

WITH WHOM YOU COMPARE YOURSELF – RELATIONSHIP OF SOCIAL COMPARISON & EMPLOYEE WORK OUTCOMES - LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE (LMX) AS MEDIATOR

Naveed Anwar¹

Assistant Professor, IQRA University Main Campus Karachi.

Dr. Niaz Ahmed Bhutto²

Head of Business Administration Dept., Sukkur IBA, Sukkur.

Dr. Irfan Hameed³

Assistant Professor, IQRA University
Karachi.

Badar Zaman Quershi⁵

PhD Scholar IQRA University Karachi

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This research contributes further into investigating the impact of Social Comparison (i.e. Negative Social Comparison (NSC) and Positive Social Comparison (PSC) and work attitudes (i.e. Overall Job Satisfaction- OJS and Affective Commitment – AC using Leader Member Exchange (LMX) as a potential mediator among the relationship of Social Comparison and work attitudes.

Design / Methodology / Approach: This research is causal, descriptive and cross sectional in nature. Following positivist research paradigm data was collected from 232 employees of First tier commercial banks using a self-administrative survey. Factor Analysis, Multiple Regression Analysis, ANOVA, Pearson Correlation and Descriptive statistics were used to test the hypothesis of the study and provide conclusion about hypothesis. The mediation effects of Leader member exchange was also tested using the steps of Baron and Kenny (1986).

Findings: The results exhibited that the Positive Social Comparison has positive association with Affective Commitment (AC) and overall job satisfaction (OJS). Further, NSC relationship was negatively significant with Affective Commitment and also it was found to have a significant negative relationship with Overall Job Satisfaction. LMX, Leader Member Exchange mediates the relationship among Social Comparison Negative and Positive Social Comparison.

Originality/Value: These significant results have shown the importance of quality of Leader Member Exchange and its impact in yielding the positive organizational outcomes. As long as the managers pay a good attention towards the quality of relationship among them and their workers, the chances are that any type of comparison (Negative or Positive) will have less chance to affect the organizational outcomes, such as affective commitment and overall job satisfaction. These results are vital for HR practitioners and will assist in designing quality HPWPs in organizations.

Key Words: Social Comparison, Leader Member Exchange, Overall Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment

* The material presented by the author does not necessarily portray the viewpoint of the editors and the management of the Institute of Business & Technology (IBT)

¹ Naveed Anwar : naveed@lrk.szabist.edu.pk

© IBT-JBS is published by the Institute of Business and Technology (IBT). Main Ibrahim Hydri Road, Korangi Creek, Karachi-75190, Pakistan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is imperative element for both individual and organizational success. Leadership is not even important for profit oriented organizations and non-profit oriented organizations but it is evident that it has even become important for military type organizations (Truckenbrodt, 2000). Leadership being an extensively researched construct in behavioral sciences has always been a mystery for researcher (Milne et al., 2007). Since many years, an emergent body of leadership research primarily focusing on the dyadic relationship between supervisor and subordinates, which is known as leader member exchange (LMX) theory, been a keen area of interest for researchers (Stringer, 2006). An ample body of research has shown that higher quality of LMX relationship has positive relationship with employees feeling of obligation to reciprocate by showing excellent work performance and with positive attitudes (Nahrgang & Morgeson, 2007). Regardless of these strong findings, earlier research has mainly focused on the impact of LMX on individual staff at dyad level; largely pay no heed to the fact that LMX is entrenched within wider social context of organization. Organizations are formed to achieve common objectives, and most of the work is done in teams or together due to the component of interdependence or synergy. As a single employee's LMX is not cut off from other members' LMX and via a sequence of every day exchanges and interactions, casual discussions, and communal events, individual may observe, learn and compare their own LMX relationships with their fellow workers, LMX relationships (Wageman, 2001). One can presume, that there is very clear relationship among LMX and organizational performance, one may say that good quality LMX will lead to good organizational performance, as mentioned above, but as we stated earlier that LMX is not an isolated event, it happens within a social context. If is this so, then how the quality of leader member exchange will be effected by the social comparison made by employees among each other and further what will be the possible impact on attitudes and behaviors of the employees. Our argument in this study is guided by the theory of social comparison given in most prominent work of Festinger in 1954, in which he states that employee normally make use of social comparison information to shape self-evaluations, and their job attitudes, behavior are guided, by this comparison (Wood, 1989). According to Moore (2007) and Mussweiler & Strack, (2000) a "contrast effect" ensue where an individual normally experience a constructive effect or influence when employees make "downward comparison" and unconstructive, negative effect or influence when individual make "upwards comparisons". In simple words, when one compare him with others who are better off, it leads to an unfavorable image, on the other side comparing ourselves to those who are worse off improves our self-image. This is also labeled as the "hedonic consequences of social comparison" (Lyubomirsky and Ross, 1997, p. 1141)

