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Abstract

CONSIDERING LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UNCERTAINTY AVODIANCE ON LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE.

Alexander DeChurch

Major Advisor Xinxuan Che, Ph. D.

This study was conducted to further research the impact of leadership style on leader-member exchange (LMX), and to investigate the role of individual uncertainty avoidance and trust on LMX when paired with the two leadership styles (transactional and transformational leadership). Three samples were collected. Sample 1 included 32 dyadic undergraduate student and leader pairs from a midsize southern private university; Sample 2 included 118 leaders recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (Mturk); Sample 3 included 141 followers recruited through Mturk. Results indicated positive relationships between follower and leader perceptions of transactional and transformational leadership style and leader-member exchange. Moreover, there are positive associations between agreement in perceptions of leadership style and agreement in leader-member exchange quality. The results also show that follower trust acts as a moderator for the relationship between follower reported transactional leadership and leader-member exchange, though not in the way hypothesized. However, follower uncertainty avoidance was not a significant moderator of the same relationships aforementioned. The findings, limitations and theoretical and practical implications are further discussed.
Keywords: Transactional Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Leader-Member Exchange, Trust, Uncertainty Avoidance.
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Introduction

The leader-follower relationship is both interesting and understudied in leadership research. Much of leadership research only examines the relationship from either the leader or follower perspective. This present study first, examines the differences in perceptions of leadership style used by the leader from both perspectives and their effect on the quality of the exchange environment; second, examines how follower trust moderates the relationships; and finally, examines the value of follower uncertainty avoidance in how followers perceive his or her leader. The value of this and future examinations of these relationships will provide valuable insights for researchers and leaders and followers in all organizations.

Regardless of where the dyadic relationship is examined, or at what level, many similarities remain. Leaders that are able to actively practice and emphasize the importance of the effective completion of tasks or directions, and try towards the development of interpersonal relationships with their followers, provide valuable benefits for their followers and their organizations (Aarons, 2006; Bass, 1985; Bass, 1989; Bass, 1998; Bass et al., 2003; Hargis, 2011; Lowe et al., 1996; Snodgrass and Shachar, 2008; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). A leader who is able to portray a balance in addressing the importance of tasks (Borgmann et al., 2016; Rowold et al., 2015) and follower needs (Howell Hall-Merenda, 1999; Rowold et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2005) will be able to reduce their followers’ uncertainty and enhance the overall communication exchange environment between their followers.
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This relationship will also be enhanced when followers have trust for, and are loyal to, their leader (Dirks and Ferrin, 2002; Goodwin et al, 2011; Whittington, 1997). When a follower is clear on their leader’s expectations and is able to have their individual follower needs attended to, perceptions from either side of the dyad are likely to be more salient. To enhance this relationship, leaders will need to better understand how his or her followers perceive their leadership style. By examining the quality of the dyadic relationship from both sides, leaders and followers will be better equipped to reach mutual understanding and agreement. Furthering understanding of how followers’ feelings of trust in their leaders, as well as how follower cultural preferences affect the leader-follower relationship, can provide additional insight, foster greater relationship understanding, and help improve the leader-follower exchange environment.

Within the scope of any organization, leaders are allotted a range of responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is to lead their followers. The extent to which any follower responds and behaves in a favorable or otherwise way is largely reliant on a variety of factors. These may include the follower’s previous experience, reinforced behaviors, the organization’s mission, procedural processes, formal and informal structures, as well as on their dynamic with the organization’s leaders (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). The leadership style a leader uses, paired with certain traits of the follower, largely dictates the extent to which followers are clear on roles (Bass, 1985).
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Communication between a follower and their leader, a follower’s trust in the leader providing and communicating the information, and the leadership style in which they transmit information and work requirements to the follower, influence the follower’s future work experience and overall effectiveness. More to this end, a follower’s past experiences, innate behavior preferences, and cultural background, will logically predispose certain followers to be more or less clear on the information provided to them by their leader, than their peers.

This present study aims to put forth an argument for future research to further investigate both perspectives of the dyadic leader-follower relationship through the examination of perceived leadership style and actual leadership style reported. An examination of how these styles and perspectives are related to the overall leader-member exchange relationship, and the impact of trust on these relationships are studied. The intentions of this study are to also further research focused on the impact of the cultural predisposition of uncertainty avoidance and its influence on the leader-follower relationship.

To that end, this present study looks to first provide evidence that the styles of transactional and transformational leadership used by the leader are significantly related to the follower’s perception of the quality of leader-member exchange, then the moderating influence of trust on these relationships will be examined, and finally the individual cultural factor of uncertainty avoidance, of the follower, will be examined as it relates to leader-member exchange agreement.
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Review of Literature

Quite possibly, the greatest resource any organization has is its personnel (leaders and subordinates). Whether these leaders and employees are in academic (teacher-student relationship) or applied (supervisor-subordinate relationship) contexts, the underlying truth is that the leader-follower relationship is a crucial medium for understanding organizational sustainability and development. Despite the importance of both, the paradigm largely extends the assumption that leaders disseminate orders and organizational needs amongst their followers.

To this effect, the tactics and styles of leadership used greatly influence the extent to which information, organizational orders, goals, and needs are transmitted to followers and subsequently how they are executed. The aim of this study is to address the perspectives of the leader and follower by examination of the links between leadership styles and leader-member exchange in previous literature. Hypotheses involving these relationships are addressed where logical links from the literature are made. The role of trust on these relationships is thereafter discussed, and the research questions regarding follower uncertainty avoidance are proposed.

Leadership

Leadership literature, within organizational contexts, indicates that leaders have a great impact of organizational and subordinate successes, as well as
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indicates that poor leadership leads to poor organizational outcomes (Boerner et al., 2007; Camps and Rodriguez, 2011; Lee et al., 2011; Ling et al., 2008; Ozaralli, 2003; Yulk, 2010). The concept of leadership, in the United States, began as an ode to this notion of patriarchal biological trait superiority and is commonly referred to as, “The Great Man Theory.” Thereafter, however, has been further examined as a style or as a process within other academic contexts. Leadership, for this study follows the definition from Yukl (2002), which indicates that leadership is, “a process whereby intentional influence is extended by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization.”

From Multifactor Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985) and within the organizational perspective, a very strategic and structured style of leadership is referred to as transactional leadership (Vera & Crossan, 2004). Transactional leadership is a leadership style, largely impacted by the implications of behavioral psychology theory, wherein the primary focus is on exchanges or a process of transactions in order to disseminate task information and explicit directives from the leader to follower (Bass, 1985; Gilbert, 1985; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). The focus of transactional leaders is to instill a greater emphasis on subordinate preciseness of task execution and task fulfillment (Aarons, 2006; Bass and Avolio, 1994). Transactional leadership is conceptualized as having three behavioral factor
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components: contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception (Bass, 1985).

Contingent reward refers to the concept that a transactional leader delineates the actions a follower needs to do to be rewarded for his or her effort; active management-by-exception, refers to how an engaged transactional leader monitors and redirects a follower’s performance especially when the follower fails to meet standards (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1999). Passive management by exception, however, refers to transactional leaders that more or less wait for performance problems to occur before taking corrective action, if at all (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1999).

The transactional leader ensures that organizational goals and standards are met, rather than on the social development of followers and their individual goals (Aarons, 2006; Bass, 1985; Gilbert, 1985; Kuhnert, 1987; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Transactional leadership has been linked to significant positive outcomes related to actual task performance (Hargis, 2011). This approach to leadership extends a logical value to organizational direction in that subordinates have a functional importance. More specifically, the transactional leader focuses on the completion of organizational tasks and bases the successes of their subordinates on their ability and effectiveness in completing organizational and job-related tasks (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

Some positive organizational implications associated with transactional leadership are that highly active transactional leaders are seen as being very
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transparent with follower and task expectations; they are clear with the appropriate process(es) to be used by followers in order to complete organizational tasks, and they are able to enable confidence in their followers to motivate them (Politis, 2002). Highly active transactional leaders inform followers on what tasks are needed to be done, how they should be done, and how they will be rewarded accordingly upon the completion of the tasks (Avery, 2004; Bass, 1985; Bass et al, 2003; Politis, 2002; Sadler, 2003; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Yukl, 2010).

Transactional leadership, though, appears to be a logical style to maintaining an effective organizational environment, lacks the element of developing subordinates outside the fulfillment of organizational tasks (Aarons, 2006; Bass, 1985; Northouse, 2007; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Yukl, 2010), lacks to instill strong follower devotion (Sadler, 2003; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Yukl, 2010), and when examined to predict effectiveness (using management by exception) is often negatively correlated (Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

As evident from the results of the Hawthorne studies, employees and subordinates are motivated by individual support (Mayo, 1949). Leaders who not only want followers to meet but exceed expectations, should examine the individual needs of their followers. This notion, supported by a more humanistic psychological perspective, focuses on the self-actualization of employees wherein leaders aim to facilitate an open environment for their followers to inevitably
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transform from a cog in the greater organizational machine and into a mindful and capable resource. This type of leadership style is referred to as transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership is a leadership style conceptualized and developed to address the aspects of a leader that exist outside of, as well as, in synchronization of organizational task-relevant goals (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Gilbert, 1985). Transformational leaders put a greater emphasis on motivating followers to do good work and create their own goals, on inspiring their followers to be creative with task and other organizational development solutions, on promoting unification and cooperation on project and organizational endeavors, and on empathically relating and considering their followers’ individual perspectives’ (Burns, 1978; Kuhnert, 1987; Stone et al., 2004; Van Knippen et al., 2013; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Because of the more individual follower-centered approach to leadership, it is no wonder that transformational leadership is a popular, useful, and prevalently studied leadership style (Northouse, 2007; Judge and Piccolo, 2004).

Transformational leadership is conceptualized as having five behavioral factor components: idealized influence behavior, idealized influence attribution, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). Idealized influence and inspirational leadership refer to the display of the leader envisioning and articulating a desirable future, how it can be arrived at,
readily demonstrates actions to meet the desired outcome, sets high standards of
performance, and demonstrates persistence and assurance to reach the standard.

Intellectual stimulation refers to displays by the leader to their followers that
indicate or support the creative and innovative growth of the follower to solve
problems or reach standards. Individualized consideration refers to the actions of
the leader to follower that indicate that the leader is focused on the developmental
needs of followers. The transformational leader displays this by demonstrating
support, coaching, and or mentoring for the follower (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1999).

