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ABSTRACT

As organizations continue to focus on improving their effectiveness, research suggests that employee performance should be an obvious consideration due to the significant influence employee behavior can have on organizational outcomes. The present study evaluated the relationship between the personality traits of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, Leader Member Exchange (LMX), and two basic types of performance: task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Insights into how personality and LMX impacts employee performance has implications for both employee selection and organizational design. Using a sample composed of students and non-students \((N = 215)\), results support a positive relationship between LMX, conscientiousness, and agreeableness and task performance as well as a positive relationship between conscientiousness and agreeableness and OCB. OCB was not related to LMX. Contrary to the hypotheses, LMX did not appear to moderate the relationship between personality and performance. Future research and practical implications are discussed.
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CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION

Researchers have tried to establish the major determiners of employee performance for decades (Dennis Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Dennis Organ & Ryan, 1995; Turnipseed & Wilson, 2009; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Employee performance has a significant impact on organizational effectiveness (Bowler, Halbesleben, & Paul, 2010; P. M. Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008). Employee performance has two primary components: task performance and citizenship performance, also known as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007). Task performance describes the roles and responsibilities as typically specified in a job description, whereas OCBs are additional behaviors that go above and beyond the daily expected tasks of a job. According to Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006), OCBs can impact effectiveness at the individual, group and organizational levels of analysis. At the organizational level, OCB is linked to an increase in customer satisfaction, profitability, and revenue along with a decrease in customer complaints and turnover (Whiting et al., 2008). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) found that OCBs increase coworker and manager productivity, the dissemination of best practices throughout the organization, and the ability to attract and retain high quality talent, while they reduce the variability of organizational performance. Perhaps most importantly, they found that OCBs enhance the organization’s ability to adapt to a changing environment.
Numerous studies have attempted to determine predictors, mediators, and moderators of relationships between predictors and task and OCB performance including job satisfaction, personality, perceptions of leader effectiveness, social exchange relationships, attitudinal measures, motives, role cognitions, and gender (Bowling, 2010; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009; Kacmar, Collins, Harris, & Judge, 2009; Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007; Y. J. Kim, Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Johnson, 2013; Dennis Organ & Ryan, 1995; Stamper & Dyne, 1999). Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) explored the combined effects of personality traits and workplace social exchange relationships, such as Leader Member Exchange (LMX) and Team Member Exchange, in predicting both task and OCB performance. Historically, personality and social exchange constructs were predominantly studied in different research areas. Results indicated that 1) conscientiousness positively predicted task and OCB performance, 2) agreeableness positively predicted citizenship performance, and 3) LMX positively predicted task and citizenship performance. Researchers also found LMX moderated both the relationship between conscientiousness and task performance and also moderated the relationship of both conscientiousness and agreeableness with citizenship performance. In support of Trait Activation Theory (TAT), Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) provided insight into situations when personality is more or less likely to predict performance (Tett & Burnett, 2003). They found that the weaker the social exchange relationship, the more important personality becomes. Conversely, the stronger the relationship, the less important personality becomes; essentially personality is “neutralized” with strong social exchange relationships. Because managers may not have a decision in selecting their subordinates, this has practical implications in that a manager should build a strong relationship with employees especially those who are lower in
conscientiousness and agreeableness traits, since these are most strongly related to performance (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007).

The present study examined the combined influence of personality (specifically conscientiousness and agreeableness) and LMX in predicting both task and OCB performance. In contrast to Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), Team Member Exchange was excluded to narrow the focus solely to LMX. The present study utilized a more balanced gender sample than used by Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) whose employee sample was 94% male and 100% male supervisors. The present study also examined a greater variety of occupations than used by Kamdar and Van Dyne’s (2007) whose sample was exclusively comprised of engineers. Due to unavailability of performance measures such as those used by Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), this study will also use different measures for personality, LMX, task performance, and citizenship performance. Based on a review of existing literature, no other study has extended the research by examining the combined effects of personality and LMX on employee performance. The study is organized as follows: brief descriptions of TAT, task, and OCB performance (R. Tett & Burnett, 2003). The present study will then present a review of the existing research into the relationship of personality and support the theory that the quality of LMX relationships can impact performance, and conclude with a summary of research connecting all the relevant constructs.

**Roots of Trait Activation Theory**

According to Tett, Simonet, Walser, and Brown (2013), TAT has historical roots in interactional psychology (see Murray 1938). The theory has three basic components: 1) personality traits evoke certain behaviors in individuals, 2) these traits are activated in response
to certain situational cues, and 3) intrinsic satisfaction results when individuals express these traits. Tett and Burnett (2003) built on Murray’s 1938 foundation and focused on workplace applications. Although five different interpretations are provided in the model by Tett and Burnett (2003), the main principle is “latent traits are expressed as work behavior in reaction to trait-relevant situations cues, yielding intrinsic rewards” (Tett et al., 2013, p.71). Essentially employees should strive to work in an environment where their individual traits can be expressed, are appreciated, and rewarded by the organization (Tett et al., 2013). Although several extensions of the theory have taken place in work autonomy and performance feedback areas, Tett et al. (2013) encourage continued research using the framework of TAT to increase understanding “the relative importance of different types of situational variable in trait-outcome relations” (p.95). As later outlined, the present study mimics Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) and will measure interactions and hypothesize that high LMX relationships, as a situational variable, will weaken the effects of personality on performance.

