Work Unit Context: The Dyadic, Team Members Relationships and Group Outcomes in a Malaysian Organization
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Abstract
This article proposed a group behavior model based on group size, dyad and team-member relationship exchange quality. The objective of this study is to identify the relationship between the size of the working group, leader-member exchange quality, team-member exchange quality that impact on the work group affective commitment as a group outcomes. A total of 215 employees (n=215) in the organization involved in plantation industry throughout Malaysia, was taken as the sample. Data were analyzed using multiple regression to examine the relationship between variables, namely, leader-member exchange quality, team-member exchange quality and affective commitment. While the Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the workgroup size, team-member exchange quality and leader-member exchange quality. The main finding by pearson correlation analysis revealed a negative relationship between workgroup size and leader-member exchange quality and team-member exchange quality. This means that the larger of workgroup size, leader-member exchange and team-member exchange quality was decreasing. The results of the multiple regression analysis showed a significant positive correlation between leader-member exchange and team-member exchange quality of the affective commitment of the workgroup. Based on these findings, several suggestions were put forward as a business and approach to enhance and sustain commitment in workgroups and networking among member groups and their leaders are directly able to improve organizational performance.

Key words: Dyadic, Team Members, Relationships, Group, Outcomes, Organization.

INTRODUCTION
The leader-member exchange (LMX) model is concerned with the hierarchical relationship between a superior and his/her subordinates. It speculatesthat, because of time pressure, the leader can develop close relationships with only a few key subordinate(s) (the high quality relationship), while, sustaining a formal relationship with the rest (the low quality relationship). This means that, since the leader is ultimately responsible for the whole group’s performance and productivity, he/she relies on formal authority, rules, policies and procedures to obtain ample performance from the group (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Researchers have demonstrated the importance of communication between leader and their members (Dansereau & Markham, 1987). Within an organization for example, leader plays enormous role as information provider to his or her members at various levels. Within the framework of leader-member exchange theory several studies have examined the supervisory communication as antecedences
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and longitudinal explorations of LMX and relationship links (Fairhurst, 2001; Lee, 2001; Lee & Jablin, 1995).

LMX research to date has focused on the antecedents of leader-member relationships within dyads and the outcomes of these relationships (Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Yet, while the literature exploring the LMX model has been expanding, some ambiguity remains regarding the effect of the work context on LMX (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). The work context where the manager and his/her subordinates reside is important especially in determining the relationship and communication between dyad. Previous research on organizational behavior has demonstrated that the leaders' characters and communication style have an effect on firm innovativeness (Lefebvre & Lefebvre, 1992), strategic orientation of the firm (Kotey & Meredith, 1997), and decisions to adopt new technologies (Thong, 1999). In Malaysia organizations, study shows that Malaysian CEOs with innovation mindset are more likely to adopt new technologies for their organization (Jantan, Ramayah, Ismail, & Hikmat, 2001). While these studies include primarily character of leaders on organizational effects neither of these studies have considered the work context such as group size where the supervisor and subordinates reside. Therefore, it seems apparent to specify and examine the link between LMX quality, team-member exchange quality team-effectiveness in Malaysia organization (Yammarino, Dansereau, & Kennedy, 2001).

The fact that work context has been largely missing from leadership and organizational behavior research is not surprising, as it is common practice for micro-organizational researchers to apply general psychological theories to study of organizational behavior, as though it were free of contextual effects (House & Aditya, 1997). However, as House and Aditya (1997) state, general psychological theories are inadequate for the task of developing intraorganizational behavior theory. Until general psychological theories are linked to group context variables, they will remain adequate to explain what goes on in organization (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). With respect to manager-subordinate relationships, this seems especially relevant given the need to consider relative magnitude of individual attributes and behaviors within groups as well as attributes of groups within organizations.