Transformational leadership has been linked to a variety of positive
individual, leader, and organizational outcomes including: performance (Boerner et
al., 2007; Camps and Rodriguez, 2011; Lee et al., 2011; Ling et al., 2008; Ozaralli,
2003; Yukl, 2010), development of shared values (Owen et al., 2004; Ozaralli,
2003), creativity in solving task related problems (Limsila and Ogunlana, 2008),
follower trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect (Yukl, 2010), self-perceived
employability, commitment (Camps and Rodriguez, 2011), work engagement
(Tims et al., 2010), empowerment, team effectiveness (Ozaralli, 2003), leaders
extra effort, satisfaction, effectiveness (Snodgrass and Shachar, 2008), as well as
others (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Whereas transactional leadership is the product
of the theories studied by behavioral psychologists such as B.F. Skinner’s operant
conditioning, transformational leadership is the product of such humanistic
perspectives of the work of Abraham Maslow (Gilbert, 1985).
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Based on the literature surrounding transformational and transactional leadership styles, it is important to note theoretically and for this present study that; a leader is not merely transactive or transformative. A leader can be high, low, or a variation of either, and furthermore, that the most effective leaders are those that embody the characteristics of both (Aarons, 2006; Bass, 1985; Bass, 1989; Bass, 1998; Bass et al., 2003; Hargis, 2011; Lowe et al., 1996; Snodgrass and Shachar, 2008; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). A disparity in literature supported by Wang and Howell (2010), and referred to in Yahaya & Ebrahim (2016), regards that much of the examination of both of these leadership styles have been done more extensively at the group level. This study hopes to add to the literature examining the role of transactional and transformational styles at a dyadic level from the perspectives of the follower and the leader as they relate to leader-member exchange.

Leader-Member Exchange

In order to better understand how styles of leadership enhance the leader-follower relationship, it is imperative to examine perceptions of the leader and follower communication exchange. Moreover, the interworking of the leader-member exchange is influenced and contingent on the perspectives of both the leader and the follower.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) refers to the interpersonal relationship between leaders and their followers, and extends that this relationship is high when exchanges promote mutual understanding and positivity (Graen and Uhl-Bien,
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1995; Liden and Graen, 1980; Rowald, 2015). An underlying tenet of LMX theory supports that LMX exists on a continuum that ranges from high-quality socio-emotional relationships to low quality transactional relationships (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997; Matta et al., 2015). Within the scope of LMX theory there exist two underlying facets: LMX quality and LMX agreement.

LMX quality reinforces the “positive,” aspect of the LMX definition, but can be perceived differently from the leader and follower perspectives (Matta et al., 2015). In past research, higher ratings of LMX quality from the leader and follower have been linked to important and positive effects on work attitudes, job performance, and retention for both followers and leaders (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; Matta et al., 2015). High vs. low LMX quality refers to the extent to which either, or both, the follower and the leader perceive the communication exchange between one another is clear, supportive, and effective (Matta et al., 2015). LMX quality can be examined from either perspective; however, LMX agreement requires a rating from both the leader and follower (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Krasikova & LeBreton, 2012; Matta et al., 2015; Sin et al., 2009). Although both LMX components are important, LMX research largely fails to examine the impact of LMX agreement (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Erdogan & Bauer, 2014; Matta et al., 2015; Matta & Van Dyne, 2015; Scandura, 1999).
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This is a pervasive issue within LMX literature. As identified by Matta et al. (2015), a meta-analysis conducted by Sin, Nahrgang, & Morgeson (2009), indicated that nearly 90% of previous LMX research only examines LMX from one side (leader or follower). This is a logical issue in consideration of the underlying premise that implores the active participation from both sides of the dyad (Kim, Poulston, & Sankaran, 2017; Krasikova & LeBreton, 2012; Matta et al., 2015). LMX agreement refers to the extent to which the leader and follower exchanges are perceived as mutually recognized (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Matta et al., 2015; Sin et al., 2009). Findings from LMX agreement literature indicate the importance of LMX agreement in positive organizational outcomes (Kim et al., 2017; Matta et al., 2015; Sin et al., 2009).

The results of Kim et al. (2017) indicated support of a positive relationship between LMX agreement and organizational commitment, as well as a negative relationship with employee turnover intentions. Matta et al. (2015) indicated that even in the presence of high reported LMX quality from one side of the dyad; low quality agreement is linked to better organizational outcomes. Specifically, “results demonstrate that when one party rates LMX quality poorly (rating it “1” on a five-point scale), the best possible outcomes, in terms of employee work engagement and OCB, are produced when the other party also rates LMX quality as a ‘1,’” (Matta et al., 2015). These results extend the importance of examining LMX agreement in understanding the perspectives of the leader and follower in
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leadership literature, as well as adds conceptual support for examining the influence of perceptions of leadership style, from followers and leaders, on LMX ratings. This present study aims to fill this overall gap in the examination of LMX from both sides of the dyadic relationship, by examining quality from both sides and agreement in leadership style.

*LMX and leadership styles*

Previous research examining leadership style and LMX supports that transformational and transactional leadership should both be considered and incorporated into the examination of LMX theory, (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). To that end, literature on the relationship involving LMX and leadership indicates that, when paired with transformational leadership, high LMX quality and agreement are critically linked to a variety of positive individual performance related outcomes such as objective and subjective performance (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Piccolo, 2006; Rowald et al, 2015), they promote organizational citizenship behaviors (Matta et al, 2015; Wang et al, 2005), and have positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .87$; Basu, 1992) and ($r = .71$; Wang et al., 2005).

The examination of transactional leadership has also been applied to LMX. A study conducted by Rowold et al. (2015) that examined 735 interrelations between different leadership constructs indicated a correlation between transactional leadership and LMX ($R = .63$) at a 95% CI. Results of the Borgmann,
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Rowold, & Bormann, (2016) study found a correlation of \( R = .63 \) between transactional leadership and LMX. The results of the previous studies examining the relationships between transformational leadership and LMX, and transactional leadership and LMX provide support that these leadership styles are indeed related to LMX, but are often not examined as predictors of LMX.

When an individual enters an organization, it is more likely that the leadership style used by their leader is perceived as a trait behavior by the follower (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Harms & Spain, 2014). This study aims to replicate this conceptualization by examining leadership styles as independent variables leading to LMX rather than as moderators of LMX. From the previous findings of the transformational leadership and LMX literature (Howell Hall-Merenda, 1999; Rowold et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2005) and transactional leadership and LMX literature (Borgmann et al., 2016; Rowold et al., 2015), and due to the lack of previous research examining transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of LMX, and the lack of studying this relationship from the follower and leader perspectives (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Erdogan & Bauer, 2014; Matta et al., 2015; Matta & Van Dyne, 2015; Scandura, 1999), this researcher proposes the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** Followers’ ratings of their leaders on transformational leadership will be positively related to their ratings of perceived leader-member exchange quality.
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Hypothesis 2: Followers’ ratings of their leaders on transactional leadership will be positively related to their ratings of perceived leader-member exchange quality.

Hypothesis 3: Leaders’ self-ratings on transformational leadership will be positively related to their ratings of perceived leader-member exchange quality.

Hypothesis 4: Leaders’ self-ratings on transactional leadership will be positively related to their ratings of perceived leader-member exchange quality.

From a theoretical perspective, transformational leadership and high LMX quality and agreement elicit trust in followers (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Henderson et al., 2009). LMX is also regarded as being conceptually and empirically aligned with transformational leadership (Basu, 1992; Deluga 1992; Gerstner and Day, 1997). Based off of literature examining LMX, the use of transformational leadership is linked to higher LMX outcomes (Basu, 1992; Gerstner and Day, 1997; Henderson et al., 2009). Furthermore, Deluga (1992), outright hypothesized that high LMX was associated with transformational leadership and found significant support this hypothesis. To this end, the researcher proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: The positive correlation between transformational leadership and perceived leader-member exchange quality by follower will be stronger than the positive correlation between transactional leadership and perceived leader-member exchange quality by follower.
The previous hypotheses look to examine separate links from either perspective of the dyad, however, in order to understand the relationships of transformational and transactional leadership on LMX; LMX agreement is also examined. A study conducted by Markham et al. (2010), examined the relationship between LMX and performance related outcomes at the dyadic-level. They found that LMX and performance were most strongly related in the presence of high dyadic LMX agreement as well as when they were in the presence of agreement of other values (Markham et al., 2010). The establishment of alignment of organizational values and agreement of exchange quality increases the clarity of the dyadic relationship and supports higher performance outcomes. To further the examine the understudied, construct deficient, importance of LMX agreement in past literature (Krasikova & LeBreton, 2012; Matta et al., 2015), and to further understand the importance of agreement of leadership style from the perspectives of the leader and follower, the following hypotheses are examined:

Hypothesis 6: The agreement between follower and leader ratings of transformational leadership will be positively related to leader-member exchange agreement.

Hypothesis 7: The agreement between follower and leader ratings of transactional leadership will be positively related to leader-member exchange agreement.
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Trust

Although transformational leadership and high LMX quality and agreement have been significantly linked to positive and mutual trust outcomes, it is critical to this present study to advocate trust as a moderator of the relationship between leadership style and LMX. Logically, positive leader-follower relationships rely on mutual trust and understanding, and research supports that there is a strong correlation between high LMX and trust (Dirks and Ferrin, 2002; Goodwin et al, 2011; Whittington, 1997). Within this particular study trust will be examined as a moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership and LMX and transactional leadership and LMX.

The true nature of trust is philosophically interesting. This is largely because it is a powerful and impactful force. The question of, “What is easy to lose, but hard to gain?” is generally answered with, “trust.” For this study the definition of trust reflects that of Podsakoff et al. (1990), in that trust will be framed as follower faith in, and loyalty to, their leader.

Trust has been studied extensively as a mediator in past research (Goodwin et al, 2011). Using trust as a mediator, with regards to previous transformational leadership studies, has been shown to be linked to promoting positive work related behaviors in followers and has been found to be highly correlated with each other (R = .87) (Podsakoff et al., 1990), whereas, trust as a moderator has been all but excused as a possibility (Goodwin et al, 2011). In a review of the literature
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surrounding and examining the relationship between transformational leadership and the use of trust a moderator or mediator in relation to other follower outcomes completed by Goodwin et al (2011), the researchers found significance for trust a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors, performance, and affect, however, the researchers regard that the relationship between trust and LMX has been under examined. They propose that trust is an outcome of quality LMX (Brower et al., 2000; Goodwin et al, 2011), and further that, “indeed, the role-taking, role-making, and role routinization of LMX are essentially part of a trust-building process.” (Goodwin et al, 2011).