Performance

Existing research identifies two basic types of performance - task and OCB. Williams and Anderson (1991) defined task performance (e.g., in-role performance) as simply executing the basic responsibilities typically outlined in a job description and can be thought of as the core job requirements. OCB (e.g., extra-role performance), goes beyond the traditional job description and includes behaviors such as helping others and volunteering for additional assignments (Bergeron, Schroeder, & Martinez, 2014). Rummler and Brache (1991) used the analogy of white space on an organizational chart to better visualize OCB; in other words, everything that is not specifically defined in the boxes on the chart. Schmitt and Borman (1993)
reconceptualized performance to include contextual performance, which is the collection of other activities that do not fall under the category of task performance. This type of performance contributes indirectly to the support of the organization, social and psychological environment and not necessarily to the technical core of the organizational purpose. Although OCB is technically considered a behavior, measuring performance through behavior is another alternative to measuring performance based on outcomes, incorporating the how into the achievement. Organizations that have performed consistently over time have supported performance measurement on longer term behaviors versus short term goal achievement (Harikumar, 2013).

Organ and Ryan (1995) suggested that task and OCB performance have different antecedents. Task performance relies heavily on knowledge, skills and abilities along with incentives and contractual rewards, where OCB relies on job attitudes and dispositional factors as well as personality. Although not absolute in every situation, as these could become antecedents for the other types of performance, but this provides a general framework for observation (Dennis Organ & Ryan, 1995). As mentioned previously, consequences of employee performance include Podsakoff and MacKenzie’s (1997) findings that OCBs influence the success of the organization and suggest further research. Naturally, lack of task performance will impact the outcomes of any organization.

The origins of OCB dates to Barnard (1938) cooperative concept. Katz and Kahn (1966) added the further descriptors of in-role vs. extra role which eventually led to a migration to the term OCB (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Turnipseed & Wilson, 2009). According to Turnipseed and Wilson (2009), the fundamental question is why employees go above and beyond for their organization? Because social exchange is the expectation of a “reward” based on association,
OCB can be considered a social exchange between an employee and an organization (Blau, 1964; Dennis Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Turnipseed & Wilson, 2009). A social exchange relationship, such as LMX, provides an explanation for why employees engage in OCB (Turnipseed & Wilson, 2009).

**Leader Member Exchange**

Initially identified almost forty years ago, LMX is another concept that has received considerable research in the organizational sciences (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012). Until the introduction of LMX, leadership had been conceptualized as a top-down process characterized as a single dimension relationship (Martin, 2010). Prominent amongst these being, Average Leadership Style which proposed leaders adopt a typical more homogeneous relationship with their subordinates (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). In contrast, LMX focuses on the dyadic relationship formed between a leader and a subordinate (Liden & Graen, 1980). LMX is based on the concept that leaders can treat subordinates differently and do not have the same leadership style across their team and is therefore categorized across a continuum (Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007; Liden & Graen, 1980). According to Bernerth et al. (2007), low LMX relationships are categorized based on transactional dimensions of employment versus high LMX relationships which are based on trust, respect and influence between the leader and subordinate. Liden and Graen (1980) stated the importance of the strength of the LMX relationship as it impacts other organizational outcomes such as performance and turnover.

In a comprehensive meta-analysis, Dulebohn et al. (2012) reviewed 247 studies to examine the antecedents and consequences of LMX in an attempt to summarize the nature of
LMX relationships. The expansive list of antecedents included three main headings of follower characteristics, leader characteristics, and interpersonal relationship. Follower characteristics included items such as competence, the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality traits, and affectivity. Leader characteristics included items such as leader expectations of followers, reward behavior, extraversion and agreeableness. Interpersonal relationship items included perceived similarity, self promotion, and leader trust. Among others, consequences of LMX included turnover intentions and actual turnover, job performance, procedural and distributive justice, and overall OCB (Dulebohn et al., 2012). Of relevance to the present study, results of their meta-analysis showed a positive relationship between LMX and conscientiousness and agreeableness as well as a stronger positive relationship with job performance and overall OCB.

Also linking OCB with LMX, Tekleab and Taylor (2003) found a very strong relationship between LMX and OCB. Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2007) also showed a strong relationship between LMX and OCB in their meta-analysis. In a more recent meta-analysis by Colquitt et al. (2013), they found support that the strength or quality of the relationship as determined by various components such as trust, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support and LMX was significant with OCB and task performance.

From a practical viewpoint, the research supports higher LMX relationships can lead to higher employee performance for both task and OCB. In addition, leaders tend to give more positive ratings to employees where the LMX relationship is stronger (Bowler et al., 2010). As mentioned before, Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) also noted the strength of the LMX relationship can also determine the role personality plays in the sequence. Dulebohn et al. (2012) conclude “that LMX relationships may be central to the organizational functioning” (p. 1744). The present study will propose the following LMX hypotheses:
H1a: LMX is positively related to task performance.
H1b: LMX is positively related to OCB.

**Personality at Work – Conscientiousness and Agreeableness**

According to Christiansen and Tett (2013), research on personality and its relation to the workplace has found both supporters as well as a fair share of skeptics. Applied psychologists now generally agree with the importance of personality and seek a greater understanding of why employees react differently in various situations, which can be partially attributed to the influence of personality (Christiansen & Tett, 2013). Most practical uses surround the selection of individuals but research continues to seek additional applications.