Cogliser and Schriesheim (2000) outline three important contextual factors in organization and these three factors were selected as the focus of the current paper: work size, work unit cooperation, and leader power. Although this contextual factor certainly important, however communication and relationship concepts generally absent in studies associated within group context (Scott, Sparrowe, & Liden, 2003). Jablin and Krone (1994) noted within workgroup context the most salient communication factors are; 1) the relationship between supervisor and subordinate; 2) relationship quality behavior among group members. In this paper, we argued that these two salient variables can provide insight into dyad and group phenomena.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Leader-Member Exchange Theory
The leader-member exchange (LMX) model of leadership provides an approach to understanding the superior-subordinate relationship. Since its initial introduction, it has become one of the most popular conceptualisations and operationalization of dyadic exchange between superior and his/her subordinates. LMX has established itself as a legitimate model and operationalization for organizational behaviour research (Schriesheim et al., 1999; Liden & Graen, 1980). In proposing this model, Graen and his colleagues (Scandura & Graen, 1984; Graen, 1976) contested the traditional leadership approaches, which assumed an Average Leadership Style (ALS) in leader behaviour across subordinates. They proposed that, researchers always concentrate on the behaviours of leaders and subordinates within a superior-subordinate dyad. Their work suggested that leaders do not have identical relationships across their subordinates in the work group, but develop unique dyadic relationships with each subordinate as a result of role-making behaviour.

High quality LMX dyads exhibit a high degree of exchange in superior-subordinate relationships and are characterised by mutual liking, trust, respect, and reciprocal influence (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Subordinates in these dyads are often given more information by the superior and report greater job latitude. Lower quality LMX relationships are characterised by a more traditional “supervisor”
relationships based on hierarchical differentiation and the formal rules of the employment contract (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975). In terms of superior behaviours, the distinction between higher and lower quality exchange relationships is similar to that of between “leadership” and “supervisor” respectively. Leaders exercise influence without sorting to formal authority, whereas supervisors rely on the formal employment contract for their authority.

Early work on LMX provides support for the model’s theoretical propositions, including within group variance in superior behaviour. Graen and Cashman (1975) also found that superior-subordinate dyads could be grouped as high, medium, or low, demonstrating differential treatment by superior among subordinates. The model also demonstrated, not only within group variation leader behavior existed, but also that it was predictive of satisfaction to a greater degree than between group variations. Dienesch and Liden (1986) expanded the model developed by Graen and his colleagues. They detailed the development process within the context of the work group as a series of steps, incorporating it with the initial interaction between the superior and subordinates, superior delegation of a series of task assignments and responsibilities, member behaviour and attributions of the leader’s intentions (positive or negative) concerning the task assignments, and finally the superior’s attributions of the members’ behaviors and their subsequent responses. The context includes the work group’s composition, the culture and policies of the organisation, and the power of the leader (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Scandura and Graen (1984) argued that these work behaviours were paramount in the development of LMX as a uni-dimensional construct. Therefore, in this study we used LMX uni-dimensional construct to capture relationships quality between supervisor and subordinate.

**Team-Member Exchange**

The concept of team-member exchange quality (TMX) is proposed as a way to access the reciprocity between a member and the peer group. The team-member exchange involves member’s perception of his or her willingness to assist other members, to share ideas and feedback and in turn, how readily information, help, and recognition are received from other members. Thus, the quality of the team-member exchange relationship indicates the effectiveness of the member’s working relationship to the peer group. The team-member exchange quality also indicates the perception of one’s role within the group. We might assume that if the perceptions of team-member exchange within a group were uniformly high, the group would approximate the ideals sought in team building where members perceive the group to be both well coordinated and cohesive. In addition, the team-member exchange quality also may be assumed that the quality of the exchange relationship with peer group would be a major influence on the affective reaction to those peers. In this study, team-member exchange is defined as the employee’s view of the quality of working relationships with other team members. Thus, it involves perceived qualities of the team itself and its members (Seers, 1989).