The literature review reveals that most of the studies investigating the quality of leader member exchange and social comparison impact on employees' job behaviors have been conceptualized almost autonomously. Binding together the LMX and social comparison theory, the current study attempts to investigate the relationship and impact of negative as well as positive social comparison on the quality of LMX and on certain organizational outcomes, such as organizational commitment and overall job satisfaction.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CURRENT HYPOTHESIS

LMX theory stated that, scarcity of time and resources for devoting to individual employee creates an opportunity for leaders to have a close social interaction with few crucial subordinates and this leads to a paired relationship between them (Cashman and Graen, 1975; Scandura and Graen ; 1987; Graen and Liden ,1980). The remaining staffs are categorized as out-group. When there is the existence of high levels of LMX, subordinates come to know how satisfied the supervisor is, with their performance and believe that they have a good work relationships with their supervisor (Graen, Novak, and Sommerkamp, 1982). Before we go any further, let's look to the fundamentals and bases of LMX stated by researchers.

While talking about the base of LMX, according to Katz and Kahn (1978) role theory is the base of LMX conceptualization and its imperial support , same idea was supported by Liden, Sparrowe, and Wayne (1997), while according to Blau (1964) it is based on social exchange relationships. Katz and Kahn (1978) argued that in organization everyone has to play a specific role. In organizations, employees have to achieve their tasks through assigned roles (Dienesch and Liden, 1986) and according to Graen (1976) roles are adopted steadily and it is the outcome of informal communications of leaders and employee.

LMX theory has evolved over the period of time in different stages. The first stage of LMX theory advancement was Vertical dyad linkage (VDL) theory formulated by Graen and his associates, (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1998). The analysis on this level is based on pair of leader and member. Further, it was discussed that there are four stages of LMX progress over last two decades.

The second phase of LMX theory development was based on the confirmation of differentiation process study; LMX relationships characteristics investigation and organizational allusion i.e. background and futures effects of LXM. The third stage of LMX development was labeled as dyadic partnership building (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1998). Vertical dyad linkage (VDL) development model was anticipated by Graen and Scandura (1987) in which the leader and the member become aware of role taking and role making and role – routinization process. (At the early development of their relationship).

Sparrowe and Lisen (1997) supported the idea that for the future research on nature of LMX, social analysis is supposed to provide a progressive path. Researchers of LMX give emphasis to quality of relationship while social network analysis dealing scholars lengthened LMX perspective by elucidating the structural base of research and theory. Leader member exchange has further extended the study of social network by taking into account the quality of relationship, the exchanges nature and conjoint social networks.

Since during preliminary stages it might be true that exchange are essential to build a high quality LMX. Faith, devotion and deference are considered as the essence of stable relation between member and leader. If anyone anticipate the results of each and every efforts made by him for everything than there is less possibility of forming a good relationship of faith and deference between them and it leads to a short period LMX relationship. The exchange of high leader member exchange can be a result of high quality along with herald. In this context, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1998) explained that leader member exchange is more transformational than transactional.

2.1 LMX and Organizational Commitment

According to Liden, Sparrowe and Wayne (1997), LMX theory's central concern is that, at work place there should be the relationships between supervisors and subordinates and the quality and intensity of these relations describe the amount of efforts (mental and physical), resources flow and support exchanges between them . In other words, we can say that high quality leader member exchange involves more exchange then the low quality leader member exchange. The research conducted by Gerstner and Day (1997) reliable findings suggest the positive relationships of LMX with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Some suggest only organizational commitment (Masterson et al., 2000).