Yet, a pervasive issue supported by previous literature affirms that the examination of the complete nature of trust and LMX is very understudied (Dulebohn et al., 2008; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; Scandura, 2008). This researcher finds no issue in the idea that trust and high LMX are linked by process and time, however, the logical issue the researcher regards remains is the purport in the evolution of the relationship or “the issue of the chicken or the egg.” This researcher supports that an evaluation of LMX is the result of interactions between a follower and a leader wherein directives and information are transmitted and exchanged, and based on the happening of these interactions, an evaluation of LMX quality and agreement can be made from either side (follower or leader assessment) (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Matta et al., 2015; Scandura, 2008).
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More to this point, the link between a follower’s perceptions of their leader’s style of leadership will inevitably be more strongly linked to the assessment of LMX when follower trust is high. This conceptual argument insists the impact of trust in relationships strengthens the positive effects of the relationship between perceptions of the leader (either preconceived notions from follower, or due to the interpretations of actions of the leader that occur) and the assessment of the culmination of behaviors after assessed by the follower.

Furthermore, this researcher adheres to the logic that high LMX is linked to mutual understanding (Cogliser et al., 2009; Matta et al., 2015; Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000), mutual liking, trust, obligation, and respect (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Scandura et al., 2008). However, this researcher proposes that an assessment of LMX can be made without trust, and that mutual understanding may be addressed on the information sincerity, style, and or the clarity of information passed. When trust is present LMX is strengthened. Sufficient transactional needs of LMX (e.g. information, exchanges) are met and can be assessed because of consistency of information flow (Cogliser et al., Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000; Matta et al., 2015) without trust.

The results of a study conducted by Simons and Peterson (2000), supported the use of trust a moderator of the relationship between task conflict and relationship conflict within groups (Dirk & Ferrin, 2001; Simons & Peterson, 2000), and the results of Schurr and Ozanne (1985), showed support for the use of
trust as a moderator of the relationship between bargaining stance of a partner and several outcomes including integrative behavior, distributive behavior, and agreements reached (Dirk & Ferrin, 2001; Schurr & Ozanne, 1985).

Dirks & Ferrin (2001) indicate that previous literature supports the idea that trust influences the relationship between one’s action and another individual’s response to that action, and furthers that different levels of trust can cause the interpretation of an action to be affected (e.g. high trust = positive interpretation, low trust = negative interpretation). Although, the past studies are not completely salient, similarities do exist. Essentially, trust can shape as assessment of the culmination of actions (Dirk & Ferrin, 2001).

For this, the assessment of the link between the leadership style used and the quality of LMX is likely supported by the trust a follower has in their leader. For this, the following hypotheses are proposed:

*Hypothesis 8: Followers ratings of trust will moderate the relationship between follower ratings of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange quality, such that the relationship will be stronger when trust is high.*

*Hypothesis 9: Followers ratings of trust will moderate the relationship between follower ratings of transactional leadership and leader-member exchange quality, such that the relationship will be stronger when trust is high.*

Essentially, trust does not need to exist as a product (Goodwin, 2011) or a necessary antecedent (Lane and Bachmann, 1998; Cullen, Johnson and Sakano,
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2000; Nielsen, 2004), but as an enabling condition (Nielsen, 2004; Ring, 1997) of higher LMX. Trust helps to enhance exchanges as followers and leaders will be able to view each other and the information exchanged as more reliable, which in turn will strengthen the LMX relationship overall.

Uncertainty Avoidance

A multilevel review conducted by Henderson et al. (2009) looked at some of the antecedents leading to higher LMX outcomes, for example they examined the effects of organizational culture on LMX as moderated by transformational leadership; however, they neglected to examine individual-level culture characteristics.

Based on this direction, the need to examine other antecedents is prevalent. A further aim of this study serves to address the importance of the further examination of the influence of transformational and transactional leadership on LMX outcomes. The use of either leadership style aforementioned, have implications that can positively affect and prepare followers to be effective within their role. In either case it is crucially important that the leader makes their followers aware of what is expected of them to complete the necessary task. Still, potential miscommunications are likely to occur between the leader and the follower due to pre-existing factors of both parties. One logical contributing factor of the effectiveness of the communication between the leader and follower is how well a follower deals with uncertain or ambiguous situations.
Although one of the goals for leaders should be to develop skill in disseminating organizational directives to followers in a transparent and complete manner, it is unlikely that a leader can account for and attend to all of the potential needs of all followers. Naturally, not all of the needs of leaders are the same and neither are those of their followers. With this in mind, certain pre-existing factors of the follower may or may not align with their leader's leadership style. In either case, it is likely that the leader-follower relationship will be affected by the salience or difference of these and other factors.

One factor in particular that affects this dynamic relationship between the leader and follower is the follower’s level of uncertainty avoidance (Yan & Hunt, 2005). Uncertainty avoidance (UA) is a cultural personality dimension made popular by Hofstede (1980), which refers to an individual’s predisposition to move away from situations that lack clear direction or are ambiguous in nature. Individuals with high levels of UA are likely to react to situations with higher levels of ambiguity or uncertainty differently than individuals with low levels of UA, or those comfortable with situations that are uncertain or ambiguous (Hofstede, 1980; Schneider, 1989; Yan & Hunt, 2005).

Those followers with high UA are likely to value clearer communication, more specific expectations, and explicit directions in order to complete organization tasks, whereas those followers with low levels of UA value autonomy, more general directives and guidelines, as well as their own creative interpretations.
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX

in reference to preparing and completing an organizational task (Hofstede, 1980; Schneider, 1989; Steel, 2018; Wang, 2018; Yan & Hunt, 2005). In consideration of transformational and transactional leadership styles pairing with follower UA it is a logical match that followers with lower UA will be comfortable with transformational leaders, in that transformational leaders promote relationship and individual development, as well as put more emphasis on their followers to develop outside of merely the completion of tasks because (Steel, 2018; Wang, 2018) that may help foster increased subjective well being in relationship focused environments with individuals with low levels of uncertainty avoidance (Steel, 2018). Previous studies have also indicated that followers with high and low uncertainty avoidance are most creative and innovative when they are under the tutelage of a communicative, empowering, transformational leader of which they trust (Wang, 2018; Zhang and Zhou, 2014).

Followers with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance will be more comfortable with transactional leaders, in that transactional leaders promote specific standards, directions, and expectations of which high uncertainty avoidance followers will have to deal with a smaller amount of uncertainty to complete a specific task or set of tasks, furthermore, individuals with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance are likely to take into account aspects of fairness of their leader when judging relationships related to communication (Shao, 2013). In additional support of this research theory, Wong & Birnbaum-More (1994)
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indicated that organizations with high uncertainty avoidance followers tend to incorporate more structural and centralization of power to promote the most ideal organizational outcomes. This notion would support the further alignment of high uncertainty avoidance with transactional leadership.

The examination of uncertainty avoidance at an individual level is quite novel and had until recently relatively unstudied. Yoo & Shin (2016) was the first study to examine the invariance of the relationships of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions at the individual level with a variety of variables. More to this point, the results indicated invariance as a norm across cultures and extend the potential to study these cultural dimensions across countries. This study will examine uncertainty avoidance at an individual level as predictor variable of LMX quality.

The correlation between uncertainty avoidance and leadership types was studied in Yoo & Shin (2016), and the correlations were not significant for the US sample. However, the leadership types examined were preference for paternalistic leadership (R =.17), preference for directive leadership (R=.34), and preference for participative leadership (R=17), none of which were confirmed as convergent or discriminate of the leadership styles in this present study. This researcher aims to examine how followers high or low on uncertainty avoidance, when paired with a leader embodying the combination of the two leadership styles (transformational and transactional), will report differences in the interpersonal leader-follower
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relationship dynamic, and proposes the following research questions to be studied at the individual level:

Research Question 1: Do followers with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance with leaders high on transformational leadership report higher levels of leader-member exchange quality than followers that report higher levels of uncertainty avoidance with leaders higher on transformational leadership?

Research Question 2: Do followers with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance and leaders high on transactional leadership report higher levels of leader-member exchange quality than followers that report lower levels of uncertainty avoidance with leaders high on transactional leadership?

With regards to the use of uncertainty avoidance as opposed to other constructs that have been used interchangeably, such as tolerance of ambiguity and tolerance of uncertainty (Furnham & Marks, 2013), this researcher hopes to fill a gap in research that has neglected to measure uncertainty avoidance in organizational contexts at the individual level, and to further the generalizability of the construct outside the use merely social differences amongst different countries. The personality/trait variable of “uncertainty avoidance” has been studied as “sociological variable” (Hofstede, 1984; Furnham & Marks, 2013), and has failed to develop many self-report measures of uncertainty avoidance (Furnham & Marks, 2013). To this end, research has yet to address the true discriminant validity
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between uncertainty avoidance of tolerance of ambiguity or tolerance of uncertainty.
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Method

Participants

For this study, 3 samples were collected with a collective total of 173 followers and 150 leaders. Sample 1 consisted of 32 dyadic relationships from students and faculty members from a private university in southeast United States. Sample 2 consisted of 118 leaders collected from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Leaders from Sample 1 and all participants from Sample 2 were combined to create a final leader sample (N = 150). Sample 3 consisted of 141 followers collected from MTurk. Only Sample 3 participant data was used for individual follower analyses.

Samples 2, and 3 were examined for explicitly identified dyadic leader-follower pairs. More specifically, if either the follower or leader identified the other’s name or ID code explicitly, then his or her data was used in a final matched dataset used for analysis. Follower data from Sample 1 and Sample 3 for matched pairs were examined together in the final matched dataset because the study is examining the leader-follower relationship in general. Demographic information was collected in all samples for description purposes.

Procedure

Sample 1 participants were recruited from a private southeast university. Leaders in Sample 1 were contacted through email. The email included information on the background of the study, an informed consent, contact information of the
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researcher, an assurance that their responses would be kept confidential, and they were provided a link to the research survey online (Examples of online and paper version of Informed consent and full surveys for both the leader and follower are included in Appendix 1 through 10). Some of Sample 1 leaders who wanted to use paper and pencil survey were given the survey during their office hours in their offices. They were then given the first leadership survey, and then given a link to send to their followers along with background information on the study. The online research surveys were sent out through an email with a link attached to the full follower survey. Because many of the leaders from sample 1 had multiple followers, they were asked to complete both parts of the leadership survey for each of his or her follower. The first part of the leadership survey included questions pertaining to leadership style; the second part of the leadership survey included questions pertaining to the quality of their LMX relationships with his or her followers.