The most accepted and referenced framework of personality is the FFM thoroughly established by Tupes and Christal in 1961, which helped define the nomenclature associated with personality (Lucius). The basic dimensions of personality, as described by the FFM, include agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience, and neuroticism which is now termed emotional stability (Walsh, 2004). Walsh (2004) also notes that due to the vast amount of research from Costa and McCrae (1992) and Wiggins and Trapnell (1997) this model is useful in interpreting and categorizing personality. According to Costa & McCrae (1992), these traits can generally be defined as follows: people high in extraversion tend to be assertive and social, high in conscientiousness tend to be purposeful and determined, high in agreeableness can be sympathetic to others and eager to help, high in neuroticism tend to have negative emotions of fear and guilt, and people high in openness tend to have intellectual curiosity and prefer variety.
To further expand, employees who are high in conscientiousness are organized, disciplined, diligent, and methodical, while also thought to correctly perform tasks, commit to performance, and comply with policies (Witt, Burke, Barrick, & Mount, 2002). Most scientists agree that conscientiousness has shown significant support in being one of the strongest predictors across all levels of performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In their meta-analysis, Organ and Ryan (1995) reviewed both attitude and dispositional measures as predictors of OCB. They found conscientiousness positively correlates, and can be considered a predictor, of OCB. Bowling (2010) also found support that conscientiousness is positively related to OCB and also moderates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. In a meta-analysis, LePine, Erez and Johnson (2002) found that trait conscientiousness has a moderate to strong positive correlation with OCB varying across studies. According to LePine et al. (2002), the wide range of correlations suggests potential moderators of the conscientiousness-OCB relationship. Tabak, Nguyen, Basuaray, and Darrow (2009) also show a total effect significance of conscientiousness on performance in the context of an academic course, showing support for time-on-task as a mediator. Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, and Gardner (2011) also found a positive correlation between agreeableness and OCB in their meta-analysis but found a greater significant positive correlation between conscientiousness and OCB. In the same meta-analysis, Chiaburu et al. (2011) showed conscientiousness was positively correlated with task performance. As a final reference, Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller and Johnson (2009) also found support that conscientiousness has a moderate direct effect on OCB.

Employees who are high in agreeableness are selfless, cooperative, helpful, flexible, and highly useful when engaging in teamwork (Witt et al., 2002). Agreeableness has not been highlighted in as many studies as conscientiousness and when included, the trait did not show as
strong of a relationship with performance. Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) and Small and Diefendorff (2006) both showed support that agreeable employees spend considerable time engaged in OCBs. Again, in the Chiaburu et al. (2011) meta-analysis, agreeableness was positively correlated with OCB and showed a positive correlation, albeit smaller, with task performance. Initial consideration was given to exclude agreeableness since Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) used this trait to study the interaction with team member exchange versus leader, but other supporting research as noted above, have seen correlations with performance, specifically OCB. Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) did not include a hypothesis in their study relating agreeableness and task performance due to the mixed prior research, but noted that occupation may have an influence on this relationship. Results of their study surprisingly showed when LMX is lower there is a positive relationship between agreeableness and task performance. Penney, David and Witt (2011) also noted that results have been mixed on the relationship between agreeableness and task performance agreeing that the strength of this personality trait may depend on the job. Based on this research, the present study will test the following hypotheses:

H2a: Conscientiousness is positively related to task performance.
H2b: Conscientiousness is positively related to OCB.
H3a: Agreeableness is positively related to task performance.
H3b: Agreeableness is positively related to OCB.

Research Question: Conscientiousness x Agreeableness

According to Penney and colleagues (2011), research supported that personality traits do not exist in silos but exist in combination with other traits. The conscientiousness and agreeableness interaction has received recent attention and was included as a research question in
the present study. Highly conscientious employees are always striving for the best, but how one achieves their goals may depend on the level of agreeableness (Penney et al., 2011). According to Witt et al. (2002), employees who are high in conscientiousness but low on agreeableness may produce dysfunctional outcomes. Additional description by Witt and colleagues (2002) for this type of employee stated they can be “micromanaging, unreasonably demanding, inflexible, curt, and generally difficult to deal with” (p. 165). King, George, and Hebl (2005) found that highly conscientious and highly agreeable individuals showed a positive relationship with OCB, but individuals who were high on conscientiousness and low on agreeableness showed a negative relationship with OCB. Understanding that multiple traits may be contributors in the situational outcome, this study will only focus on the two-trait interaction between conscientiousness and agreeableness (Penney et al., 2011).

Although the primary focus of the present study is on conscientiousness and agreeableness, data was collected for exploratory purposes on the other three personality traits in the FFM: extraversion, openness to experience, and emotional stability (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Several studies, such as Small and Diefendorff (2006), have shown other personality traits, like emotional stability, have a positive relationship with OCB, so the present study explored any unexpected results.

**Combined Influence of Personality and Social Exchange**

As discussed by Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), the basis of TAT is that the situational circumstance can strengthen or weaken the effect of personality on performance (Tett & Burnett, 2003). More specifically, we followed their logic in “applying trait activation to the current context, we propose that personality will predict task performance and helping [OCB] only when
social exchange relationships are poor quality” (Kamdar & Van Dyne, p.1289). Given this research, our interactional hypotheses are as follows:

H4: LMX will moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and task performance such that the relationship will be stronger when LMX is low.