**Relationships Quality within Work Group**

The most important links in any organisation occur within superior-subordinate dyads. A dyadic relationship is primary form of communication, and also any dyadic communication breakdown has fundamental implications for overall performance throughout the entire organization (Clampitt & Downs, 1994). Dyadic relationship can be defined as an exchange of information and influence among organisational members, one of whom has an official authority to direct and evaluate the activities of the subordinates in the organisation (Jablin & Krone, 1994). The quality of the superior-subordinate relationship is of crucial importance to the employees as well as the organisation because subordinates identify their immediate superior as the most preferred source of information on events in an organisation (Lee, 2001). In addition, employees identify their immediate superior as the primary source for receiving information from the top management (Lee, 2001).

Jablin and Krone (1994) described dyadic communication patterns as a form of work interactions in superior-subordinate relationships. He classified the supervisor-subordinate relationships into nine categories, which are; interaction patterns, openness in communication, upward distortion of information, the gap in understanding between superiors and subordinates, superior feedback, and the communication qualities of effective versus ineffective superiors. Jablin and Krone (1994) expanded this notion by including a component of social support in superior-subordinate relationships. Social support is the interaction between people who lend a hand, reassure, show concern for, and give encouragement
between superior and subordinates (Meiners & Miller, 2004). This unique form of interaction reduces uncertainty, provides a sense of personal control, and creates a stronger bond between the superior and subordinates (Lee, 2005; Lee & Jablin, 1995). In addition, social support can also serve as a defence to shield the negative consequences of stress brought on by organizational factors such as role ambiguity, work overload, and job uncertainty (Cohen, 1993). The most consistent finding in the social support research is that, the immediate superior is the person most likely to provide this support and thus, reduce employees’ stress (Anderson & Tolson, 1991; Alexander, Helms, & Wilkins, 1989). In sum, dyadic relationships quality is used as a process to obtain maximum resources from both superior and subordinates. This is affected through exchange activities between a supervisor and subordinates that include both work and social support interaction.

The cooperative group member behavior can be defined as message exchange behaviors designed to facilitate the joint achievement of work group goals (Lee, 2001). Tjosvold, Andrews and Jones (1983) suggest that as individual become more cooperative in attaining work-related goals with other group members, they exchange more information, more cooperative in resources, show concern and interest in what others want to accomplish, and provide assistance (Tjosvold, Andrews, & Jones, 1983). Further, it is also argued that individuals’ personalities also affect the cooperative behavior in working group (Lepine & Dyne, 2001). In addition, Lee (2001) argued that the one potential influence for group member cooperative behavior is the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) between superiors and subordinates. The cooperative behavior among organizational members plays an important role in contributing organizational effectiveness and social relationships. For example, Lepine and Dyne (2001) study found that employee initiative through constructive change-oriented behavior contribute to contextual performance. In another study in health organization settings a cooperative behavior skills intervention program among nursing home staff found to improve relationships with patient family members (Pilemer et al., 2003). These studies suggest that the important of cooperative behavior among group members in influencing various organizational outcomes.

**Hypothesis Development**

LMX literature also suggests that the quality of LMX relationship leads to differing interaction patterns and attitudes between a superior and his/her subordinates (Fairhurst, 2001). LMX quality seems to dictate the type and quality of interaction pattern, biased heavily in favor of subordinates involved in high quality versus low quality LMX relationships. Thus, subordinates in high quality LMX relationships are likely to display more sophisticated communication behaviors than their peers in low quality LMX relationships. Subordinates in high quality LMX relationships expect and enjoy greater openness and frequency in communication, safety communication, voice and feedback opportunities, participation and involvement in decision making, cooperative and receptive information sharing, and person-oriented message exchanges. These dyadic activities in turns affect superior-subordinates communication behaviors (Harris & Kacmar, 2005; Kacmar, Witt, Zivnuska, & Gully, 2003; Lee, 2001; Michael, Guo, Yrle; Yukl & Fu, 1999). In sum, it appears highly likely that LMX quality have an implication on supervisory communication within dyads and between dyads in a group. In addition to this, Cogliser and Schriesheim (2000) argued that LMX theory is predicted on the concept of a leader behaving in a varying fashion toward different subordinates in his/her group. The size of the work unit could determine the amount of time the leader would have to spend and communicate with subordinate, and each subordinate communication to each other. For instance, in larger work units the time that leader will spend with his/her subordinates will be lesser and further this will lead to less time for the leader to communicate with their subordinates. Therefore, we posed the following hypotheses:

**H1:** There is a significant negative relationship between work size unit and LMX quality

**H2:** Within the work group there is positive relationship between LMX quality and group affective commitment.

Communication literatures suggest that within the supervisor-subordinate relationships have implications for each members working together in a group (Kramer, 2004 & 1995). A study by Sias and Jablin (1995) for example, found that differences in the quality of a superior’s communication exchanges with his or her subordinates have an impact to each member of the work group. Each members of the work group are aware of the differential treatment and, in fact, talk about it. Furthermore, individuals in
low quality versus high quality LMX relationships with their superior have more conversations about differential treatments with their peers. Sias (1996) also found that members of a working group interacting about differential treatment by their supervisor served to create and reinforce social perceptions about differential treatment in the work group (Sias, 1996; Sias & Jablin, 1995).

In addition to above literatures, cross-cultural analysis has also provided us an understanding about relationships within work group in Malaysia. For example, Hofstede has proposed five major dimensions where cultures differ: Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism, masculinity vs. femininity and long-term vs. short-term orientation. Many of these cultural traits are clearly relevant to the study of superior-subordinate relationships (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). Hofstede’s concepts of power distance and masculinity vs. femininity dimensions, for example, are used to identify cultural expectations of superior-subordinate relationships dynamic. Hofstede (2003) suggests that Malaysian organizations’ culture indicates high scores for power distance and masculinity-femininity dimensions when compared to Australia, United Kingdom and United States. Additionally, Hofstede’s also illustrates Malaysian as more collectivist nature society, meaning that there is close ties among individuals and a greater tolerance for a variety of opinions. This result implies superior and subordinate relationships in Malaysia exhibit greater acceptance of autocratic and paternalistic leadership behaviors. In work connected to Hofsted’s cultural dimensions, Asma and Lim (2001) and Lim (2001) examine these cultural dimensions in various private and public organizations in Malaysia and they found similar patterns with Hofstede’s work (Asma & Lim, 2001; Lim, 2001) where there is high power distance and collectivist nature in the Malaysian organizations.

There is also another significant cross-cultural study, explicitly examining cultural differences and their relationship with leadership effectiveness, has also been recently released. The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) study (Ashkanasy, 2002; Kennedy, 2002) elaborates and expands upon Hofstede’s findings. This study is even more exhaustive, collecting data from 62 different societies over a seven-year period, and examining differences over similar cultural dimensions, including power distance. However, Kennedy (2002) argues that acceptance of power distance in Malaysia is less extreme than Hofstede’s (1984) original work and Asma’s and Lim’s (2001) and Lim’s (2001) when compared to other countries involved in the GLOBE study. Kennedy (2002) further argues that even though Malaysia can be considered as a culture with high power distance, it is balanced with strong human communication orientation in superior-subordinate relationship. Furthermore, effective leaders in Malaysian organizations are expected to show compassion while using more of an autocratic, rather than a participative style (Kennedy, 2002). However, consistent with Hofstede’s work, the GLOBE study also shows collectivist nature in Malaysian organization and this implies preference of Malaysian employees to work as a group. For example, Malaysian employees are more likely to use coordination to integrate their work tasks, and use team workflows to deal with task uncertainty (Pearson & Chong, 1997). There is also a high preference for teamwork goals rather than individual goals (Chan & Pearson, 2002) and they tend to be more idealistic in-group performance (Karande, Rao, & Singhapakdi, 2002). Therefore, we posed the following hypothesis:

H3: There is a negative relationship between work size unit and TMX quality.

H4: Within the work group there is positive relationship between TMX quality and group affective commitment.

