



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Department of Accounting

Working Paper Series

**Audit Committees and Internal Auditors:
Using LMX for Relationship Analysis**

By

**Mohammad Noor Hisham Osman,
Karen A. Van Peurseem and Ian Eggleton**

Number 98

April 2008

MANAGEMENT SCHOOL
Te Raupapa

The *Working Paper Series* is published by the Department of Accounting, University of Waikato, and is intended to provide staff, visitors and postgraduate students with a forum for publishing developing research. The opinions expressed in the various papers in the Series are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily endorsed by the Department. Working Papers are preliminary in nature; their purpose is to stimulate discussion and comment, and the author(s) would welcome any feedback from readers.

Correspondence concerning the submission of manuscripts and the receipt of copy may be addressed to:

The Editor - Working Paper Series
Department of Accounting
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, New Zealand
Fax: 0064 (0)7 838 4332

Correspondence concerning the reproduction of, or comment on, any part of a Paper should be addressed to the author(s) concerned.

ISSN 1177-7230 (Online)

ISSN 1173-7182 (Print)

AUDIT COMMITTEES AND INTERNAL AUDITORS¹:

USING LMX FOR RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS

Mohammad Noor Hisham Osman

*Department of Accounting
University of Waikato
Hamilton, New Zealand*

Karen A Van Peurse

*Department of Accounting
University of Waikato
Hamilton, New Zealand*

Ian Eggleton

*Department of Accounting
University of Waikato
Hamilton, New Zealand*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to provide a theoretically-informed meaning for the 'quality of the audit committee-internal auditor relationship' construct and to provide a new instrument for its measure. Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX theory) is widely accepted in the management communication and management literature as one which can be used to explain the development of a leader-member relationship and the quality of such a relationship. The analysis will be grounded in the LMX literature, and in understanding of the relationship between the audit committee and internal auditors. This paper is a contribution to the literature as such application of LMX is a newly theorised initiative to enable researchers to improve our understandings of this important corporate relationship. The output of this analysis can be used for research which evaluates the quality of the audit committee-internal auditor relationship (AC-IA relationship).

¹ An earlier version of this paper has been presented in ARA Conference 2007, Auckland. I would like to thank Deborah Alexander (discussant) for her comments and suggestions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this paper are (1) to provide a theoretically-informed meaning for the ‘quality of the audit committee-internal auditor relationship’ construct and (2) to provide an instrument for this construct. Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX theory) is widely accepted in the management and management communication literature as a theory that explains the development of a leader-member relationship and the quality of this relationship (Berneth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007b; Makela, 2005; Sias, 2005; van Breukelen, Schyns, & Blanc, 2006). LMX will form the groundwork of this analysis². This paper is a contribution to the literature as such application (of LMX) is a newly theorised initiative to help evaluate and understand this important corporate relationship. Furthermore, the output of this analysis can be used for studies evaluating the quality of the audit committee-internal auditor relationship (AC-IA relationship).

Studies on the quality of the AC-IA workplace relationship, which are few, are important for two reasons. Firstly, the findings of such studies could increase our understanding on this relationship. This is because studies on the quality of the AC-IA relationship extend previous studies in this topic by evaluating characteristics associated with a ‘good’ audit committee-internal auditor relationship. Previous studies in this topic (e.g., Goodwin, 2003; Goodwin & Yeo, 2001; Raghunandan, Read, & Rama, 2001) investigate variables and conditions that associated with the

² The authors also discover communication studies that utilize and test concepts such as ‘subordinate’s satisfaction with their superior’ (Walter, Anderson, & Martin, 2005), ‘nature or type of superior-subordinate communication’ (Miles, Patrick, & King, 1996), ‘superior-subordinate communication satisfaction’ (Pincus, 1986), and the ‘openness of superior-subordinate communication’ (Jablin, 1980). Given that these concepts are not theories and none of the scholars claim that these concepts reflect the goodness or the quality of a leader-member relationship, this study then does not consider these concepts as relevant.