Sample 1 followers were given the opportunity to take the follower survey either with pencil and paper version or online using the survey link from his or her leader. The researcher, in coordination with the sample 1 leaders, provided sample 1 followers interested in taking the survey via paper and pencil, a specific time and place for them to complete the survey. This process was done during the office and working hours of the leaders in a separate room. The researcher remained in the room during the entire survey time period. The follower survey included questions
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pertaining to uncertainty avoidance, his or her leader’s leadership style, the quality of their LMX with his or her leader, and on trust/loyalty in his or her leader (see Appendix 7 and Appendix 8 for follower and leader surveys).

In order to establish the correct pairing of sample 1 leaders and sample 1 followers, sample 1 followers were first prompted to identify their leader’s name and title (see Appendix 5 and 6 for follower and leader initial contact information prompts). Once the sample 1 follower completed the survey, their leader was contacted again via email and in person to complete the second leader survey. The second leader survey asked the leader about the LMX relationship with his or her follower(s). Once the sample 1 leaders and followers completed all surveys, a personalized code was generated for each leader and follower.

Sample 2 was recruited using Mturk. The leader survey posted on Mturk included the combined set of leadership survey questions (leadership style and LMX questions). Participants were then given a week window to respond to the survey and compensated twenty-five cents for their responses. Upon completion of the full leadership survey, participants were directed to a page that included a link to the online follower survey for them to send to their followers to complete.

Due to a lack of dyadic responses from Sample 2, we recruited a third sample through Mturk. Sample 3 participants were asked to complete the follower survey within one week for forty-five cents. They were also asked to send a link to the online leader survey for their leader to complete on the final page of the survey.
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Participants from samples 2 and 3 were asked to create an ID code consisting the first three letters of the participants Mother’s name and the last three digits in the participant’s phone number. For example, if the participant’s mother’s name was “Mary,” and the participant’s phone number was 555-555-5555, then the participant’s ID would be “mar555.” The participants of samples 2 and 3 both were instructed to provide the ID they used and the link to the corresponding survey (follower for sample 2 participants and leader for sample 3 participants). The ID was then used to pair the leaders and followers from the responses collected in Qualtrics.

Participants from all three samples were directed to or provided a final debrief page of the study and given the opportunity to receive more information on the use of the data and the purpose and implications of the study (see Appendix 9 for debrief.) Once all participant data was collected; all participant information was removed and identification codes were assigned for explicitly identified pairs. All follower identification numbers began with the letter “F” and were followed by a four-digit code (i.e. F1234). All leader identification codes began with the letter “L” and were followed by a four-digit code (i.e. L1234). Each complete set of dyad data was then re-coded using, “FL,” followed by a four-digit code (i.e. FL0001). In total 49 dyadic pairs were collected in the Matched dataset.
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX

*Measures*

**Leadership style.** Follower’s perception of leadership and leaders reported leadership style were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 6S developed by Bass & Avolio (1992). Transformational Leadership was measured using (12 items) and include the 4 dimensions of Leadership: Idealized influence ($\alpha = 0.78$), Inspirational motivation ($\alpha = 0.81$), Intellectual stimulation ($\alpha = 0.75$), and Individual consideration ($\alpha = 0.74$) (Elenkov, Judge, Wright, 2005). Each dimension contains 3 items and is measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=Not at all, 2 = Once in a while, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Fairly often, 5 = Frequently, if not always). An example of an item from Idealized Influence is, “I make others feel good to be around me,” an example item of Inspirational Motivation is, “I express with a few simple words what we could and should do,” an example item of Intellectual Stimulation is, “I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before,” and an example of Individualized Consideration is, “I let others know how I think they are doing.” The overall score of Transformational leadership for each perspective is the sum of the item scores divided by 12. Reliability was calculated through SPSS (Sample 2, $\alpha = .85$; Sample 3, $\alpha = .86$; Matched Sample Follower, $\alpha = 88$; Matched Sample Leader, $\alpha = 78$).

Transactional Leadership is measured using (6 items) and include the 2 dimensions of Active Transactional leadership: Contingent Reward ($\alpha = 0.73$) and Management by Exception ($\alpha = 0.72$; Elenkov, Judge, Wright, 2005). Both
dimensions contain 3 items; both are measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not at all, 1 = Once in a while, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Fairly often, 4 = Frequently, if not always). An example of an item from Contingent Reward is, “I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals,” and an example of an item from Management by Exception is, “As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything.” The overall score of Transactional leadership for each perspective is the sum of the item scores divided by 6. Reliability was calculated through SPSS (Sample 2, $\alpha = .72$; Sample 3, $\alpha = .72$; Matched Sample Follower, $\alpha = .78$; Matched Sample Leader, $\alpha = .71$).

**LMX.** To measure both perspectives of LMX the 7-item LMX-7 scale developed by Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995), was used. The scale is measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale and the option descriptions for the levels (1 - 5) differ for each question. (e.g. 1= Rarely, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Fairly Often, 5 = Very Often and 1 = Not a Bit, 2 = A Little, 3 = A Fair Amount, 4 = Quite a Bit, 5 = A Great Deal). An example question from this measure for a follower about their leader is, “How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?” and for the leader, “How would you characterize your working relationship with your followers?” The reported Cronbach's alpha ranged from .80 to .90 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Reliability was calculated through SPSS (Sample 2, $\alpha = .82$; Sample 3, $\alpha = .82$; Matched Sample Follower, $\alpha = .85$; Matched Sample Leader, $\alpha = .66$).
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**Trust.** Followers trust in their leader was measured using the 6-item Trust In/Loyalty to the Leader Scale (Podsakoff et al., 1990) from Podsakoff et al. (1990), which examined the impact of transformational leader behaviors on organizational citizenship behaviors. The Trust In/Loyalty to the Leader Scale was developed to assess follower trust/loyalty to leader of an organizational leader and is measured on a 7-point Likert scale, however, due this rating scale has been changed to a 5-point Likert scale, (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree or disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree), to stay consistent with the scales of the other measures. One of the items is reverse coded; “I have a divided sense of loyalty toward my leader.” An example of a standard coded question from the measure is, “I feel quite confident that my leader will always try to treat me fairly.” Reported reliability of the scale is .90 (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Reliability was calculated through SPSS (Sample 3, $\alpha = .82$; Matched Sample Follower, $\alpha = .86$).

**Uncertainty Avoidance.** Followers’ level of uncertainty of avoidance was measured using 5 questions from The Individual Cultural Values Scale (CVSCALE) developed by Yoo, Donthu, & Lenartowicz (2011). The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree or disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree). An example item from the measure is, “It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures,” and, “Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected.
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of me.” Reported reliability of the scale is .86 (Yoo & Shin, 2016). Reliability was calculated through SPSS (Sample 3, $\alpha = .86$; Matched Sample Follower, $\alpha = .52$).

**Analyses**

After the data was collected the information was uploaded to an analytical software application - IBM SPSS analytical software version 25, for data cleaning and the completion of all research analyses. Participant data from Samples 1, 2, and 3 were cleaned and examined for incomplete responses and outliers. Sample 1 consisted of 32 leader and follower responses, and all data was complete and free of outliers. Sample 2 consisted of 191 leader responses. After data cleaning 118 pieces of complete leader participant data remained.

The leader data from samples 1 and 2 were combined and provided the final Leader data set ($N = 150$). Sample 3 consisted of 150 follower responses. After data cleaning 141 pieces of complete participant data were used for the final Follower dataset. Follower data from sample 1 were not used because of their unique follower statuses (undergraduate student athletes and faculty). This was done to keep a clean dataset consisting only of followers collected from Mturk. The follower data from sample 1 was used in the final dataset used for dyad relationship analyses.

The final matched dataset consisted of the 32 leader-follower responses from Sample 1 and an additional 17 leader-follower pairs identified from samples 2 and 3. As stated, in the procedure, matched data from Samples 2 and 3 were
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identified using the ID codes created by participants. After pairing was conducted
all identifiable participant data, including the participant created ID codes, were
removed and replaced with the codes created by the researcher.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were examined using Pearson bivariate correlations
(Sample 3 and the Matched dataset). Hypotheses 3 and 4 were examined using
Pearson bivariate correlations (Sample 2 and the Matched dataset). Hypothesis 5
was examined using Steiger’s z test (Sample 3 and the Matched datasets).
Hypotheses 6 and 7 were examined using difference in agreement scores and
Pearson bivariate correlations (the Matched dataset). Hypotheses 8, and 9 were
examined using moderated regression analyses (Matched dataset). Research
Questions 1 and 2 were examined using moderated regression analyses and 3x3
two-way ANOVAs (Matched dataset).

Table 1

*Follower Dataset Variable Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, and Kurtosis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_F</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Loyalty</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSVC</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 141. SD = standard deviation, TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, LMXQ_F = Follower’s Leader Member Exchange Quality, Trust = Follower Trust, CSVC = Follower Uncertainty Avoidance.
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Table 2
*Leader Dataset - Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, and Kurtosis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_L</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_L</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_L</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 150. TF_L = Leader Transformational Leadership, TA_L = Transactional Leadership, LMXQ_L = Leader’s Leader Member Exchange Quality.

Table 3
*Matched Dataset Variable Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, and Kurtosis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_F</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSVC</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF_L</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_L</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_L</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 49. SD = standard deviation, TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, LMXQ_F = Follower’s Leader Member Exchange Quality, Trust = Follower Trust, CSVC = Follower Uncertainty Avoidance, TF_L = Leader Transformational Leadership, TA_L = Transactional Leadership, LMXQ_L = Leader’s Leader Member Exchange Quality.
Results

In order to examine hypotheses 1 through 4, Pearson bivariate correlations were calculated. Hypothesis 1 examined the relationship between followers’ perceptions of their leaders’ transformational leadership style with regards to their reported leader member exchange quality. This analysis was first conducted using the sample 3 follower Mturk sample. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r(141) = .71, p < .01$, indicating support for H1. Hypothesis 2 examined the relationship between followers' perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style with regard to their reported leader member exchange quality. This analysis was first conducted using the Sample 3 follower Mturk sample. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r(141) = .75, p < .01$, indicating support for H2.

Table 4
Variable Correlations - Follower Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF_F</th>
<th>TA_F</th>
<th>LMXQ_F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>.79 **</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_F</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.75 **</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 141. TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, LMXQ_F = Follower ‘s Leader Member Exchange Quality; alphas are included in the diagonal. ** = $p < .01$. 
Hypothesis 3 examined the relationship between leaders' reported transformational leadership style and leader member exchange quality with their followers. This analysis was first conducted using the sample 2 leader Mturk sample. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(150)} = .62, p < .01$, indicating support for H3.