H5a: LMX will moderate the relationship between Conscientiousness and OCB such that the relationship will be stronger when LMX is low.

H5b: LMX will moderate the relationship between Agreeableness and OCB such that the relationship will be stronger when LMX is low.

Figure 1 – Relationship of proposed hypotheses
CHAPTER II.
METHOD

Participants

The study sample consisted of 215 participants that were undergraduate or graduate level students at a middle sized university in the southeast United States. In addition to students, the sample included participants recruited through Facebook© and LinkedIn©. The mean age of participants was 39 (SD = 16.94) with the range of ages between 18 and 82. The majority of the participants were female 162 (75.3%) and 49 (22.8%) were male with 4 (1.9%) not reporting gender. Of the participants, 195 (90.7%) reported their ethnicity as White, with the remainder reporting Black (N = 6, 2.8%), American Indian (N = 3, 1.4%), Asian (N = 3, 1.4%), Latino (N = 2, .9%), and combined or mixed rate (N = 4, 1.9%). Two participants did not report race (N = 2, .93%). One hundred and nine participants (50.7%) were employed full-time, 51 (23.7%) were employed part-time, 30 (14.0%) were unemployed, while 23 (10.7%) were retired. The mean hours worked per week for currently employed respondents was 38.3 (SD = 12.26). The average tenure was 6.9 years (SD = 7.86). The mean salary for currently employed participants was $55,228 (SD = 37,640). The major industries reported included transportation with 50 (23.5%) participants, 24 (11.3%) participants in education, 23 (10.8%) participants in entertainment, and 54 (25.4%) participants choosing other.
Materials

The present study used previously published and validated measures. The surveys were distributed and collected using a third party on-line vendor, Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com), which was also used to track survey responses. Measures that were selected included: Wayne and Liden’s (1995) Task Performance scale, Williams and Anderson’s (1991) OCB scale, the LMSX scale developed by Bernerth et al. (2007), and the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) 50 item Big 5 personality survey (Goldberg, 1999).

Measures

Task Performance

As suggested by Kacmar et al. (2009), task performance was measured using 6 items adapted from Wayne and Liden’s 1995 Task Performance Scale (see Appendix A). The coefficient alpha for the task performance scale was .65. Items were reworded based on self-report and uses a workplace frame of reference. A 7-point Likert-type scale was used as in the original scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree). Sample questions included “Overall, to what extent do you feel you are performing your job the way your supervisor would like it to be performed”, “To what extent has your performance met your supervisor’s expectations at work”, and “Overall, to what extent do you feel you have been effectively fulfilling your roles and responsibilities at work”. The similarity questions included in this scale were not used for the present study since a self report format was used.
OCB

Eleven items were adapted and reworded from Williams and Anderson’s 1991 scale based on self-report and used a workplace frame of reference and a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree) (see Appendix B). The coefficient alpha for the OCB performance scale was .68. Sample questions included “At work, do you help others who have heavy workloads” and “At work, do you assist your supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)”. The task performance questions from the Williams and Anderson (1991) scale were not used for this study.

Multiple scales exist based on whether an aggregated or component approach is taken in measuring OCB. Even multiple scales exist based on an expanded taxonomy approach to measuring OCB (LePine et al., 2002). Although the present study is more interested in an overall OCB relationship, the OCB scale developed by Williams and Anderson in 1991 is utilized in an attempt to capture all facets of OCB. Although seemingly antiquated, this scale has been used in numerous studies such as Kim, O’Neill, and Cho (2010), Chang, Rosen, Siemieniec, and Johnson (2012), and most recently in Shaffer, Li, and Bagger (2015)Shaffer, Li, and Bagger (2015). Chang et al. (2012) note that Williams and Anderson’s (1991) scale is segmented into categories or labeled subscales that are targeted towards individuals (OCBI) and targeted towards organizations (OCBO). Some researchers claim that OCBI and OCBO are two different constructs (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007) while others posit the two components represent an overall measure of OCB (Chang et al., 2012; Hoffman, Blair & Meriac, 2007). Hoffman et al. (2007) found strong correlations between OCBI and OCBO ($r = .98$) so the present study uses the Williams and Anderson (1991) scale to capture aggregate OCB performance.
LMX

Based on a recent meta-analysis and recommendation by Dulebohn et al. (2012), the present study used a recently developed measure of LMX (LMSX) by Bernerth et al. (2007), which is one of the only measures based on a social exchange foundation between the leader and follower (see Appendix C). According to Bernerth et al. (2007), many of the recently developed scales, such as LMX7 and LMX-MDM, do not measure exchange. The coefficient alpha for the current LMSX scale was .93. Items used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree) as developed in the original study. Sample questions included “My manager and I have a two-way exchange relationship”, “I do not have to specify the exact condition to know my manager will return a favor”, and “I have a balance of inputs and outputs with my manager”.