extent and frequency of the AC-IA interactions only. Secondly, studies on the quality of the AC-IA relationship are important because the findings of these studies could benefit policy makers and practitioners. For policy makers, the findings could become an input to the process of developing future corporate governance recommendations, regulations or legislation. As an example, if it is found that the audit committee authority to set internal audit department budget (or other factor) is a determinant of the quality of the AC-IA relationship the authority, then, this could be incorporated in the future corporate governance recommendations, regulations or legislation. For practitioners, the findings could be used as a basis to formulate internal policies regarding the AC-IA relationship.

This paper is developed by referring to materials related to LMX theory which appear mostly in the organizational psychology and communication literature. These materials are searched using University of Waikato's Illumina PsycARTICLES and Waikato Managements School's ABI/INFROM Global (ProQuest), Academic Search Premier (EBSCOHost), Emerald, Blackwell Synergy, and Elsevier Science Direct databases. These six databases are used in order to ensure that relevant LMX theory's materials will not be overlooked. Keywords used in the search are 'leader member exchange theory' and the commonly used abbreviation for the theory which is 'LMX theory'. Relevant citations in each material are followed up.

This introductory section is followed by a section on LMX theory (section 2) in order to reveal the leader-member relationship quality construct and the instrument for this construct. Critiques on LMX theory will be addressed in section 3. This paper will

conclude with how LMX can inform a theoretical meaning for ‘the quality of the AC-IA relationship’ construct and with a discussion its instrument (section 4).

2. LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE THEORY

The purpose of this section will inform on two key points: (1) the meaning for the quality of the leader-member relationship construct according to LMX theory, and (2) the instrument for the relationship quality construct. These two points are useful given that they will be applied to the AC-IA relationship context.

There is a need for an introduction to LMX theory as this is the first time this theory which is from the organizational psychology literature is utilized in evaluating the quality of the AC-IA relationship:

2.1 Background

LMX theory is developed by Graen and his colleagues more than 30 years ago (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga , 1975). This theory is known as ‘vertical dyad linkage’ or VDL until the 1980s (see Danserau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Liden & Graen, 1980). Graen and colleagues abandoned this name and the VDL abbreviation “because of its unexpected connotation of venereal disease” (Graen, 2005, p. 207). This theory’s current name is then formed and this theory is refined in recent decades (Graen, 2005; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; van Breukelen et al., 2006).

Graen and colleagues in Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) claim that LMX theory can explain the quality of workplace relationships that exists within an organization and “between organizations (e.g., leaders and followers, team members and teammates, employees and their competence networks, joint venture partners, supplier networks, and so forth)” (p. 225). The way this theory can be applied to evaluate the quality of leader-member relationships, member-member relationships, and organization-member relationships had been discussed by Graen and colleagues in Uhl-Bien et al. (2000) and Graen, Hui and Taylor (2004). Even though Graen and colleagues claim that LMX theory can explain almost all types of workplace relationships, most scholars acknowledge that LMX theory is widely accepted as a theory that can inform as to a leader-member relationship and its quality only (see Berneth et al., 2007b; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Makela, 2005; Scherbaum, Finlinson, Barden, & Tamanini, 2006; Sias, 2005; van Breukelen et al., 2006). Sias (2005), for example, acknowledge that LMX theory is widely accepted as a theory that can explain the quality of the leader-member relationship and also point out that Kram and Isabella’s (1985) peer relationship typology, instead of LMX theory, is widely accepted as a framework that can explain the quality of the member-member relationship. LMX theory, as adopted here, refers therefore to the relationship between the ‘leader’ and ‘member’.