Researcher investigated that, the satisfaction, commitment, performance level of out group members is lower than the in group members (Allinson, Armstrong, and Hayes, 2001) LMX has found to have a direct relationship with organizational commitment (Ansari et al., 2001; Masterson et al., 2001). According to Ansari et al. (2001), "professional", "revere," "input" and "affect" positively associate with commitment, but are unrelated with persistence commitment, particularly in case of "affect." In same vein, Meyer et al. (1993) noticed the irrelevancy of c o n t i n u a n c e commitment with professional involvement.

2.2 LMX and Job Satisfaction

As per Epitropaki and Martin (2005) fewer longitudinal studies examined LMX as job satisfactions" forecaster. LMX was positively linked with job satisfaction (Vecchio et al., 1986) Correspondingly, Major et al. (1995) examined 224 fresh recruit and Epitropaki and Martin (2005) examined 436 British workers, both found the same results for the effects of LMX.

The existing literature provides justification of this positive impact of LMX on job satisfaction. First, employee in high-quality LMX get several intrinsic benefits (empowerment, decision power) and extrinsic benefits (salary enhancement, advancement) and also endows positive socio-emotional experiences (Epitropaki and Martin, 2005), that is positively associates with satisfaction on job. Second, job satisfaction is that, up to what level realty meets our perception of job (Locke, 1967); in-group members in LMX are more confident and feel superior then those fellow members who are not taken as in-group members. Third, according to work design models, LMX and job satisfaction are positively associated.

Further evidences, verify a strong connection of outcomes with high quality relationships; so far there are some restrictions for this research. First ,even though separation of worker as out and in work group is the central concern of the LMX theory but there is the lack of research on the effects of this separation (i.e. high and low quality relationships with workers) (Maslyn and Uhl-Bien, 2005). Second, several researchers argued about the need of analyzing margin conditions of LMX effects. (Chen, Lam, and Zhong, 2007; Erdogan and Enders, 2007).

At present, we do not have a refine knowledge of circumstances in which LMX is strongly or weakly associated to essential results. In addition, resource allocation in context of forming a high quality relationship, will give manager a better idea of, when such favors are valuable in the relationships. Third, in general organizational behavior (Johns, 2006), and Particular LMX (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Schriesheim et al., 1999) have been argued because the analyzing of relationships was not within a social context. LMX theory is based on leaders" differential relationships with workers in the group and it is essential to consider "patterns of relationship quality" as depict by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995: 234), that is maintain in work groups.

The quality of LMX may have an association with organizational outcomes, as high quality LMX may have positive association with organizational outcome such as commitment and job satisfaction but the question, which most of literature is unable to answer, that LMX do not happen in isolation. Employees in general always compare their relation with boss as compare

to others. This comparison may be of two types upward with those who are better off and also with those who are worse off. If it is so then the question arise that what could be the possible impact this upward and downwards social comparison on LMX and organizational outcome. Let us find out more about this phenomenon social comparison, which I believe is a reality in real organization.

3. SOCIAL COMPARISON

According to Festinger (1954), social comparison is the process in which individuals compare them to other to aware that how they have to behave, what is envisaged and/or how to treat. This theory suggest that at foundation level human got “a drive to evaluate their opinions and abilities” and “to the extent that objective, non-social means are not available, people evaluate their opinions and abilities by comparison respectively with the opinions and abilities of others.”. Therefore, coworkers are the sources of social comparison information (Colquitt, 2004). Moreover, individuals habitually use “aggregate social comparisons” in which they compare their selves with people in their near environment (Buckingham and Alicke, 2002)

Knowing ones” value or position in work group is one of the reasons for engaging in social comparison. According to group value model of justice, an individual wants to be the part of social collectives and the treatment of organizational authorities defines worker importance and acceptance in work group.

To expand social comparison processes to in the employee perception of LMX, we speculate that LMX association to outcomes of work will not only affected by evaluation of own relationship but with the quality of relationship of coworkers too. As discussed earlier, high quality individuals” LMX is directly proportional to favorable utcomes of job, and inversely proportional to unfavorable outcomes at work. However, in this research we examined that these relationships with relation to employees making comparison with each other, In particular, we expect favorable outcomes when employee make positive social comparison and further it will lead to high quality leader member exchange relationship.