Personality

The Big Five personality traits were measured using Goldberg’s IPIP 50 item survey (Goldberg, 1999; see Appendix D). The coefficient alpha for conscientiousness was .74 and .82 for agreeableness. Items were reworded using a workplace frame of reference and used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree). Sample questions for conscientiousness included “At work, I am always prepared”, “At work, I pay attention to details”, and “At work, I like order”. Sample questions for agreeableness include “At work, I am interested in people”, “At work, I sympathize with others’ feelings”, and “At work, I take time out for others”. 
Design & Procedure

The present study used a between-subjects design. Students accessed the questions through Sona research system (www.sona-systems.com) at a mid size university in the southeastern United States, Facebook©, and LinkedIn©. Participants began the survey with an electronic informed consent form and had to consent to the study before proceeding. Participants were told that it would be helpful to either have a current job or prior job but this was not a requirement so there were no conditions in the study. The survey was administered online and took approximately thirty minutes to complete. Responses were kept completely confidential and anonymous which is made very clear to the responders through the informed consent form at the beginning of the survey.

Participants were instructed to respond to questions based on their current or most recent workplace situation. The questions were structured to include a frame of reference, specifically in the workplace, in an attempt to increase validity as recommended by Reddock, Biderman, and Nguyen (2011). An additional introductory question asked participants if they are currently employed or have prior employment. If the answer was no, they were taken to the last section of the survey which contained personality questions only. If the answer was yes, they continued in the same predefined sequence of questions. Participants were then asked to fill out the survey using the task performance, OCB, LMX and personality scales outlined above. Participants self-reported on all survey questions. Finally, the participants were asked demographic questions including age, ethnicity, gender, average hours worked per week, salary, industry, employment status, and tenure. The survey then thanked the participants for their time and gave contact information for any questions regarding the study.
CHAPTER III.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Means, standard deviations and correlations among the study variables are shown in Table 1. Correlations were significant ($p < .001$) between task performance and OCB performance ($r = .36$), conscientiousness ($r = .48$), LMX ($r = .36$), and agreeableness ($r = .28$). Correlations were significant ($p < .01$) between OCB performance and agreeableness ($r = .19$) and conscientiousness ($r = .19$) but was not significant with LMX ($r = .13$). LMX correlations were only significant ($p < .05$) with agreeableness ($r = .15$) but not with conscientiousness ($r = .09$). The correlations between agreeableness and conscientiousness were significant ($r = .31$, $p < .001$).
Table 1  Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Task Performance</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OCB Performance</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.482***</td>
<td>0.192**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LMX</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.364***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.278***</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>0.305***</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  *** p < .001

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. Reliabilities were estimated as follows: task performance (α = .65), OCB performance (α = .68), LMX (α = .93), agreeableness (α = .82), and conscientiousness (α = .74).

Hypothesis-Related Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to conduct the statistical analysis using moderated regression techniques. Moderated regression was used to discover how LMX moderates the personality-performance relationship. With a target of detecting an effect size of .3, the power of the analyses based on a sample of 215 was calculated as .90.

Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and LMX were the independent variables, while employee performance, specifically task and OCB, were the dependent variables. LMX was also used as a moderating variable in the interactional hypotheses. The first set of hypotheses stated that LMX will be positively related to task performance (H1a) and OCB (H1b). Results show support for H1a with a positive significant correlation between LMX and task performance (r =
but there was no support found for H1b with a non-significant correlation between LMX and OCB \((r = .13, ns)\), however, results were in the expected direction. For clarification purposes as will be reviewed in the Discussion section regarding the operationalization of the OCB variable, additional analysis included calculating reliabilities of separate OCB-I scale \((\alpha = .74)\) versus OCB-O scale \((\alpha = .41)\). The results showed no significant correlation between OCB-I and LMX \((r = .10, ns)\) but showed significant correlations between OCB-O and LMX \((r = .184, p < .01)\).

The second set of hypotheses stated that conscientiousness will be positively related to task performance (H2a) and OCB (H2b). Results show support for both hypotheses with significant correlations between both conscientiousness and task performance \((r = .48, p < .001)\) as well as conscientiousness and OCB \((r = .19, p < .01)\).

The third set of hypotheses stated that agreeableness will be positively related to task performance (H3a) and OCB (H3b). Results again show support for both hypotheses with significant correlations between both agreeableness and task performance \((r = .28, p < .001)\) and agreeableness with OCB \((r = .19, p < .01)\).

Moderated regression analysis was performed to evaluate the interactional effects of the last two hypotheses: if LMX moderates the relationship between conscientiousness and task performance such that the relationship will be stronger when LMX is low (H4); and if LMX moderates the relationship between conscientiousness and OCB (H5a) and agreeableness and OCB (H5b) such that the relationship will be stronger when LMX is low. Overall, results found no support for H4, H5a and H5b as outlined below.

Table 2 shows the results of the moderated regression analysis. Each analysis involved two steps. Step one of the regression analysis included task performance as the dependent
variable and conscientiousness, LMX, and agreeableness as predictors. Step two included adding the product term developed by multiplying conscientiousness and LMX into the regression model. Step one results showed significance for the main effect for conscientiousness ($\beta = .43, p < .001$) and LMX ($\beta = .31, p < .001$) with task performance. In step two the combined interactional effects of conscientiousness and LMX did not contribute additional unique variance in task performance ($\Delta R^2 = .001$) and did not support H4 ($\beta = -.33, ns$; see Table 2).