The ‘leader-member relationship’ according to Graen and colleagues is a relationship between “leaders and their direct reports” (Graen et al., 2004, p. 38). In a similar fashion, in Schriesheim, Scandura, Eisenbach, and Neider (1992) this relationship is understood to describe as a relationship “between a manager and each of his or her direct reports” (p. 983). These descriptions imply that the term ‘leader-member relationship’ refers to a relationship between a high level personnel and a low level

personnel who reports directly to him or her. The Audit Committee- Internal Audit (AC-IA) relationship can be categorized as one application of the leader-member relationship given that the audit committee is an authoritative subcommittee situated within an organization's governing board; and the internal auditor is a lower or middle level manager who normally reports directly to that committee among others (Van Peurse, 2005).

A review of the literature reveals that LMX theory can explain the quality of the leader-member relationship in many contexts – indicating the robustness of this theory in explaining the quality of this type of relationship. For instance, in the organizational psychology literature (e.g., Berneth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007a; Bhal & Ansari, 2007; Yifeng & Tjosvold, 2008) and in the communication literature (e.g., Fix & Sias, 2006; Lee, 2001; Sias, 2005) LMX is commonly used to evaluate the quality of superior-subordinate relationships, in the sports literature Case (1998) suggested that LMX theory can be used to evaluate the quality of coach-player relationships, and in the equal opportunity literature Makela (2005) suggested that this theory can be used to explain and to evaluate the quality of employer-employee relationships. Also, Duchon, Green and Taber (1986) found that LMX theory offers a valid explanation for the quality of board chairman-board member relationships and, later, this theory has been used to evaluate the quality of such relationship by Hoye (2006) and Hoye (2004).

This indicates that LMX theory, as developed and refined by Graen and colleagues more than 30 years ago, is now widely accepted in the literature as a theory that explains the quality of the leader-member relationship, and is robust in explaining the

quality of this type of relationship. The explanation provided by LMX theory about the 'leader-member relationship quality' construct will be presented in the next section.

2.2 The 'quality of the leader-member relationship' construct

The 'leader-member relationship quality' construct, according to Graen and colleagues, "contains three dimensions – namely respect, trust, and obligation" (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 237). In Graen (2005, p. 209) and Uhl-Bien, Graen, and Scandura (2000, p. 148) Graen and his colleagues still maintain that, even today, an appropriate understanding this construct still contains respect, trust, and obligation dimensions as well. However, it appears in the literature that two of Graen's colleagues, Liden and Dansereau, suggest that the leader-member relationship quality construct contains other dimensions. Specifically, Liden (and his colleagues) suggest that LMX incorporates dimensions of 'affection', 'respect', 'loyalty', and 'contribution' (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden & Maslyn, 1998) and Dansereau (and his colleagues) theorize that this construct contains two dimensions - leader's support of a member's self-worth and member's performance that satisfies a leader (Dansereau, 1995; Dansereau et al., 1995). Graen and colleagues do not recognize these explanations as directly related to their theorization. Graen (2005) classifies these explanations as "different theories of dyadic" relationship namely Multidimensional LMX theory and Individualized Leadership theory (Graen, 2005, p. 205). They argue that these alterations do not apply in the same manner to the relationship between high and low level personnel; accordingly, the Liden and

Dansereau groups' explanations about the dimensionality of the leader-member relationship quality construct do not detract from the original Graen group models.

Definitions for these 'respect', 'trust', and 'obligation' dimensions appear in Uhl-Bien et al. (2000, p. 157-161). The 'respect' dimension, according to Graen and colleagues, refers to one party in the leader-member relationship admiration "for the other's [workplace] capabilities" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000, p. 157). A leader respects a member who is highly capable and who will not damage his or her reputation. A member respects a leader who is highly proficient about his or her roles and organization, and who is "interpersonally and politically astute" (ibid, 2000, p. 157).