Hypothesis 4 examined the relationship between leaders' reported transactional leadership style and leader member exchange quality with their followers. This analysis was first conducted using the sample 2 leader Mturk sample. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(150)} = .58, p < .01$, indicating support for H4.

Table 5
Leader Dataset - Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, and Kurtosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF_L</th>
<th>TA_L</th>
<th>LMXQ_L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_L</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_L</td>
<td>.77 **</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_L</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 150. TF_L = Leader Transformational Leadership, TA_L = Transactional Leadership, LMXQ_L = Leader’s Leader Member Exchange Quality; alphas are included in the diagonal. ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$.

The complete matched dataset, which consisted of the 49 leader-follower sets of data, was then used to test hypotheses 1 through 4, again using Pearson’s bivariate correlations. Hypothesis 1 examined the relationship between followers’ perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership style with regards to their
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reported leader member exchange quality. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(49)} = .78$, $p < .001$, indicating additional support for H1. Hypothesis 2 examined the relationship between followers' perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style with regards to their reported leader member exchange quality. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(49)} = .54$, $p < .001$, indicating support for H2.

Hypothesis 3 examined the relationship between leaders reported transformational leadership style and leader member exchange quality with their followers. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(49)} = .48$, $p < .01$, indicating additional support for H3. Hypothesis 4 examined the relationship between leaders reported transactional leadership style and leader member exchange quality with their followers. Results of the Pearson correlation indicated that the association between the two variables was positive and significant, $r_{(49)} = .24$, $p < .10$, supporting H4.
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Table 6

*Matched Dataset Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF_F</th>
<th>TA_F</th>
<th>LMXQ_F</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>CSV</th>
<th>TF_L</th>
<th>TA_L</th>
<th>LMXQ_L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_F</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF_L</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_L</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMXQ_L</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 49. TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, LMXQ_F = Follower’s Leader Member Exchange Quality, Trust = Follower Trust, UA = Follower Uncertainty Avoidance, TF_L = Leader Transformational Leadership, TA_L = Transactional Leadership, LMXQ_L = Leader’s Leader Member Exchange Quality; alphas are included in the diagonal.

In order to examine hypothesis 5, Steiger’s z test was used to determine whether the correlation between followers’ perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership style and their reported LMX quality was significantly stronger than the correlation between followers' perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style and reported LMX quality. To do so an online tool (http://quantpsy.org/corrtest/corrtest2.htm) with a Steiger’s z test function was used to examine the difference in the strengths of the correlations (Lee & Preacher,
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2013). The Sample 3 follower sample and the Matched sample were both used to examine this hypothesis.

Using the follower sample, results of the Steiger's z test indicated that the correlation between follower rated transformational leadership and follower rated LMX quality ($r_{(141)} = .71, p < .01$) and the correlation between follower rated transactional leadership and follower rated LMX quality ($r_{(141)} = .75, p < .01$) were not significantly different from each other ($Z = .97, p = .33$), thus not supporting H5. However, in the matched data set, the results of the Steiger’s z test indicated that the correlation between followers’ perceptions of their leaders transformational leadership style and their reported LMX quality ($r_{(49)} = .78, p < .01$) was significantly stronger ($Z = 3.22, p < .01$) than the correlation between followers' perceptions of their leaders transactional leadership style and reported LMX quality ($r_{(49)} = .54, p < .01$) thus indicating support for H5. Overall, H5 is only partially supported.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 were examined using only the matched set of data. The intention in examining hypotheses 6 and 7 was to determine whether agreements among leadership style perceptions were significantly related to agreement in leader member exchange quality ratings (agreement in LMX quality from the leader and follower). These particular hypotheses were examined through a possible logical interpretation; by examining if greater magnitude of difference in follower and leader perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership
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were positively associated with a greater magnitude of difference in perceptions of
LMX quality (less agreement in LMX).

To do so, difference scores between the ratings from follower and leader for
transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and LMX quality were
calculated for each variable, respectively. The difference scores found for each
variable pair (i.e. leader transformational – follower transformational, leader
transactional – follower transactional, and leader LMX – follower LMX) were then
transformed into absolute values (i.e. if, leader transformational – follower
transformational = -1.10, it became 1.10) to create composite difference scores for
each paired variable. Absolute values were used in order to avoid an issue with the
direction of the difference (i.e. follower transformational score – leader
transformational score / leader transformational score - follower score, and or
positive/negative difference score values).

A Pearson’s bivariate correlation was then calculated between the absolute
difference of perceptions of transformational leadership style and the absolute
difference in leader member exchange quality. Results of the Pearson bivariate
correlation showed a significant positive association between the two variables, $r_{(49)} = .53, p < .01$, indicating support for H6. A Pearson’s bivariate correlation was then
calculated between the absolute difference of perceptions of transactional
leadership style and the absolute difference in leader member exchange quality.
Results of the Pearson bivariate correlation showed a significant positive
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association between the two variables, $r_{(49)} = .53$, $p < .01$, indicating support for H7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABS_D_TF</th>
<th>ABS_D_TA</th>
<th>ABS_D_LMXQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS_D_TF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS_D_TA</td>
<td>.51 **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS_D_LMXQ</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 49. SD = standard deviation, ABS_D_TF = Absolute value of the Difference between Leader and Follower Transformational Leadership scores; ABS_D_TA = Absolute value of the Difference between Leader and Follower Transactional Leadership scores; ABS_D_LMXQ = Absolute value of the Difference between Leader and Follower Leader Member Exchange Quality scores. ** = $p < .01$

Hypotheses 8 and 9 were examined using both the follower set of data, as well as the matched dataset. Both Hypotheses were tested using moderation analyses specifically examining the moderating effects of follower trust on the proposed relationships. All moderation analyses and interpretations were conducted using the moderation and mediation steps outlined in Baron & Kenny (1986).

Follower Dataset Moderation Results

To test H8, follower trust was examined as a moderator of the relation between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality rated by the follower. Follower perceptions of transformational leadership were entered
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in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 51% of the variance in LMX quality, $R^2 = .51$, $F_{(1, 139)} = 144.67, p < .001$. In the second step of the regression analysis, trust was entered and it explained an additional 16% of the variance in LMX quality, $\Delta R^2 = .16, \Delta F_{(1, 138)} = 66.74, p < .001$. In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of follower perceptions of transformational leadership and follower trust was entered, but it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX quality by the follower, $\Delta R^2 = .00, F_{(1, 137)} = .00, p = .97$. Thus, follower trust was not a moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower, thus not supporting Hypothesis 8. An additional analysis was conducted to examine follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower transformational and LMX quality (see appendix 11). The mediation analyses and interpretations were conducted using the steps outlined in Baron & Kenny (1986).

To test H9, follower trust was examined as a moderator of the relation between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transactional leadership was entered in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 56% of the variance in LMX quality, $R^2 = .56, F_{(1, 139)} = 176.62, p < .001$. In the second step of the regression analysis, trust was entered and it explained an additional 16% of the variance in LMX quality, $\Delta R^2 = .16, \Delta F_{(1, 138)} = 79.45, p < .001$. In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of follower perceptions of transformational
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leadership and follower trust was entered, and it explained an additional 1% of the variance in LMX quality, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F_{(1, 137)} = 4.48$, $p < .05$. The final model with follower transactional leadership, follower trust, and the interaction term was significant $R^2 = .72$, $F_{(3, 137)} = 123.06$, $p < .001$, but in the opposite direction as hypothesized, thus not supporting Hypothesis 9. A visual representation of the moderation is included in Figure 1.

Table 8

*Hypothesis 9 Moderation Results – Follower Dataset*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>.77 (.06) ***</td>
<td>.45 (.06) ***</td>
<td>.96 (.25) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46 (.05) ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA x Trust</td>
<td>-.13 (.06) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$ = .66**</td>
<td>R$^2$ = .72**, $\Delta R^2$ = .16***</td>
<td>R$^2$ = .73*, $\Delta R^2$ = .01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 141. Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors are reported. TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, Trust = Follower Trust, *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$. 

Figure 1. *Moderation of Follower Trust on TA leadership and Follower reported LMX Quality*
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Results of Matched Dataset Research Questions 1 and 2 Analyses

Exploratory analyses were conducted using the matched dataset to answer research question 1 and 2. First, Pearson bivariate correlations were conducted to examine the strength of the relationships between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership style and follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership style, $r_{(49)} = .26$, $p < .10$, and follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style, $r_{(49)} = .39$, $p < .01$.

Table 10
* Variable Correlations - Matched Dataset *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF_F</th>
<th>TA_F</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>.71 **</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>.26^</td>
<td>.39 **</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, UA = Follower Uncertainty Avoidance; alphas are included in the diagonal. ** = $p < .01$, ^ = $p < .10$. 

46
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX

Second, Steiger’s z test was used to determine whether the correlation between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership style was significantly stronger than the correlation between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leader’s transactional leadership style. Results of the Steiger’s z test indicated that the strength of the relationship between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transformational leadership style \( (r_{(49)} = .26, p < .10) \) and the relationship between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transactional leadership style \( (r_{(49)} = .39, p < .01) \) were not significantly different from each other \( Z = -1.24, p = .21 \).

To further test the proposed research questions, follower uncertainty avoidance was examined as a moderator of the relationships between follower reported transformational leadership and follower LMX quality, and follower reported transformational leadership and follower LMX quality, respectively. In the first moderation analysis follower perceptions of transformational leadership were entered in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 61% of the variance in LMX quality, \( R^2 = .61, F(1, 47) = 72.73, p < .001 \). In the second step of the regression analysis, follower UA was entered and it, but it was not significant \( \Delta R^2 = .01, \Delta F(1, 46) = .74, p = .40 \). In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of follower perceptions of transformational leadership and follower uncertainty avoidance was entered, but it did not explain a significant
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increase in variance in LMX quality by the follower, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 45) = .09$, $p = .77$. Thus, follower uncertainty avoidance was not a moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower.

In the second moderation analysis follower perceptions of transactional leadership were entered in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 29% of the variance in LMX quality, $R^2 = .29$, $F(1, 47) = 18.93$, $p < .001$. In the second step of the regression analysis, follower uncertainty avoidance was entered, but it was not significant, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 46) = .38$, $p = .54$. In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of follower perceptions of transformational leadership and follower uncertainty avoidance was entered, but it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX quality by the follower, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 45) = .21$, $p = .66$. Thus, follower uncertainty avoidance was not a moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower.