In contrast, we speculate that negative social comparison will lead towards low quality leader members exchange and negative outcomes can be expected. There are number of studies and theoretical grounds for this speculation, but almost no study have studied LMX, Social comparison and organizational outcomes.

It is found that when there is low LMX of individuals, it is supposed that work outcomes of employees are worse when LMX of coworker is high. Particularly, employee having low LMX with respect to other workers sends a signal that he or she is less valuable than coworkers. Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson, and Pagon (2006) named this process of differentiation of relationships as “singled out”. Singling out entailed that, leader can develop high quality relationship with worker, but neglecting a worker and intentionally giving him a low status is questionable (about his value and acceptance by the leader).

According to Festinger (1954), for an individual having high LMX, predication is different that of from social comparison theory. As social comparison theory suggest that when individual have high quality relations with leader, in comparison of coworkers, the outcome of this relationship is favorable but organization justice theory suggest different. As equity theory explained that when there are overpayments for any individual with reference of others then individuals feel guilt and negative emotions.

Therefore, a high quality relationship with leader when coworkers do not have can raise negative emotions that lead to unfavorable attitudes and performance. According to equity theory and researches on deservingness (Feather, 1999), there are possible burdens because of high position rank. Researchers in this regards showed that, such high rank individuals or “tall poppies”

are evaluated negatively in their social circle. Therefore, individuals with high quality relationships with leader contrast to coworkers (having low quality relationships), have a fear of treated negatively by fellows and for avoiding these consequences and for getting most favorable outcomes, there should be similar relationship of both i.e. individuals and coworkers with leader. There is the validation of the idea that, work group members use the treatment of fellows as social comparison information. Research finds the relationship of one's own treatment with treatment for others in same work group and it is analyzed that the outcome is more favorable when both treatments are similar (Colquitt, 2004; Duffy et al., 2006; Mayer, Nishii, Schneider, and Goldstein, 2007).

Based on finding, literature review and research gap exist in context mentioned above in social comparison, leader member exchange, overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The present study expected the following relationships

Hypothesis 1: *Negative Social Comparison will be negatively related to Overall Job Satisfaction.*

Hypothesis 2: *Negative Social Comparison will be negatively related to Affective Commitment*

Hypothesis 3: *Positive Social Comparison will be positively related to Overall Job Satisfaction.*

Hypothesis 4: *Positive Social Comparison will be positively related to Overall Affective Commitment.*


Hypothesis 5a: *LMX will mediate the relationship between Negative Social Comparison and Overall Job Satisfaction.*

Hypothesis 5b: *LMX will mediate the relationship between Negative Social Comparison and Affective Commitment*

Hypothesis 6a: *LMX will mediate the relationship between Positive social comparison and Overall Job Satisfaction.*

Hypothesis 6b: *LMX will mediate the relationship between Positive social comparison and Affective Commitment*

Semantic Diagram



4. RESEARCH DESIGN

A survey method was used to collect data from the employees of private banks operating in Larkana District. A Self-Administered Questionnaire was distributed in 360 Employees of total 55 private banks in Larkana. Of the 360 questionnaires distributed, 232 completed questionnaires were received, for a response rate of 64 %. All respondents those participated in research were permanent, and of top and middle level officer. The sample was composed of bank employee's graduate degree (21 percent), with Master's Degree (79 percent). Most of the respondents (72 percent) were male. Almost 55% respondents were Master Degree holder and rest were around 45% had bachelor degree.

4.1 Measures

All variables other than control variables were measured using a five point Likert scale ranging from "Not At All" (1) to "To Great Extent" (5). All scales were highly reliable and been used since many years by many researchers.

4.2 Social Comparison

The two dimensions of social comparison positive and negative social comparison given by Vander Zee et. al (2000) was used to measure the social comparison of employees. These 12 items were used to measure positive and negative social comparisons.

4.3 Leader Member Exchange:

Quality of Leader member exchange among employee and their supervisor was measured through the highly recommended seven-item LMX 7 scale developed by (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). A sample item is "How well does your immediate supervisor understand your problems and needs?" (Alpha = 0.91) (Klein & Kim, 1998)

4.4 Affective Commitment:

Employee Affective commitment with their organization was measured using a five item scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). A sample item is "I feel emotionally attached to this organization." Correlation of 0.83 was reported with overall scale of Organizational Commitment.