Trust, according to Uhl-Bien et al. (2000), exists when a party in a leader-member relationship believes that the other party will not betray nor manipulate his or her weaknesses, believes that he or she can depend on the other party, and believes that he or she and the other party share a common "set of principles" in dealing with each other (p. 158). The 'obligation' dimension, according to Graen and colleagues, is a reflection of the way parties in a leader-member relationship exchanging "favours" among them (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000, p. 161). If there is a high mutual obligation between a leader and a member then one of these parties will grant favours to another "without being asked and without consideration of payback" (ibid, 2000, p. 161). In a low mutual obligation situation, a favour is granted by one party "because it is requested, and the expectation is almost immediate payback" (ibid, 2000, p. 160).

LMX theory explains that a high quality leader-member relationship reflects a presence of a high degree of mutual trust, respect, and obligation between parties who

are involved in the relationship. When there is a high degree of mutual respect, trust, and obligation between the leader and the member, they then will interact “beyond mechanical compliance with routine directives of the organization” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000, p. 153). According to Settoon, Bennet and Liden (1996), LMX theory describes this situation as one in which the leaders will provide beyond “employment contract” assistance and the followers will fulfil the leaders’ beyond employment contract “requests” (p. 220). Leaders can be sure that followers will act as reliable assistants; and the followers, in turn, can be sure of the leaders’ protection and help (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Uhl-Bien et al., 2000; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Applying this particular LMX explanation to the audit committee and internal auditor, a high quality AC-IA relationship therefore would be characterized by a high degree of mutual respect, trust, and obligation between these parties. Also, in a high quality AC-IA relationship the committee will protect and help the auditor, and the auditor, in turn, will become the committee’s reliable assistant.

A low degree of mutual respect, trust, and obligation between a leader and a member, which characterizes a low relationship quality, is related to leaders and members who only comply with “job prescriptions, authority, formal directives, and so forth” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000, p. 153). According to Uhl-Bien et al.(2000), a leader and a member with a lack of mutual respect, trust, and obligation between them will form a relationship that can be described as a “boss-employee” relationship (p. 153). In this sort of relationship, the leaders act in accordance with their job authority and the followers work in accordance with their job specification only (Graen & Scandura, 1987). This LMX theory explanation about a low quality leader-member relationship implies that in a low quality AC-IA relationship both parties, in relation with each

other, comply with organizational and regulatory requirements only, and the parties do not benefit from the communication that would occur in a (LMX-defined) high quality relationship.

This section reveals an LMX theory's explanation for the leader-member relationship quality construct. The way this construct can be measured will be discussed in the next section.

2.3 The instrument

Many different measurement instruments for the relationship quality construct have been developed and applied in the LMX theory literature (see Berneth et al., 2007b; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Keller & Danserau, 2001; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999; and van Breukelen et al., 2006 for an extensive review and critiques). The earliest version of instrument is the two-item Negotiating Latitude Measure used in a study conducted by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). Other measurement instruments have been developed since this time. For instance, there is a four-item instrument (Graen & Schiemann, 1978; Liden & Graen, 1980), a five-item instrument (Dunegan, Uhl-Bien, & Duchon, 2002; Graen, Dharwadkar, Grewal, & Wakabayashi, 2006; Graen, Liden, & Hoel, 1982), a six-item instrument (Schriesheim, Neider, Scandura, & Tepper, 1992), a seven-item instrument (Boies & Howell, 2006; Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000; Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Lee, 2001; Scandura & Graen, 1984; Seers & Graen, 1984; Sias, 2005; Stringer, 2006; Tekleab & Taylor, 2003; Tepper et al., 2006; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003; Yagil, 2006), an eight-item instrument (Berneth et al., 2007b), a 12-

item instrument (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Morrow, Suzuki, Crum, Ruben, & Pautsch, 2005; Wakabayashi & Graen, 1984), and a 14-item instrument (Wakabayashi, Graen, & Uhl-Bien, 1990). Some of these more recent constructs are used to measure the quality of the leader-member relationship construct. The ten most recent LMX studies that appear in ABI/INFROM Global (ProQuest) database and instruments are set out in Table 1:

Table 1: LMX Instruments of Recent Use

Studies	Versions of instrument (developed by)*
1. Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007)	12-item (Liden & Maslyn, 1998)
2. Farr-Wharton and Brunetto (2007)	7-item (Liden & Graen, 1980; Mueller & Lee, 2002; Scandura & Graen, 1984)
3. Jawahar and Carr (2007)	12-item (Liden & Maslyn, 1998)
4. Liang, Ling, and Hsieh (2007)	11-item (Huang, 1999)
5. G. Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, and Rosen (2007)	8-item (Bauer & Green, 1996)
6. Erdogan and Enders (2007)	12-item (Liden & Maslyn, 1998)
7. Z. Chen, Lam, and Zhong (2007)	7-item (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995)
8. Bhal and Ansari (2007)	10-item (Bhal & Ansari, 1996)
9. Sparrowe, Soetjpto, and Kraimer (2006)	12-item (Liden & Maslyn, 1998)
10. Lapierre, Hackett, and Taggar (2006)	6-item (Schriesheim, Neider et al., 1992)

As at 15th of February 2008

A review of the literature reveals several flaws in the way that a number of these instruments (Table 1) have been developed and/or have been applied in previous studies. Firstly, instruments for the leader-member relationship quality construct often fail to reflect the LMX theory explanation. Specifically, this theory explains that the quality of the leader-member relationship construct contains mutual respect, trust, and obligation dimensions, however, instruments that appear in previous studies are not developed for assessing these three dimensions. So for example, the five-item instrument used in Graen et al. (2006) is not for assessing the degree of mutual respect,

trust, and obligation but for assessing the degree of other categories of dimensions as described in their discussion below:

The quality of the employee's relationship with his or her supervisor was assessed using the LMX approach with the following items on a five-point scale: [1] approachability and flexibility of the supervisor toward the newcomer, [2] the supervisor's willingness to use authority to help the newcomer, [3] clarity of the supervisor's expectations and feedback to newcomers, [4] the newcomer's latitude to influence the supervisor to change his or her role situation, and [5] after-hours interaction between the supervisor and subordinates with respect to social and leisure activities. (p. 153)

Schriesheim et al. (1999) and Schriesheim, Scandura et al. (1992) in their extensive reviews of previous LMX studies also found that there is a lack of instruments that reflect the LMX theory explanation. Specifically, Schriesheim, Scandura et al. (1992) after reviewing previous studies conclude that "LMX scales have typically not been developed using an a priori theoretical definition of its content subdomains" (p. 984).

A second problem encountered in the development and the application of instruments for the leader-member relationship quality construct is a lack of explanation about the validity of the instrument. For instance, Graen and his colleagues typically do not disclose the validity of the instrument that they use but only acknowledge that they develop a particular version of the instrument by referring to their earlier theorizations or earlier studies (see Dunegan, Duchon, & Uhl-Bien, 1992; Graen et al., 2006; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This flaw had been discovered earlier by Schriesheim et al. (1999) and they emphasize that each time a researcher develops a instrument for the relationship quality construct he or she should conduct a "systematic psychometric study or explicit construct validation" (p. 100). Barge and Schlueter (1991) also discover that there is an absence of explanation about the validity of LMX theory's

instruments and consequently conclude that more studies are needed “to assess the degree of construct, convergent, or predictive validity of these various instruments” (p. 546).

Thirdly, the development and the application of a particular version of an instrument for a study are typically done without providing explanations or reasons for doing so. For instance, in Graen et al. (2006) a five-item instrument is developed and applied to evaluate the quality of the leader-member relationship; however, this was done without providing informed support for choosing this instrument over other instruments that already appeared in the literature (p. 153). In Dunegan et al. (2002), a different version of a five-item instrument developed by Dunegan et al. (1992) is used without clarifying why this instrument suits this particular study. Likewise, Graen and his colleagues in Wakabayashi et al. (1990) use a 14-item instrument without providing explanation except to acknowledge that the instrument is developed by Wakabayashi, Graen, Graen, and Graen (1988).