Finally, two sets of two exploratory 3 x 3 two-way ANOVAs were conducted. The first two 3 x 3 two-way ANOVAs were conducted to examine the effect of different levels of follower uncertainty avoidance and different levels of leadership in predicting follower perceptions of leadership. To do so, the z score composites for the variables of follower uncertainty avoidance, leader reported transformational leadership, and leader reported transactional leadership were
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examined in order to create 3 additional variables with 3 levels of each variable. Z score values greater than -1SD were coded as “1,” and labeled as “low,” Z score values within -1SD and 1SD were coded as “2,” and labeled as “normal,” Z score values greater than 1SD were coded as “3,” and labeled as “high.”

In the first 3 x 3 Two-way ANOVA conducted, follower uncertainty avoidance and leader reported transactional leadership were examined as the independent variables predicting follower perceptions of transactional leadership. Results of the 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA revealed no significant effect of level of follower uncertainty avoidance and leader reported transactional leadership on follower perceptions of TA leadership.

In the second 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA conducted, follower uncertainty avoidance and leader reported transformational leadership were examined as the independent variables predicting follower perceptions of transformational leadership. Results of the 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA revealed no significant effect of level of follower uncertainty avoidance and leader reported transformational leadership on follower perceptions of transformational leadership.

The second two 3 x 3 Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to examine the effect of different levels of follower uncertainty avoidance and different levels of follower perceived leadership in predicting LMX quality by the follower. To do so, the Z score composites for follower perceived transformational leadership and follower perceived transactional leadership were examined in order to create 3
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additional variables with 3 levels of each variable. Z score values greater than -1SD were coded as “1,” and labeled as “low,” Z score values within -1SD and 1SD were coded as “2,” and labeled as “normal,” Z score values greater than 1SD were coded as “3,” and labeled as “high.”

In the first 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA conducted, follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceived transactional leadership were examined as the independent variables predicting LMX quality by the follower. Results of the 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for follower perceptions of transactional leadership on LMX quality by the follower, F(2, 40) = 4.19, p < .05, η2 = .17; however, follower uncertainty avoidance had no significant main effect on LMX quality by the follower. There is no interaction between follower transactional leadership and on follower LMX (p = .84).

In the second 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA conducted, follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceived transformational leadership were examined as the independent variables predicting LMX quality by the follower. Results of the 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for follower perceptions of transformational leadership on LMX quality by the follower, F(2, 40) = 15.87, p < .001, η2 = .44; however, follower uncertainty avoidance had no significant effect of level of follower uncertainty avoidance on LMX quality by the follower. There is no interaction between follower transformational leadership and uncertainty avoidance on follower LMX (p = .31).
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Discussion

Summary of Findings

The overarching focus of this study was to examine the leader and follower perspective. Perceptions of the leader by the follower and leader reported transformational and transactional leadership were measured as well as follower and leader reported leader member exchange quality. The strength of the relationships between leadership style and reported leader member exchange, from both perspectives were analyzed; follower trust was examined as a moderator of these relationships, and the role of follower uncertainty avoidance was also explored.

The results of the analyses indicated support for most of the proposed hypotheses. Specifically, in examining the relationships between follower perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership on LMX quality as reported by participants from both Mturk follower dataset and the matched datasets, support was found for hypotheses 1 and 2. These results suggest that followers, who perceive his or her leader as being higher on transformational and transactional leadership, are likely to report higher ratings of LMX quality with his or her leader.

In examining the relationship between leader transformational leadership and LMX quality as reported by the leader for both datasets, support was found for hypothesis 3. Furthermore, these results suggest that leaders, who perceive his or
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herself as a transformational leader, are likely to report higher ratings of LMX quality with his or her followers. In examining the relationship between leader transactional leadership and LMX quality as reported by the leader for the Leader dataset, support was found for hypothesis 4. Additionally, these results suggest that leaders, who perceive his or herself as being a transactional leader, are likely to report higher ratings of LMX quality with his or her followers.

However, hypothesis 4 was not supported in the matched dataset. Taken together, the findings and support for hypotheses 1 – 4, reaffirmed the significant and positive associations found in previous literature examining the relationship between transformational leadership and LMX (Basu, 1992; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Rowold et al., 2015; (R = .71; Wang et al., 2005), (R = .53) and transactional leadership and LMX (Borgmann, Rowold, & Bormann; Rowold et al., 2015).

Next, I compared the strength of correlations between followers’ perception of his or her leaders’ leadership style and LMX. On one hand, the result indicated that the association between followers who perceive his or her leader as a transformational leader and follower rated LMX quality was significantly stronger than the association between followers who perceive his or her leader as a transactional leader and follower rated LMX quality in the matched dataset. This finding provided partial support for hypothesis 5. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the strengths of the associations in the Mturk
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX

follower dataset. Still, the result from the matched dataset indicates that followers who perceive his or her leader as a transformational leader may actually report a better LMX relationship with his or her leader, than those that perceive his or her leader as a transactional leader. However, these results could also merely indicate that transformational leadership and LMX share more similarity than transactional leadership and LMX.

Collectively, the results from the hypotheses 1 - 5, indicate support for the value of examining transformational and transactional leadership from both perspectives in consideration of LMX quality (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). The significant positive relationships between the variables demonstrate support that both leadership styles contribute to the perceived quality of the exchange relationship from both the follower and the leader.

The results from the examinations for hypotheses 6 and 7 provided support for both hypotheses. Specifically, the researcher intended to examine whether agreement among leadership style perceptions were significantly related to the agreement in leader member exchange quality. The results indicated that individual ratings of leader and follower reported transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and LMX quality were indeed positively and significantly related, respectively. Furthermore, it was shown that the difference scores for both leadership styles positively and significantly related to the difference scores in
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LMX quality. Thus, these results indicated support that, in general, better agreement between perceptions of leadership styles is related to better LMX agreement.

In addition, the result of the analysis indicate that hypothesis 8, trust as a moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and follower rated LMX quality, was not supported; however, in the follower dataset follower trust was a significant moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and follower rated LMX quality, such that when follower trust was high the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality was weaker. This result was unexpected, however, in further examination of the simple slope visual representation (see Figure 1.) a possible interpretation of the finding may be that the value of follower trust outweighs that of follower perceptions of their leader as transactional. Essentially, higher follower trust is of more importance to followers when considering leader member exchange quality.

Exploratory analyses examining H8 and H9 in the matched dataset were not supported (see appendix 11); however, the exploratory analyses examining follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower transformational leadership and follower rated LMX quality (provided in appendix 12 and 13) indicated support for the relationship in both datasets; this is in line with previous findings (Goodwin et al, 2011).
Finally, the results of the exploratory analyses conducted using the follower dataset to examine both research questions, indicated that both leadership styles were significantly correlated with UA. The correlation between follower transactional leadership and follower uncertainty avoidance had a higher positive correlation than follower transformational leadership and follower uncertainty avoidance. However, it is important to note that the results of the Steiger’s z test indicated that the differences between the two correlation relationships were not significant.

Differences in follower uncertainty avoidance did not cause a significant difference in how followers perceived his or her leader as transformational or transactional. The results of the exploratory analyses conducted using the matched dataset to examine both research questions, indicated that leader reported transformational leadership helped to explain variance in follower reported transformational leadership (uncertainty avoidance did not), and that leader reported transactional and follower uncertainty avoidance helped to explain variance in follower reported transactional leadership. Follower perceived transformational leadership helped to explain additional variance in LMX quality, however follower uncertainty avoidance, follower transactional, leader leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership, respectively) did not. Taken together, these findings suggest that followers who perceive his or her leader as having idealized influence, as inspiring, intellectually stimulating, and considerate
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of his or her individual follower needs (Bass, 1985), will likely report higher ratings of LMX quality regardless of how the leader actually perceives his or herself (see appendix 14).

The examination of follower uncertainty avoidance as a moderator of follower perceived leadership styles and follower LMX quality indicates significant results for main effect only. Additional exploratory analyses conducted examining follower uncertainty avoidance as a moderator of the relationships between leadership style agreement and LMX agreement indicated no significant interactions. Essentially, follower uncertainty avoidance was not shown to strengthen these relationships in a significant way (see appendix 14 and 15 for additional moderation analyses).

Furthermore, the results of the 3 x 3 Two-way ANOVA examining perceptions of transactional leadership and uncertainty avoidance on follower LMX quality revealed a significant main effect for follower perceptions of transactional leadership on LMX quality by the follower, but that follower uncertainty avoidance had no significant effect on LMX quality by the follower. Results of the 3 x 3 two-way ANOVA examining perceptions of transformational leadership and uncertainty avoidance on follower LMX quality revealed a significant main effect for follower perceptions of transformational leadership on LMX quality by the follower, but that follower uncertainty avoidance had no significant effect on LMX quality by the follower. In both analyses, the interaction between followers’
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perceived leadership style and uncertainty avoidance were not significant predictors of follower LMX. Overall, these results do not suggest that the role of follower uncertainty avoidance strengthens leader member exchange quality or that either of these leadership styles interact it with it differently.

Limitations

The major limitation of the present study was the lack of sample size and the lack of unique leader-follower data. Due to this issue, the resulting implications of this study need to be taken into consideration. The intended samples of interest were on undergraduate athletes and their respective coaches. Unfortunately, only seventeen sets of complete coach-athlete data participated in the study, the rest of the follower and leader sample came from Mturk and managers and employees at the university's athletic center.

The data from coaches and managers with multiple athletes or employees were utilized in analyses for each individual follower reported on and not controlled for, therefore analyses including leader leadership data was likely affected. The follower and leader data collected from Mturk postings were collected from two separate posting. Not all followers and leaders from Mturk, included in the follower and leader data, explicitly identified the follower or leader they answered the leadership and leader-member exchange quality questions about. Because of this issue the final dataset only consisted of 49 explicit dyads. These
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pervasive issues reduce the generalizability of the results from the aforementioned analyses.

Another limitation of the study was in the examination of hypotheses 6 and 7. The results of the analyses conducted revealed support for the proposed relationships, however, the difference in leadership and leader member exchange quality agreement scores between the followers and leaders did not examine the nature of their relationship to each other when values were above or below the mean. The values were taken as absolute differences, which merely suggest logical support that: less agreement among leader and follower reported leadership styles is related to less agreement in leader member exchange quality by the leader and follower. Future studies should look to examine the full nature of the leader and follower agreement among these variables.