4.5 Overall Job Satisfaction:

A highly reliable scale to measure overall job satisfaction, developed by Cook Hepworth, Wall and Warr, (1981) was used in present study. A sample item is "All in all, how satisfied are you with this organization, compared to most?"

4.6 Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to confirm the generalizability and validity of the selected measures in our research context, an exploratory factor analysis was performed. All items that were loaded on more than one factor or had a low factor loading were taken out one by one. Finally 23 items were selected"; 06 for Positive Comparison, 06 for Comparison, 05 for LMX, 04 for AC and 02 for

OJS. (See Figure 1)

5. RESULTS

Figure 2, presented the descriptive statistics and inter-correlations among all the constructs (including control variables), using average scores of the scales finalized in the measurement model.

Main Effect Results:

To test H1 and H2, Multiple Hierarchical Regression Analysis was used. The first step of the analysis was to enter all demographic variables in to the model. In the subsequent step of the analysis Negative Social Comparison (NSC) was entered into the model. The results of the analysis are presented in exhibit 3. The results of Regression Analysis (See Figure 3) supported the predicted relationships among NSC and Overall Job Satisfaction, So H1 hypothesis was supported and for H2 -the predicted relationship among NSC and Affective Commitment (AC) was also supported.

To test H3- -H4, Multiple Hierarchical Regression Analysis was used. The first step of the analysis was to enter all demographic variables in to the model. In the subsequent step of the analysis Positive Social Comparison (PSC) was entered into the model. The results of the analysis are presented in Figure 3. The results of Regression Analysis (See Figure 3) support the predicted relationships among PSC , overall Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment (AC) .Hence Hypothesis 3 and 4 were supported.

Mediating Variables Results:

H5a-H6b predicted that LMX would mediate the relations between Social Comparison (PSC & NSC) and both OJS and AC examined in this study. To test these hypotheses, the three-step mediation regression procedure provided by Baron and Kenny (1986) was followed. Baron and Kenny (1986) stipulate three requirements for establishing mediation effects. First, regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable must yield a significant effect for the independent variable on the dependent variable. Second, regressing the mediator variable on the independent variable must yield a significant effect for the independent variable on the mediator variable. Third, regressing the dependent variable on both the independent variable and the mediating variable must yield a significant effect for the mediator on the dependent variable. Mediation is present when all three conditions are met. Full mediation is demonstrated if the independent variable is no longer significant when the mediator variable is included in the equation. Partial mediation is demonstrated if the effect of the independent variable is smaller when the mediator variable is included in the equation.

H5a -6b predicted that LMX will mediate the relationship of NSC, PSC and both work attitudes (overall job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment) examined in the Study. To test the hypothesis, the Three – steps mediation regression steps mentioned by Baron and Kenny (1986) was followed. The results of H5a and H5b showed that the LMX fully mediate the relationship among social Comparison (Negative and Positive Social Comparison) and organizational outcomes (Overall Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment).

6. DISCUSSION

Literature review has shown that it is a normal nature of employees to compare themselves with one another. Some compare themselves with staff above them in social status and some compare with the people lower in the line. Which were categorized as Positive and Negative Social Comparisons (Referred as PSC and NSC) Based on this comparison, it was proposed by this study that the work attitudes may or may not vary among the staff with negative and positive social comparison. On the other hand, it was also conceptualized that the leader member exchange quality does play a vital role in this whole puzzle. The LMX can be vital force to mediate the relationship among Social Comparison and work attitudes. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis showed that the predicted relationship among NSC and Overall Job Satisfaction supported and the negative relationship among NSC and Affective Commitment (AC) was also supported.