Even though there are many instruments to measure the leader-member relationship quality construct in the literature, because of these weaknesses there is one instrument that receives stronger support: the seven-item instrument which is frequently referred to as LMX-7. The LMX-7 is composed of a single factor which is measured from seven separate questions. That is, it is a unidimensional instrument for the leader-member relationship construct (Graen, 2005; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Their description of this instrument is reinforced and its use is supported by the finding of Schyns and Paul (2005) who surveyed 252 employees from German organizations and found in a “factor analyses, LMX-7 turn out to be one-dimensional... (explained

variance by the first factor: 59.37%, loadings between .49 and .97)” (p. 187). The recommended version of LMX-7 is revealed in Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) and in Figure 1:

Figure 1: LMX-7

1. Do you know where you stand with your leader ... do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do? (Does your member usually know)				
Rarely	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very often
2. How well does your leader understand your job problem and needs? (How well do you understand)				
Not a bit	A little	A fair amount	Quite a bit	A great deal
3. How well does your leader recognize your potential? (How well do you recognize)				
Not at all	A little	Moderately	High	Very high
4. 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? (What are the chances that you would)				
None	Small	Moderate	High	Very high
5. 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? (What are the chances that you would)				
None	Small	Moderate	High	Very high
6. 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
7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader? (Your member)				
Extremely ineffective	Worse than average	Average	Better than average	Extremely effective

Notes: Continuous scale of sum of 5-point items (1 left to 5 right). Leader's form consists of same seven items asked about member of (leader in parentheses). Expected agreement between leader and member report is positive and strong and used as index of quality of data.

Source: Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) p. 237

On close scrutiny of LMX-7 presented in Figure 1, it can be seen that this particular instrument does not appear to directly assess the dimensions of the leader-member relationship quality construct -- 'respect', 'trust', and 'obligation'. Specifically, item 1,2, and 3 in the LMX-7 relate to a member's perception on leader satisfaction,

understanding, and recognition respectively. It can be seen that item 4 and 5 ask about a leader's commitment to help when a member is in a difficult situation and item 6 asks about a member's willingness to defend his or her leader. Item 7, which is described by Graen and his colleagues as a 'centroid item', measures the member's perception of the quality of the relationship in general (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 236; Keller & Danserau, 2001, p. 134). However, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) claim that this version of the instrument is nonetheless designed to and can measure the leader-member relationship quality construct adequately. They claim that the "LMX construct has multiple dimensions [namely mutual respect, trust, and obligation], but these dimensions are so highly [positively] correlated they can be tapped into with the single measure of LMX" which is LMX-7 (p. 237).

We note that this particular seven-point instrument is somewhat inexplicably set out on different scales, some questions include – at the lowest end – points indicating 'not at all', 'none' and others 'rarely'. We believe this to be unusual in that it does not reflect the same points on a scale; nor perhaps even the same scale with respect to 'not at all' and 'none' options. While we found nothing in the literature to suggest that this nullifies the effectiveness of this particular instrument, it is something of which to be aware in its further application and use. We also suggest that this is a point on which further study could be fruitful.

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) acknowledge the emergence of new instruments to measure the relationship between the leader and member:

We acknowledge that the measure of LMX has changed over the years. Investigations have used the 2-item (Dansereau, et al., 1975), 4-item (Graen &

Schiemann, 1978; Liden & Graen, 1980), 5-item (Graen, Liden, & Hoel, 1982), 7-item (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Seers & Graen, 1984), 10-item (Ridolphi & Seers, 1984), 12-item (Wakabayashi & Graen, 1984), and 14-item (Wakabayashi, Graen, & Uhl-Bien, 1990; Uhl-Bien, et al., 1990) LMX scale (p. 236).