From the above discussion, the following are evident for Malaysian employees: (a) Collectivism in nature and they emphasizes the importance of the group; (b) High power distance emphasizes the importance of the leader and his or her status and power difference in respect of the group; (c) group-based rewards emphasize the importance of group work and performance (Yammarino & Jung, 1998).

METHOD

Participants of this study were employees reporting to specific manager in work groups. The organization involved in plantation industry throughout Malaysia. Each employee directly reported their job progress to the manager on a daily basis. This selection rule was intended to ensure employees were sufficiently familiar with their managers so as to have develope exchange relationship with supervisor and group members. Face to face interviews were conducted in this study, which involved 215 samples.
In the sample 35% (n=76) were male and 65% (n=139) were female. Fifty-five percent (n=119) and had been employed in the organization for 1-6 years. Approximately 31% (n=68) aged between 26 to 31 years in organization. Approximately 95% (n=206) were Malay, 97% (n=208) were Muslim. Approximately 39% (n=86) of participants had diploma and indicate that 32% (n=68) had worked in the organization. The English language version of LMX by Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp; Scandura and Graen (1984), and TMX by Seers (1989), and affective commitment by Stinglhamber, Bentein and Vandenberghe (2002) were used to obtain the data. This follows the preference of other researchers who have also used English language questionnaire instead of other local languages for Malaysian subjects (Bochner, 1994; Schumaker & Barraclough, 1989; Furham & Muhiudeen, 1984). The reason is that Malaysians, especially those involved in the business sector, are fluent in the English language (Lim, 2001). Details of the instruments used in this study are as follows:

**LMX.** Respondents’ perception of LMX item in the organization is measured by seven items developed by Scandura and Graen (1984) and viewed based on the theory of LMX (α=.78).

**TMX.** Respondents’ perception of TMX item in the organization is measured by 12 items developed by Seers (1989) and viewed based on the theory of TMX (α=.77).

**Affective commitment.** Respondent’s perception of affective commitment item in the organization is measured by seven-items develop by Stinglhamber Stinglhamber, Bentein dan Vandenberghe (2002). (α=.79).

All these items were measured and operationalized using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 shows the standard deviations and correlations for all variables. Mean of the group size was 50.85 with a standard deviation of 5.15, has correlation with the LMX was -18. While the correlation between the group size with TMX variable was -16. The correlation between group size with affective commitment (group outcomes) was -16. Mean of the LMX variable was 3.65 with a standard deviation of .63 has correlation with the TMX variable was 66. While the correlation between LMX with affective commitment shows the correlation was .68. Mean of the TMX variable was 3.60 with a standard deviation of .60 has correlation with affective commitment to the value of .77. The four variables are significant at the .01 significance level and at the .05 level of significance.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables appear in Table 1. Multiple regressions were used to test hypothesis.

**Hypotheses Testing**

Table 2 shows the Pearson correlation between the size of the work group with LMX shows a negative and significant correlation (r = -.188; p < .01). While the Pearson correlation between the size of the working group with TMX indicates a negative and significant correlation (r = -.161; p < .05). Therefore, we failed to reject hypotheses H1 and H3 indicating the larger the size of a work group the lesser relationship quality between supervisor and subordinate and subordinate with their peers in the work group.

Multiple regression analysis techniques were used test hypotheses 2 and 4 (see Table 3). Results of the multiple regression technique indicates that the overall model is significant (F = 196.46, p < .05) with R² = .65 indicating that 65% variance of affective commitment are explained by LMX and TMX variables. Examination of the standardized regression coefficients revealed that LMX was significantly having positive association with affective commitment (β = .30; t = 5.54; p < 0.05). The coefficient for TMX was also significantly having a positive association with affective commitment (β = .57; t = 10.52; p < 0.05). Therefore, we failed to reject H2 and H4 advance in this study. This results indicates that the higher relationships quality between supervisor and subordinate and between subordinate and their group member, the higher subordinate’s commitment to the work group.
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implication for theory and research

According to the analysis carried out showed a significant negative correlation between the group size and LMX. The findings from this study are consistent with studies conducted by Green, Anderson, and Shivers (1996). Previous studies have also shown similar results, that the size factor has a negative relationship with LMX. This occurs because the large size of the working group and the number of members of the public in a working group of the parts that exist in organization, causing the head are more likely to change their behavior and be more autocratic at the same time interactions with subordinates and quality relations between leaders and subordinates will decrease.