The predicted relationships among PSC, Affective Commitment (AC) and Overall Job Satisfaction were supported. The mediation effect of LMX on Social Comparison (NSC & PSC), Affective Commitment and Overall Job Satisfaction was significant and supported. So, this reflects how important the quality of LMX among employees and supervisors is. The employees with NSC can easily be handled with quality LMX. If managers will focus on their relationship with employees the negative impact of NSC can be reduced, to yield the positive work outcomes. One of the main reasons for these interesting results may be the nature of employees and confused state of mind of workers working in under developed countries. Due to more or less obvious factors such as lack of job opportunities, job insecurity, introverted nature of employees, lack of education, lack of self-awareness in under developed countries, staff in poor countries does have emotions, feelings towards the jobs, they do compare with one another, but how much vocal they are about this comparison is another question to be explored by future researchers. Some where they are vocal and have shown that their relationship with their supervisor do make an impact on work attitudes ,when then compare themselves either negative or positive but on the other side some time they have shown the results otherwise..

7. CONCLUSION

The seen, observed attitudes and relationships can be sugar coated by employees by hiding the real feeling and attitudes. This needs further exploration by future researchers, especially with context to Pakistan and other Under Developed Countries. It is the high time that the managers and researchers in underdeveloped countries should start understanding that the work situations, nature of staff , economic resources, personalities and other factors are different in poor countries , which may cause issues in applying the lessons learned from researches conducted in advance economies .

Limitations and Future Research Directions

First limitation is that nature of cross sectional design for data collection did not gave way to the concepts in due time. Some loops in feedback may exist between past, present and future definitions of the underlying concepts. For example a recent happening may cause distortion to the feedback. Second the Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Structural Equation modeling could have been used to study the relationships among the variables of the model. This would have given a chance to test the full path model. Third, as this study have incorporated only overall Job satisfaction and Affective commitment as work outcomes , it would have been interesting to take other work attitudes and even work behaviors in to the account, such as performance, actual

turnover, absenteeism , OCB , Turn over Intentions.

REFERENCES

- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.
- Blau, P.M. 1964. Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Buunk BP, Zurriaga R, Peiró JM, Nauta A, Gosálvez I. (2005). Social comparisons at work as related to a cooperative social climate and to individual differences in social comparison orientation. *Applied Psychology*, 54, 61–80.
- Carson, K., and Carson, P.P. 2002. LMX reflections: An interview with George Graen, *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship* 7, 91-98.
- Dienesch, R.M., and Liden, R.C. 1986. Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development, *Academy of Management Review* 11, 618-634
- Dienesch, R.M., and Liden, R.C. 1986. Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development, *Academy of Management Review* 11, 618-634
- 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.
- Ferris, G.R. 1985. Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process: A constructive replication, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 70, 777-781.
- Gouldner, A.W. 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement, *American Sociological Review* 25, 161-178.
- Graen, G., and Cashman, J. 1975. A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (eds.), *Leadership Frontiers*, 143-165, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175-208.
- Graen, G.B. 1976. Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1201-1245, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Graen, G.B., and Scandura, T.A. 1987. Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing, *Research in Organizational Behavior* 9, 175-208.
- Graen, G.B., and Uhl-Bien, M. 1998. Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective, *Leadership Quarterly* 6, 219-247.
- Graen, G., and Cashman, J. 1975. A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (eds.), *Leadership Frontiers*, 143-165, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G.B.; Novak, M.; and Sommerkamp, P. 1982. The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 30, 109-131.
- 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., and Scandura, T.A. 1987. Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing, *Research in Organizational Behavior* 9, 175-208.
- Graen GB, Liden RC, Hoel W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 868–872.
- Graen, G.B.; Novak, M.; and Sommerkamp, P. 1982. The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 30, 109-131.
- Katz, D., and Kahn, R.L. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organization*, 2nd ed., New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Klein, H., & Kim, J. (1998). A field study of the influence of situational constraints, leader- member exchange, and goal commitment on performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 88 95.