They return however to their own seven point instrument after considerable assessment and testing:

This refinement of the measure has occurred from our learning through research and theorizing about LMX. Different measures have involved the use of added experimental items to tap into and test the dimensionality of LMX.... Conclusion from this testing indicates to us that, even though items were added to tap into possible multiple dimensions, the expanded measure was highly correlated with the more concise 7-item LMX and produced the same effects. Moreover, although multiple factors were generated for the larger measures, the Cronbach alphas for the single measure were consistently in the 80%-90% range, and the high correlations among the factor scales made consideration of these factors as multiple measures inappropriate (Cashman, 1975; Schiemann, 1977; Seers, 1981; Schriesheim & Gardner, 1992; Scott, 1993; Bell, 1994) (p. 236).

For our as well as their purposes therefore, the relationship they have discovered to be best measured with LMX-7 appears to be an appropriate one:

Therefore, we conclude that the 7-item LMX, with the centroid item of “How effective is your working relationship with your leader?” is the most appropriate and recommended measure of LMX. Of course, we shall continue to develop psychometrically new and improved versions of LMX... In terms of the use of alternate measures of LMX, we can only postulate that this was due to lack of accessibility of the [7-item] LMX measure. (p. 236)

The findings of Gerstner and Day (1997) and Liden and Maslyn (1998) that LMX-7 is a reliable instrument support Graen and colleagues' recommendation for using this version . Specifically, Gerstner and Day (1997) found that LMX-7 is the most reliable among the many versions of LMX instrument. Through a meta-analytic review they found that the LMX-7 has the highest average Cronbach Alpha compared to other versions of instrument [member's perspective LMX-7 Cronbach Alpha 0.89; other

member's perspective versions of instrument Cronbach Alpha 0.83; leader's perspective LMX-7 Cronbach Alpha 0.78; other leader's perspective versions of instrument Cronbach Alpha 0.76] (Gerstner & Day, 1997, p. 831). Liden and Maslyn (1998) in developing an alternative instrument for the relationship quality construct also found that LMX-7 has a high Cronbach Alpha [0.89 and 0.91 for student sample and employees sample respectively] (p. 53). The Cronbach Alpha statistic indicates a instrument's internal consistency reliability which can be understood as a statistical approximation of the goodness of items in the instrument in assessing a particular construct (Trochim, 2006; Van der Velde, Jansen, & Anderson, 2004).

The findings of Gerstner and Day (1997) that the LMX-7 has a high predictive validity also is a form of support for the use of this version of instrument. Specifically, in their meta analysis study Gerstner and Day (1997) found that "the LMX-7 measure[ment] also tended to obtained higher correlations with outcomes than using other measures"³ (p. 837). In addition, Keller and Danserau (2001) in assessing the predictive validity of four versions of LMX instrument (2-item, 3-item, 4-item, and 5-item instruments) found that instruments that contain a centroid item (the 3-item instrument and the 5-item instrument) have the highest predictive validity. The finding of these researchers implies that LMX-7, which has the centroid item (see Table 3.2 item 7), is also high in predictive validity.

A review of the literature indicates that Graen and his colleagues' recommendation to use the LMX-7 is followed by most researchers. For instance, both Liden and Maslyn

³ Gerstner and Day (1997) conclude that the findings of their study imply "that LMX7 appears to provide the soundest psychometric properties of all available LMX measures. As such, the LMX7 measure is recommended to researchers interested in assessing an overall (i.e., unidimensional) exchange quality" (p. 837).