For Hypotheses 5a, OCB was the dependent variable and conscientiousness, LMX and agreeableness were the predictors. Results showed no significant main effect for conscientiousness ($\beta = .14, ns$) and LMX ($\beta = .10, ns$) with OCB and no significance for the product term of multiplying conscientiousness and LMX ($\beta = -.50, ns$). Results of this step did not contribute additional unique variance in OCB ($\Delta R^2 = .002$) which did not support H5a (see Table 2). For Hypotheses 5b, step one included OCB as the dependent variable and agreeableness, LMX, and conscientiousness as the predictors. Step two included adding a product term developed by multiplying agreeableness and LMX. Step one results showed no significant main effect for agreeableness ($\beta = .13, ns$) and LMX ($\beta = .10, ns$) with OCB. Similar to interactional effects in H5a, the combined interactional effects of agreeableness and LMX did not contribute additional unique variance in OCB ($\Delta R^2 = .001$) which did not support H5b ($\beta = -.28, ns$; see Table 2).
## Table 2 Results of moderated regression analyses

### Task Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.342&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness x LMX</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.343&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCB Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.064&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.064&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness x LMX</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.066&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> All p values are two-tailed

<sup>b</sup>R² for the three-variable model.

<sup>c</sup>R² for the three-variable + product model.
Further results of the research question in the present study reviewed the two-trait interaction between conscientiousness and agreeableness and the impact on task performance, which was analyzed using multiple regression analysis. Step one of the regression analysis included task performance as the dependent variable and conscientiousness, agreeableness, and LMX as the independent variables. Step two included adding the product term developed by multiplying conscientiousness and agreeableness into the regression model. Step one results showed significance for the main effect for conscientiousness ($\beta = .43, p < .001$) and LMX ($\beta = .31, p < .001$) but not agreeableness ($\beta = .08, ns$) with task performance. In step two the combined interactional effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness did not contribute additional unique variance in task performance ($\Delta R^2 = .001$) and did not support the proposed research question ($\beta = -.423, ns$).

Finally, for clarification purposes, additional analysis was performed using moderated regression to show if tenure between the participant and the organization moderated the strength of the LMX relationship and is outlined in detail in the Discussion section. Results supported a product variable of multiplying tenure and LMX ($\beta = .929, p < .01$). Results of this step contributed additional unique variance in task performance above prior models ($\Delta R^2 = .029$). Figure 2 shows the interaction of LMX and tenure on task performance.
Figure 2 – Results of Interaction between LMX and Tenure on Task Performance
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Supporting the findings of Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), the present study found that LMX and conscientiousness were both positively related to task performance. The present study also found that agreeableness was positively related to task performance, which was not hypothesized in Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007). Further, results supported that conscientiousness and agreeableness were correlated with OCB. However, in contrast to Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), LMX was not significantly related to OCB, but results were in the expected direction. Although the main effects were partially supported, most surprising results were the lack of support for all of the interactional hypotheses. This suggests, in direct contrast with Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007), that the strength of the LMX relationship between a leader and subordinate does not moderate the relationship between personality and performance. Relationships of significant hypotheses are shown in Figure 3.
Supporting prior studies, such as Dulebohn et al. (2012) and Colquitt et al. (2013), LMX was found to be positively related to task performance. These results support numerous past analyses that have connected conscientiousness with OCB including Dennis Organ and Ryan (1995) and Bowling (2010) as well as meta-analysis by LePine et al. (2002) and Chiaburu et al. (2011). In addition, the present study also shows support for agreeableness positively relating to OCB as found in Small and Diefendorff (2006) and Chiaburu et al. (2011).

Although multiple studies and meta-analysis have found a positive relationship between LMX and OCB such as Dulebohn et al. (2012), Colquitt et al. (2013), and Tekleab and Taylor (2003), some research has not supported this result. Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2002) showed support that LMX was significantly related to performance but not OCB, which directly aligns with the present study results. A possible explanation for the lack of relationship between LMX and OCB is the operationalization of the OCB variable. As described earlier, the present study used Williams and Anderson’s 1991 scale for OCB to measure the variable in an aggregate
form. However, studies such as Ilies et al. (2007) found that LMX is more strongly related with OCB-I at the individual level than OCB-O at the organizational level. Additional analysis performed clearly showed the OCB-O portion of the scale in our study had low reliability. In contrast to the Ilies et al. (2007) study, running additional analysis between OCB-I and LMX showed no significant correlation between the variables. However, the additional analysis showed significant correlations between OCB-O and LMX. This indicates the underlying relationship between LMX and OCB is more complex and warrants further investigation. Future research efforts should pay close attention to the operationalization of the OCB variable as this can have impacts on study results.

One of the most surprising findings was the lack of interaction of LMX as a moderator between personality and performance. One possible explanation for this, as noted by Dulebohn et al. (2012) and Nahrgang, Morgeson, and Ilies (2009), is that the strength of LMX relationships are influenced over time and can evolve pending certain interactions and behaviors that take place between the leader and follower. While the present study did not capture the tenure between the leader and follower specifically, data were captured on the tenure between the participant and the organization (M_{ten} = 6.9 years).