- Kaiser, H.F. (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-415.
- Liden, R.C.; Wayne, S.J.; and Stilwell, D. 1993. A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78, 662-674.
- Liden, R.C.; Sparrowe, R.T.; and Wayne, S.J. 1997. Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future, *Research in Personal and Human Resource Management* 15, 47-119.
- Lyubomirsky S, Ross L. (1997). Hedonic consequences of social comparison: A contrast Of happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1141-1157.*logical Review*, 110, 472-489.
- Liden, R.C.; Sparrowe, R.T.; and Wayne, S.J. 1997. Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future, *Research in Personal and Human Resource Management* 15,47-119.
- Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R.T., & Wayne, S.J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 47-119). Greenwich, CT: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Moore DA. (2007). Not so above average after all: When people believe they are worse than average and its implications for theories of bias in social comparison. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102, 42-58.
- Mussweiler T. (2003). Comparison processes in social judgment: Mechanisms and consequences.
- Milner, K., Katz, L. A., Fisher, J., & Notrica. (2007). Gender and the quality of the leader-member exchange: Findings from a South African organization. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(2), 316-329.
- Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at work: A meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 71.
- Stringer, L. (2006). The link between the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship and the level of the employee's job satisfaction. *Public Organizational Review*, 6, 125-142.
- Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (2000). The relationship between leader-member exchange and commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acquisition Review Quarterly*, 7(3), 233.
- Wageman R. (2001). The meaning of interdependence. In Turner ME (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 197-217). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human relations*, 7(2), 117-140.
- Wood JV. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 231-248.
- Wheeler, L., & Caggiula, A. R. (1966). The contagion of aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Wayne, S.J., and Green, S.A. 1993. The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior, *Human Relations* 46, 1431-1440.
- Wayne, S.J., and Ferris, G.R. 1990. Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75, 487-499.

Appendix**Figure 1. Factor Loading for Positive Social Comparison, Negative Social Comparison, Leader Member Exchange, Over All Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment**

Items	1	2	3	4	5
Positive Social Comparison					
I realize that I can also improve myself like them	0.668				
I am pleased that things can get better	0.723				
I have good hope that my situation will improve	0.780				
I am happy that I am doing so well	0.511				
I feel relieved/comfortable about my own situation	0.611				
I realize how well I am doing	0.547				
Negative Social Comparison					
It is threatening to realize that I am not doing so well		0.760			
I feel depressed realizing that I am not so well off		0.755			
I feel depressed realizing that I am not so well off		0.724			
I feel fear of decline like them		0.840			
I fear that my future will be similar to them		0.755			
I fear that I will go along the same way		0.710			
Leader Member Exchange					
Do you know where you stand with your leader			0.740		
How well does your leader understand your job problems			0.610		
How well does your leader recognize your potential?			0.510		
Regardless of how much formal authority your leader?			0.771		
How would you characterize your working relation with your leader?			0.710		
Affective Commitment					
I feel emotionally attached to this organizations				0.709	
This organization has a lot of personal meaning for me				0.669	
I really feel my organization's problems are mine				0.698	
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of my Organization				0.560	
Overall Job Satisfaction					
Considering skills, effort. How satisfied are you with your					0.838
How satisfied do you feel with your chance for getting ahead in this organization in the future?					0.563

Total Variance Explained = 53.08% KMO=0.808

Figure 2: Descriptive statistics & Inter-Correlations Summary

S.No	Variables	Mean	Std .D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Gender	NA	NA							
2	Experience	4.97	3.68	.052	1					
3	Qualification	NA	NA	-.009	-.030	1				
4	LMX	2.91	0.57	-.001	-.098	.074	1			
5	OJS	3.22	0.65	-.037	-.126	-.023	.444**	1		
6	AC	2.97	0.59	-.041	.046	.062	.212**	.204**	1	
7	PSC	3.24	0.81	-.068	-.105	-.046	.388**	.554**	.363**	1
8	NSC							-		
		2.96	0.72	-.062	-.097	.081	.128		.180**	.237**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

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

Exhibit 3: Results of Regression Analyses
Overall Job Satisfaction **Affective Commitment**

Step 1	LMX	-0.05		0.735	-0.15		0.374
Gender Qualification Experience		0.00		0.878	0.03		0.061
		-0.06		0.534	0.07		0.525
	NSC	0.331*	-0.090*		-0.16*		
PSC	0.422*	0.451 *			0.13*		
LMX		0.204*			0.254*		
Step 3							
LMX ¹		0.15*			0.105*		
LMX ²		0.13 *			0.17 *		
Adjusted R ²			0.36			0.25	
Change in R ²			0.06			0.03	

*. Significant at the 0.05 level

1:
LMX
Mediation Results of LMX with NSC
LMX²:
Mediation Results of LMX with PS