However, according to the study by Labianca and Brass (2006), this negative relationship was a key factor to the production of opportunities for expanding the social ledger in this organization. Therefore, this negative relationship has great power to produce a better quality of work among workers in organization. At the same time, this negative relationship could create awareness in people to change and stimulate them to work with a double to their organization. Negative correlation exists between the size of the LMX in organization indirectly have implications on the use of the theory of LMX in this study. In terms of theory, LMX is the relationship between the leader and dyadic the subordinate in organization only. But when in the context of large work groups, the use of this theory is limited because not able to predict the effect on the relationship between the members of other groups. LMX theory is used in this study did not investigate the effects arising from the members of the group when only the leader and subordinate only to interact. Thus, the theory of TMX theory has been used to predict the effect on members of the group in the context of a working group.

Previous studies showed a significant positive relationship between LMX and commitment to the working group. In this study, significantly higher LMX, the higher the commitment of the individuals highlighted in the working group. This is because there is a better understanding and interaction between the two parties. Thus, positive communication and LMX is important in establishing the level of commitment of workers in organization. This situation indirectly, to describe the implications of the use of TMX theory used in this study. In terms of theory, TMX theory defines leadership as a process that is pressing on the interaction between leaders and subordinates. Yulk (1999) states that this theory explains how a leader and member of the interplay between one another. Thus, the higher the quality of relations that exist, the more closely the relationship between leaders and members. This indicates that TMX is positively related to employee commitment and influence in organization.

Implication for practices

There are several practical implications for organizations. Previous studies showing a positive and significant relationship between TMX with the commitment of individuals in work groups. This means that the higher quality of TMX, the higher commitment of individuals in the group that their work highlights in the organization. This is because relationships at work are usually influenced by relations of informal communication between employees as to create a homely without regulatory behavior. According to Morrison (2004) also found that satisfaction and commitment exhibited by members of the organization not only depend on the communication linkages between them, but also influenced by the basic psychological needs and safety, social and self recognition as proposed by Maslow (1954). Ford and Seers (2006) also states that social interaction with members of the group is a good predictor of creating agreement among members of the group. It indirectly affects the organizational aspects of management in controlling the behavior of all employees of the organization.

LIMITATIONS

Perhaps the main weakness of this study is the focus of group size. Current investigations limit themselves to group size. Thus, we do not know if LMX quality and TMX quality are affected with other types of group characteristic such as differences and similarities of group member’s demography. It would be desirable for future studies to combine the relational demography of group members and supervisor in work group.

Finally, this study extends our understanding of communication and relationships within supervisor-subordinate relationship quality and team-member relationships quality that have association with the size of workgroup and affective commitment. Researchers have already documented the direct effects of
LMX and TMX quality on organizational outcomes (Ellemers, Gilder, & Haslam, 2004), yet in order to continue providing knowledge useful for managers, researchers must continue their efforts to identify specific behaviors within the workgroup relationship that influence LMX and TMX have on work outcome. Recent research views relationship development and communication activities within a dyadic relationship as interdependent complex process that is grounded within a group (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000) and thus, a key limitation on this study are limiting itself to only LMX and TMX. Clearly, information such as relationships and group attributes that tracks relationship development and communication activities within the workgroup is needed.
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**Table 1** Means, standard deviations, and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Group size</td>
<td>50.85</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.LMX</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.TMX</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Affective commit.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p< .01.
*p< .05.
Table 2 Correlation between group size, TMX and LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>LMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.188**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
*p<.05

Table 3 Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Affective commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMX</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .65
Adjust R² = .64
F = 196.46*
df = 214

*p < 0.05.