Results indicated that 24 participants (11.21%) had less than one year tenure with 70 participants (32.71%) less than five years’ tenure. One would have to assume the tenure with the organization is a related indicator of duration of the leader-follower relationship, keeping in mind the tenure could be less based on the scenario that the participant could change jobs and potentially leaders within the same organization. Specifically Nahrgang et al. (2009) studied the development of the LMX relationship over time and found support that leaders form different exchange relationships with members at initial introduction that transforms over time. Their
study was longitudinal and only captured an eight week period, but called for future research to extend the duration since little is known about the initial influences on the LMX relationship and how they change over time. Liden, Wayne, and Stilwell (1993) also found that although initial interactions are critical in the development of the quality of LMX relationships, they do increase over time and up to six months. Additional analysis as outlined at the end of the Results section showed tenure between the participant and the organization moderated the strength of the LMX relationship, indicating this relationship does account for some variability. As it relates to the present study, future studies should also include a question to capture length of time the employee has reported to their current supervisor (beyond tenure with the organization) to determine contributors to the variability in the strength of the LMX relationship.

There is also research support that OCB can be considered a mediator, influencing the relationship between trait characteristics and LMX. The present study did not support the influence of LMX on the OCB performance criterion. Lapierre and Hackett (2007) showed strong support for a model illustrating more conscientious employees who display higher levels of OCB can enhance the quality of LMX relationships and eventually leading to greater job satisfaction. Lapierre and Hackett (2007) go on to suggest that conscientious employees can partially use OCB to leverage the quality of LMX relationships. Nahrgang et al. (2009) also found support that LMX quality can vary over time partly due to changes in both leader and member performance, “For both leaders and members the performance of their dyadic partner is a key predictor of relationship quality” (p. 263). Specifically Nargang et al. (2009) posited that initial interactions depend on the member extraversion and leader agreeableness traits but as noted, both leader and member performance impacts the quality of the relationship over time. This in conjunction with the tenure finding outlined above could suggest a feedback loop in the
LMX-OCB relationship. The longer the tenure and potentially stronger relationship between the leader and the subordinate, the more OCB is displayed, which can result in strengthening the LMX relationship. The cyclical nature of this relationship needs to be examined further in future research.

**Limitations/Future Research**

There are several limitations associated with the present study. First, the use of self-report data can cause common method bias in responses. According to Ilies et al. (2007), common source bias may cause relationships, especially for LMX and OCB, to be stronger than using multiple reporting sources. Further research in this area is needed to fully understand the impact of self-report data as related to the present study variables. In addition, future research may want to consider multiple sources of data, such as supervisor or co-workers, versus self-report data, which could influence the outcomes of the study.

Another limitation in the present study is the concept of faking, which according to Oh, Wang, and Mount (2011) can cause response distortion, a typical result of self-reported data. They noted that respondents have the ability to fake on tests in the lab and field when instructed to do so. Penney et al (2011) also emphasized issues around faking should preclude the use of personality tests specifically related to selection.

Although the present study captured 215 participants, one could argue that the study had low power. Capturing additional participants could have provided further insight into the relationships and results.

Finally as noted earlier, the operationalization of the OCB variable could have an impact on the current results. Studies in OCB research use various scales that measure OCB in different
ways. Another example includes Turnipseed and Wilson (2009) and Small and Diefendorff (2006) who used a scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fretter (1990) based on five dimensions of OCB: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Future research should ensure proper operationalization of variables, specifically when working with OCB.

Practical Implications/Conclusion

Several practical implications result from the present study. First, organizations should understand the supported findings related to the antecedents of task performance and positive relationships with LMX, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. All three variables showed significant correlations with task performance.

Secondly, organizations should be more aware of ways to increase OCB performance. OCB becomes very important in highly competitive environments where having employees who go above and beyond becomes critical in setting an organization apart from the competition. Selection based on a FFM with scores high in conscientiousness and to a lesser extent agreeableness, might be an indicator of future likelihood of employees engaging in OCB, and can impact employee performance and likely organizational effectiveness (Bowling et al., 2010; Chiaburu et al., 2011). According to Chiaburu et al. (2011) organizations can also include OCBs as part of the performance management and reward processes. Ilies et al. (2009) recommended a long-term strategy that includes selection, career development, and job design will help increase overall OCB in organizations which will benefit organizational effectiveness.

Finally, leaders should be aware that the strength of their relationship with subordinates can change, and likely increase, over time. In addition, according to Dulebohn (2012)
organizations need to keep in mind leadership is based on relationships and this can directly impact a member’s performance, specifically task performance. Leaders should develop close, supportive relationships with subordinates as a way to improve task performance.

In closing, the present study reviewed the combined effects of personality and leader member relationships with both task and OCB performance. Although the results did not support an interactional model of LMX moderating the personality-performance relationship, results supported main relationships between LMX, conscientiousness, and agreeableness with task performance. In addition, the present study also showed significant relationships between conscientiousness and agreeableness with OCB. Future research is recommended to see how the present study variables would react in different context to further support the performance literature.
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WAYNE AND LIDEN’S 1995 TASK PERFORMANCE SCALE
Wayne and Liden’s 1995 Task Performance Scale

1. Overall, you perform your job the way your supervisor would like it to be performed.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

2. Your performance meets your supervisor’s expectations at work.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

3. Overall, you effectively fulfill your roles and responsibilities at work.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

4. Your overall level of performance at work is satisfactory.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

5. After 6 months at work, you are superior to other new subordinates reporting to your supervisor.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