Theoretical Implications

From a research perspective the limitations of this study and the subsequent results should be taken into consideration with a sensible degree of understanding. In a positive light the results of this study first, help to further leadership literature and fill gaps in the research by including the perspective of leadership styles from the follower and leader; second, the results help examine the gaps in the research that empirically support the theoretical and conceptual and value of transactional leadership with regards to enhancing leader-member exchange quality; third, the results provide further support for the importance of trust in improving LMX
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relationships; fourth, the results further the value of studying trust as a mediator of the transactional/transformational leadership - LMX relationships; fifth, the study adds to the literature examining uncertainty avoidance as an individual level cultural construct; sixth, the study further examines how the cultural variable of uncertainty avoidance relates to leadership and leader-member exchange relationships; and seven, the value of transactional and transformational leadership with the variable of uncertainty avoidance. Moreover, the results of this study indicated the importance in considering both the leader and follower perspectives when examining the effects of different leadership styles have on the quality of leader member exchange relationships.

As stated in the limitations, the major issues with the true empirical value of the present study are the result of a poor sample size of dyadic relationships. Overall, great value would come from a re-examination of the present study with a larger sample of unique dyadic relationships. The addition of analyses specifically examining the relationship between leader member exchange agreement and agreement of perceived transformational and transactional leadership style from the follower and leader, as well as controlling for leaders with multiple followers should also be considered in future studies.

**Practical Implications**

Practically, this study provides support for the notion that followers who perceive his or her leader as a transformational and as an active transactional
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leader, will likely report higher quality relationships with his or her leader, regardless of how comfortable they are with ambiguous or uncertain situations. Leaders who are able to instill trust and loyalty with in his or her followers, will also likely benefit from better reported exchange environments from his or her followers, especially when their followers perceive them as being transactional. Leaders of all organizations should look to consider the perspective of his or her followers, especially with regards to how their followers view their leadership style.

The positive relationships between the perceived and confirmed leadership styles of the follower and leader, provide practical use for leaders of all organizations in that leaders can gain insights from his or her followers view he or she as a leader. Sincerely, trying to understand how to better lead one’s followers, may increase the quality of those relationships, and increase the likelihood that both parties will be more mindful in the future of how they interact with each other. The followers may also be more aware of their perceptions of their leaders, and how their cultural predispositions affect the quality of the communication exchanges with their leaders. The results of this study provide support that understanding the perceptions from both sides of the leader-follower dyad, offers the opportunity for both parties to potentially improve the quality of their leader-member exchange.
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Conclusion

This study provided evidence that the styles used by leaders (e.g., transactional or transformational) are influential on follower’s perception of the quality of leader-member exchange, which moderated by employees’ trust on their leaders, and finally to furthered the understanding on the value of uncertainty avoidance of followers at individual level and with regards to LMX. The results of this study have implications for future research as well as for practical application. Furthermore, the results of this study added to leadership research and confirmed the value of understanding leadership from both the leader and follower perspectives concurrently.
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Appendix 1

Example of Online Informed Consent for the Leader.

Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study. The researcher will answer any questions before you sign this form.

Study Title: Trust in Certain Leadership

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership on follower-leader relationship. You were chosen as possible participant because of your leadership status.

Procedures: You will be asked to complete a brief, 5-10 minutes, survey on your leadership style. You will first be prompted to provide your name and the name or ID of a direct follower that you will answer a few short questions about. Please send them the link at the end of the survey in order for your responses to be matched. Then proceed to fill out the rest of the survey. The value of this study can only be achieved through the completion of both the leader and follower surveys.

Potential Risks of Participating: There is no foreseeable risk associated with this research study.

Potential Benefits of Participating: IF you choose to participate in the study, some potential benefits include: the opportunity to reflect on your leadership style, the opportunity for your follower reflect on their perspective of your leader-follower relationship, and the opportunity to receive insights on how to improve the quality of your relationship. You will also help to fill gaps in research that neglects to examine the importance of understanding how leadership affects the leader-follower relationship.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, instead of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in online locked file on this researcher’s personal computer. When the study is completed and the data has been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report, only for the researcher to pair the unique leader-follower relationship.

Voluntary participation:
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Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions we ask you.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
Graduate student Alexander M. DeChurch
Cell: 330.727.1060
Email: adechurch2017@my.fit.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
Dr. Lisa Steelman, IRB Chairperson
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: lsteelma@fit.edu
Phone: 321.674.8104

Agreement:
I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.
Example of Written Informed Consent for the Leader. – Paper and Pencil version

Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study. The researcher will answer any questions before you sign this form.

Study Title: Trust in Certain Leadership

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership on follower-leader relationship. You were chosen as possible participant because of your leadership status as a leader and or coach.

Procedures: You will be asked to complete a brief, 5-10 minutes, survey on your leadership style. You will first be prompted to provide your name, and your specific title, and then proceed to fill out the rest of the survey. Followers or athletes from your respective team will be contacted separately through email and be offered the opportunity to participate in this study as well. Upon the completion of that survey, you will be contacted again to fill out another brief, 5 minutes, survey on the unique relationship you have with that athlete.

Potential Risks of Participating: There is no foreseeable risk associated with this research study.

Potential Benefits of Participating: IF you choose to participate in the study, some potential benefits include: the opportunity to reflect on your leadership style, the opportunity for your athletes to receive bonus points in their classes, and the opportunity for you to reflect on the relationships with the athletes that identify you as a leader. You will also help to fill gaps in research that neglects to examine the importance of understanding how leadership affects the leader-follower relationship.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, instead of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in online locked file on this researcher’s personal computer. When the study is
completed and the data has been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name
will not be used in any report, only for the researcher to pair the unique leader-
follower relationship.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not
participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions we ask you.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
Graduate student Alexander M. DeChurch
Cell: 330.727.1060
Email: adechurch2017@my.fit.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
Dr. Lisa Steelman, IRB Chairperson
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: lsteelma@fit.edu Phone: 321.674.8104

Agreement:
I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the
procedure and I have received a copy of this description.
Participant: _____________________ Date: _____________________

Principal Investigator: _____________________ Date: _____________________
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Example of Online Informed Consent for the Follower.

Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Study Title: Trust in Certain Leadership

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership on follower-leader relationship. You were chosen as possible participant because of your status as a direct subordinate.

Procedures: You will be asked to complete a brief, 15 minutes, survey on your leader’s leadership style, a personality questionnaire, as well as questions on your trust in your leader and your perceptions on the relationship between you and your leader. You will first be prompted to provide your name and the name of your leader.

Potential Risks of Participating: There is no foreseeable risk associated with this research study.

Potential Benefits of Participating: IF you choose to participate in the study, some potential benefits include: the opportunity to receive bonus points in a course, and the opportunity for you to reflect on the relationship with the leader that you identify. You will also help to fill gaps in research that neglects to examine the importance of understanding how leadership affects the leader-follower relationship. (If you are answering through Mturk you must have your Leader fill out the survey from the survey link provided at the end of the survey.)

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, instead of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in online locked file on this researcher’s personal computer. When the study is completed and the data has been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your leader will not be given access or have knowledge of the content of your responses. Your leader will only know that you have completed the survey with he or she in mind, in order for them to answer a survey on their view on your unique follower-leader relationship. Your name will not be used in any report.
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Voluntary participation:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions we ask you.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
Graduate student Alexander M. DeChurch
Cell: 330.727.1060
Email: adechurch2017@my.fit.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
Dr. Lisa Steelman, IRB Chairperson
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: lsteelma@fit.edu
Phone: 321.674.8104

Agreement:
Clicking the ARROW button below indicates that you have read the procedure described above, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.
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Example of Written Informed Consent for the Follower. – Paper and Pencil version

Informed Consent
Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study. The researcher will answer any questions before you sign this form.

Study Title: Trust in Certain Leadership

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership on follower-leader relationship. You were chosen as possible participant because of your status as an athlete.

Procedures: You will be asked to complete a brief, 10-15 minutes, survey on your coach’s leadership style, a personality questionnaire, as well as questions on your trust in your coach and your perceptions on the relationship between you and your leader (coach). You will first be prompted to provide your name, email, your sport, and the name of your coach.

Potential Risks of Participating: There is no foreseeable risk associated with this research study.

Potential Benefits of Participating: IF you choose to participate in the study, some potential benefits include: the opportunity to receive bonus points in a course, and the opportunity for you to reflect on the relationship with the leader that you identify. You will also help to fill gaps in research that neglects to examine the importance of understanding how leadership affects the leader-follower relationship.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, instead of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in online locked file on this researcher’s personal computer. When the study is completed and the data has been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your coach will not be given access or have knowledge of the content of your responses. Your coach will only know that you have completed the survey with he or she in mind, in
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order for them to answer a survey on their view on your unique follower-leader relationship. Your name will not be used in any report.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions we ask you.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.
Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
   Graduate student Alexander M. DeChurch
   Cell: 330.727.1060
   Email: adechurch2017@my.fit.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
Dr. Lisa Steelman, IRB Chairperson
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: lsteelman@fit.edu
Phone: 321.674.8104

Agreement:
I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.
Participant: ___________________________ Date:

Principal Investigator: ___________________________ Date:

__________________________
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Participant Identification for Leader Survey – Online and Mturk

The following questions are used for pairing purposes. Your responses will be kept confidential. Only the researcher will have access to the content of your responses.

In order to continue, a participant id must be created. The ID consists of 6 characters: the first 3 characters will be the first 3 letters of your mother’s name and the last 3 characters will be the last 3 digits of your phone number. This is the ID your follower has given you or that you will tell your follower to put in place of your name on their survey.

Please provide your name:________________________________________

Please provide your formal leadership status:_________________________
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Participant Identification for Follower Survey – Paper and Pencil version

Please provide your name: ____________________________

Please provide your follower status: ____________________

Please provide the name of your leader and title: ____________
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Participant Identification for Leader Survey – Paper and Pencil version
Please provide your name:______________________________________________

Please provide your formal leadership status:____________________________
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Leader Survey

Answer the following questions according to how they relate to how you believe you are in your leadership role. Indicate your responses along the scale below.

Not at all  Once in a while  Sometimes  Fairly often  Frequently, if not always

I make others feel good to be around me

I express with a few simple words what we could and should do

I enable others to think about old problems in new ways

I help others develop themselves

I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work

I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards

Others have complete faith in me

I provide appealing images about what we can do

I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things

I let others know how I think they are doing

I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals

As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything

Others are proud to be associated with me
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I help others find meaning in their work

I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before

I give personal attention to others who seem rejected
I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish

I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work

Read the following questions closely. Rate these statements based on the scales for each statement.