6. If your supervisor could, he/she would change the manner in which you are doing your job at work.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree
APPENDIX E

WILLIAMS AND ANDERSON’S 1991 OCB PERFORMANCE SCALE
Williams and Anderson 1991 OCB Scale

1. At work, you help others who have heavy workloads.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

2. At work, you assist your supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

3. At work, you take time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

4. At work, you go out of your way to help new employees.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

5. At work, you take a personal interest in other employees.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

6. At work, you pass along information to other co-workers.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

7. At work, your attendance is above the norm.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

8. At work, you give advance notice when unable to come to work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

9. At work, you spend a great deal of time on personal phone conversations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>10. At work, you complain about insignificant things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. At work, you adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BERNERTH, ARMENAKIS, FIELD, GILES AND WALKER 2007 LMSX SCALE
Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, Giles & Walker 2007 LMSX Scale

1. My manager and I have a two-way exchange relationship.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

2. I do not have to specify the exact conditions to know my manager will return a favor.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

3. If I do something for my manager, he or she will eventually repay me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

4. I have a balance of inputs and outputs with my manager.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

5. My efforts are reciprocated by my manager.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

6. My relationship with my manager is composed of comparable exchanges of giving and taking.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

7. When I give effort at work, my manager will return it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

8. Voluntary actions on my part will be returned in some way by my manager.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
APPENDIX G

GOLDBERG’S 1999 INTERNATIONAL PERSONALITY ITEM POOL
Goldberg’s International Personality Item Pool

1. At work, I am the life of the party.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

2. At work, I feel little concern for others.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

3. At work, I am always prepared.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

4. At work, I get stressed out easily.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

5. At work, I have a rich vocabulary.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

6. At work, I don't talk a lot.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

7. At work, I am interested in people.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

8. At work, I leave my belongings around.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree
   Strongly Agree

9. At work, I am relaxed most of the time.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. At work, I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. At work, I feel comfortable around people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. At work, I insult people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. At work, I pay attention to details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. At work, I worry about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. At work, I have a vivid imagination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. At work, I keep in the background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. At work, I sympathize with others' feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. At work, I make a mess of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. At work, I seldom feel blue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. At work, I am not interested in abstract ideas.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

21. At work, I start conversations.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

22. At work, I am not interested in other people's problems.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

23. At work, I get chores done right away.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

24. At work, I am easily disturbed.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

25. At work, I have excellent ideas.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

26. At work, I have little to say.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

27. At work, I have a soft heart.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree

28. At work, I often forget to put things back in their proper place.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   Strongly  
   Disagree  
   Strongly  
   Agree
29. At work, I get upset easily.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

30. At work, I do not have a good imagination.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

31. At work, I talk to a lot of different people.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

32. At work, I am not really interested in others.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

33. At work, I like order.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

34. At work, I change my mood a lot.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

35. At work, I am quick to understand things.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

36. At work, I don't like to draw attention to myself.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

37. At work, I take time out for others.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree

38. At work, I shirk my duties.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly Agree
39. At work, I have frequent mood swings.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

39. At work, I have frequent mood swings.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

40. At work, I use difficult words.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

40. At work, I use difficult words.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

41. At work, I don't mind being the center of attention.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

41. At work, I don't mind being the center of attention.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

42. At work, I feel others’ emotions.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

42. At work, I feel others’ emotions.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

43. At work, I follow a schedule.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

43. At work, I follow a schedule.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

44. At work, I get irritated easily.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

44. At work, I get irritated easily.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

45. At work, I spend time reflecting on things.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

45. At work, I spend time reflecting on things.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

46. At work, I am quiet around strangers.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

46. At work, I am quiet around strangers.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

47. At work, I make people feel at ease.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

47. At work, I make people feel at ease.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree

48. At work, I am exacting in my work/tasks.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Disagree

48. At work, I am exacting in my work/tasks.
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   Strongly Agree
Disagree

49. At work, I often feel blue.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Agree

Disagree

50. At work, I am full of ideas.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Agree

Disagree
APPENDIX H

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS
Demographic Questions

*Participants should respond based on their current or most recent employment.*

What is your current employment status?
- _____ Unemployed
- _____ Employed Part-time
- _____ Employed Full-time
- _____ Retired

Which of the following industries do you work?
- _____ Education
- _____ Entertainment
- _____ Finance/Insurance
- _____ Government
- _____ Health/Medicine
- _____ Manufacturing
- _____ Non-Profit
- _____ Retail
- _____ Social Work/Social Services
- _____ Transportation
- _____ Other

What is your current or last job title?________________________________

Please list your current or prior salary: __________

Average hours worked per week: __________

Number of Employees in Current Employer (or prior employer):
- _____ 10,000+
- _____ 5,000-9,999
- _____ 1,000-4,999
- _____ 501-999
- _____ 500 or under

Tenure in Current Position (or most recent position): ______ (in years)

Approximately how many employees does your current (or prior) supervisor have reporting to him/her? __________
Please list your current age: _______ (in years)

What is your Gender? _______Female _______Male

Ethnicity/Race Questions:

1 - Are you Hispanic or Latino? Yes/No

2 - Please select one or more races:
   _____American Indian or Alaska Native
   _____Asian
   _____Black or African American
   _____Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   _____White
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