Do you know where you stand with your follower; Do you usually know how satisfied your follower is with what you do?
Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Fairly Often Very Often

How well does your follower understand your job problems and needs?
Not a Bit A Little A Fair Amount Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How well does you recognize your follower’s potential?
Not at All A Little Moderately Mostly Fully

Regardless of how much formal authority you have in your position, what are the chances that your follower would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?
None Small Moderate High Very High

Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority you have, what are the chances that your follower would “bail you out,” at his/her expense?
None Small Moderate High Very High

I have enough confidence in my follower that they would defend and justify my decision if he/she were not present to do so?
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
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How would you characterize your working relationship with your follower?
Extremely    Worse Than Average    Average    Better than Average    Extremely Ineffective    Effective
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Follower Survey

Answer the following questions according to how the statements resemble your beliefs. Indicate this using the scale below.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neither agree or disagree Agree Strongly agree

It is important to have instructions spelled out in detail so that I always know what I’m expected to do.

It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures.

Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected of me.

Standardized work procedures are helpful.

Instructions for operations are important.

Answer the following questions according to how the statements resemble YOUR LEADER. Indicate your responses along the scale below.

Not at all Once in a while Sometimes Fairly often Frequently, if not always

I make others feel good to be around me

I express with a few simple words what we could and should do

I enable others to think about old problems in new ways
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I help others develop themselves

I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work

I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards

Others have complete faith in me

I provide appealing images about what we can do

I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things

I let others know how I think they are doing

I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals

As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything

Others are proud to be associated with me

I help others find meaning in their work

I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before

I give personal attention to others who seem rejected

I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish

I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work

Answer the following questions according to how the statements resemble your beliefs. Indicate this using the scale below.

Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

I feel quite confident that my leader will always try to treat me fairly.
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX

My leader would never try to gain an advantage by deceiving followers.

I have complete faith in the integrity of manager/supervisor.

I feel a strong loyalty to leader.

I would support leader in almost any emergency.

I have a divided sense of loyalty toward my leader.

Read the following questions closely. Rate these statements based on the scales for each statement.

Do you know where you stand with your leader; Do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do?

Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Fairly Often Very Often

How well does your leader understand your job problems and needs?

Not a Bit A Little A Fair Amount Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How well does your leader recognize your potential?

Not at All A Little Moderately Mostly Fully

Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your leader would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?

None Small Moderate High Very High

Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your leader has, what are the chances that he/she would “bail you out,” at his/her expense?

None Small Moderate High Very High

I have enough confidence in my leader that I would defend and justify his/her decision if he/she were not present to do so? (Your member would)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
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How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?
Extremely    Worse Than Average  Average  Better than Average  Extremely
Ineffective   Effective
LEADERSHIP STYLE, TRUST, AND UA ON LMX
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End of Survey Debrief.

"Thank you for your participation in this research study. Your responses to the survey will be used to understand the relationship of followers’ perceptions of their leader's leadership styles and the leader’s leadership style as they relate to leader-member exchange quality and agreement. Your responses on trust will be also examined as they affect these relationships. The impact of your response to the cultural personality trait of uncertainty avoidance will also be examined as in the presence of your leader's leadership style and on the leader-member quality relationships. If you would like any additional information on this study feel free to contact this researcher (Alexander DeChurch) at his email: adechurch2017@my.fit.edu. Thank you again for your participation."
Additional Moderation Analyses conducted

Matched Dataset Moderation Results

To test H8, follower trust was examined as a moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transformational leadership and Follower Trust were entered in the first step of the regression analysis. In the second step of the regression analysis, the interaction term between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and follower trust was calculated and entered, and it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX quality by the follower, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F_{(1, 45)} = .07$, $p = .79$. Thus, follower trust was not a significant moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower, thus not supporting Hypothesis 8.

To test H9 Follower Trust was examined as a moderator of the relation between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transactional leadership and follower trust were entered in the first step of the regression analysis. In the second step of the regression analysis, the interaction term between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and follower trust was calculated and entered, and it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX quality by the follower, $\Delta R^2$.
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= .03, $F_{(1, 45)} = 2.68, p = .11$. Thus, follower trust was not a significant moderator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower, thus not supporting Hypothesis 9.
Exploratory Mediation Analyses conducted

Matched Dataset Mediation Results

As an exploratory examination of the data, a mediation was conducted using SPSS PROCESS. The mediation examined follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transformational leadership were found to positively predict follower trust ($b = .60, p < .001$). Follower trust predicted LMX quality by the follower ($b = .28, p < .05$). Using the bootstrapped, bias corrected 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect, it was found that the bootstrapped indirect effect was significant. The bootstrapped indirect effect was .17 with a 95% CI [.02, .35]. Because the 95% CI did not include zero, the indirect effect was significant.

As an exploratory examination of data, a mediation was conducted using SPSS PROCESS. The mediation examined follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transactional leadership were found to positively predict follower trust ($b = .54, p < .001$). Follower trust predicted LMX quality by the follower ($b = .54, p < .001$). Using the bootstrapped, bias corrected 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect, it was found that the
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bootstrapped indirect effect was significant. The bootstrapped indirect effect was
.29 with a 95% CI [.11, .52]. Because the 95% CI did not include zero, the indirect
effect was significant. However, because the indirect was still significant after the
full mediation, this indicated a partial mediation.
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*Exploratory Mediation Analyses conducted*

**Follower Dataset Mediation Results**

As an exploratory examination of data, a mediation was conducted using SPSS PROCESS. The mediation examined follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transformational leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transformational leadership were found to positively predict follower trust ($b = .81, p < .001$). Follower trust predicted LMX quality by the follower ($b = .49, p < .001$). Using the bootstrapped, bias corrected 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect, it was found that the bootstrapped indirect effect was significant. The bootstrapped indirect effect was .32 with a 95% CI [.22, .44]. Because the 95% CI did not include zero, the indirect effect was significant.

As an exploratory examination of data, a mediation was conducted using SPSS PROCESS. The mediation examined follower trust as a mediator of the relationship between follower perceptions of transactional leadership and LMX quality by the follower. Follower perceptions of transactional leadership were found to positively predict follower trust ($b = .70, p < .001$). Follower trust predicted LMX quality by the follower ($b = .43, p < .001$). Using the bootstrapped, bias corrected 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect, it was found that the
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The bootstrapped indirect effect was significant. The bootstrapped indirect effect was .31 with a 95% CI [.22, .40]. Because the 95% CI did not include zero, the indirect effect was significant.
Additional Regression Analyses using Follower dataset (Sample 3)

Results of Follower Dataset Research Questions 1 and 2 Analyses

A series of analyses were conducted using the Follower dataset. In order to examine RQ1 and RQ2, multiple exploratory analyses were conducted. First, Pearson bivariate correlations were conducted to examine the strength of the relationships between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transformational leadership style and follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transactional leadership style. Results of the Pearson correlation showed a significant positive association between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transformational leadership style, \( r_{(141)} = .50, p < .01 \), and follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transactional leadership style, \( r_{(141)} = .44, p < .01 \).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Correlations - Follower Dataset</th>
<th>TF_F</th>
<th>TA_F</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF_F</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA_F</td>
<td>.79 **</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>.50 **</td>
<td>.44 **</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 141. TF_F = Perceptions of Transformational Leadership by the follower, TA_F = Perceptions of Transactional Leadership by the follower, UA = Follower Uncertainty Avoidance. ** = p < .01.
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Next, Steiger’s z test was used to determine whether the correlation between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transformational leadership style, \( r_{(141)} = .50, p < .01 \), was significantly stronger than the correlation between follower uncertainty avoidance and follower perceptions of their leaders transactional leadership style, \( r_{(141)} = .44, p < .01 \). Results of the Steiger's z test indicated that the correlations were not significantly different \( Z = 1.26, p = .21 \).

Next, a regression analysis was conducted to examine if follower uncertainty avoidance and their perceptions of leader’s style (transformational and transactional) had an effect on follower perceived LMX quality. For this regression follower uncertainty avoidance, follower transformational leadership, and follower transactional leadership were examined as predictors on follower LMX quality. Results of the regression analysis conducted showed that the predictors explained 63% of the variance in follower LMX quality; \( R^2 = .63, F_{(3, 137)} = 78.66, p < .001 \). Follower uncertainty avoidance \( (b = .23, p < .01) \), follower transformational leadership \( (b = .27, p < .01) \), and follower transactional leadership \( (b = .48, p < .001) \) were all significant predictors of LMX quality by the follower.
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Additional Regression Analyses using matched dataset

Follower uncertainty avoidance, follower perceived leadership (transactional and transformational, respectively), and leader leadership style (transactional and transformational) were examined as predictors of follower LMX quality. The results of regression analysis indicated that the variables accounted for 62% of the variance of Follower LMX quality, \( R^2 = .62, F_{(5, 43)} = 14.13, p < .001 \).

Follower uncertainty avoidance \( (b = .16, p = .35) \), leader transformational leadership \( (b = -.01, p = .96) \), leader transactional leadership \( (b = -.10, p = .56) \), and follower transactional leadership \( (b = -.05, p = .73) \), were not significant predictors of LMX quality by the follower; however, follower transformational leadership was a significant predictor of LMX quality by the follower \( (b = .82, p < .001) \).

To further test the proposed research questions, follower uncertainty avoidance was examined as a moderator of the relationships between transformational leadership agreement and LMX agreement, and transactional leadership agreement and LMX agreement, respectively. In the first moderation analysis transformational leadership agreement was entered in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 28% of the variance in LMX agreement, \( R^2 = .28, F_{(1, 47)} = 17.92, p < .001 \). In the second step of the regression analysis, follower uncertainty avoidance was entered and it, but it was not significant, \( \Delta R^2 = .03, \Delta F_{(1, \ldots} \)
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46) = 2.00, \( p = .16 \). In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of transformational leadership agreement and follower uncertainty avoidance was entered, but it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX agreement, \( \Delta R^2 = .00, F(1, 45) = .06, p = .80 \). Thus, follower uncertainty avoidance was not a moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership agreement and LMX agreement.

In the second moderation analysis transactional leadership agreement was entered in the first step of the regression analysis, and it explained 28% of the variance in LMX quality, \( R^2 = .28, F(1, 47) = 18.53, p < .001 \). In the second step of the regression analysis, follower uncertainty avoidance was entered and it, but it was not significant not significant, \( \Delta R^2 = .04, \Delta F(1, 46) = 2.75, p = .10 \). In the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term of transactional leadership agreement and follower uncertainty avoidance was entered, but it did not explain a significant increase in variance in LMX agreement, \( \Delta R^2 = .00, F(1, 45) = .04, p = .84 \). Thus, follower uncertainty avoidance was not a moderator of the relationship between transactional leadership agreement and LMX agreement.