(1998, p. 52) and Schriesheim, Neider et al. (1992, p. 138-139) in their attempt to develop a instrument for their own version of LMX instrument (an 11-item instrument and 6-item instrument respectively) acknowledge that the LMX-7 is the most frequently use instrument (and use this version of instrument as a benchmark in assessing the convergence validity of their instrument). Likewise, Gerstner and Day (1997) in their meta analysis review on LMX studies found that LMX-7 is “the most frequently used” instrument in the literature (p. 829). Even Schriesheim who criticizes the absence of a universal instrument for the leader-member relationship quality construct (see Schriesheim et al., 1999; Schriesheim, Scandura et al., 1992) and had developed her own version of a six-item instrument for the construct (Schriesheim, Neider et al., 1992), follows Graen and colleagues recommendation to use LMX-7 (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000, p. 496).

It is concluded that LMX theory has an accepted explanation for the ‘quality of the leader-member relationship’ construct and furthermore this theory has a recommended, appropriate, and widely accepted instrument for its construct. The question of whether LMX theory can be appropriately applied to study the quality of the AC-IA relationship will be clarified in section 4, after addressing critiques on this LMX theory .

3. CRITIQUES OF LMX THEORY

The purpose of this section is to address critiques of LMX theory. This section is important because it demonstrates that potential flaws of LMX theory have been considered before this theory is used in providing the meaning for the ‘quality of the

AC-IA relationship' construct and in providing the instrument for this construct. A review of the literature indicates that critiques on LMX theory are several and these critiques are discussed below.

Van Breukelen et al. (2006) and Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser (1999) criticize that LMX theory has no conclusive dimensions for the 'quality of leader-member relationship' construct (these dimensions indicate what this construct comprises). According to Schriesheim et al. (1999), who conduct an extensive review on LMX studies, in 1990s six concepts which are "mutual support, trust, liking, latitude, attention, and loyalty" were frequently referred by Graen and colleagues and other scholars as the dimensions for the relationship quality construct (1999). In the 1980s, according to Schriesheim et al. (1999), in 13 studies 18 dimensions which include "understanding, latitude, authority, information, influence in decision making, [and] communications" are referred by Graen and colleagues as dimensions for the leader-member relationship quality construct, a reflection that there is no certainty about the dimensionality of this construct (p. 76). Earlier, Grestner and Day (1997) and Dienesch and Liden (1986) in their review of previous studies also criticize that there are no conclusive dimensions for this construct.

It is possible that these critiques on the inconclusiveness of the leader-member relationship quality construct's dimensions may be unfounded. This is there does exist evidence from the LMX theory literature which indicates that there is some evidence to support the dimensionality of this construct. Specifically, Graen and colleagues in Graen (2005), Uhl-Bien et al. (2000), and Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) acknowledge that they theorize that the leader-member relationship quality construct contains

respect, trust, and obligation dimensions. It is likely that this critique is raised by scholars after they discover that Graen and colleagues, in some of their studies, mention that the leader-member relationship quality construct contains dimensions other than respect, trust, and obligation. This would not necessarily take away from the fact that they continue to be reasonable measures of LMX dimensions and indeed in some cases form, as described by Graen and colleagues, “our own testing of the dimensionality of the LMX construct” (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 237).

In the mid 1980s, Dienesch and Liden (1986) raise their concern about the LMX theory conceptualization alleging that Graen and colleagues offered a “narrow conception of the” leader-member relationship quality as in that particular time Graen and colleagues focussed on categorizing the relationship qualities into ‘low, medium, and high’ only (p. 624). Graen and colleagues had been charged as not describing how a leader-member relationship develops from low to high in term of quality.

Graen and colleagues addressed Dienesch and Liden’s (1986) critique in their introduction of the Role Making Model in Graen and Scandura (1987). This model represents that the development of the quality of the leader-member relationship involves three steps: (1) role taking, (2) role making, and (3) role routinization (Graen & Scandura, 1987, p. 179). A more refined version of Role Making Model appears in Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991), Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), and Uhl-Bien et al. (2000) and addresses the concerns raised as to categorisation

Another critique is raised by Vecchio and Gobdel (1984). These researchers question the generalization of LMX theory. Specifically, Vecchio and Gobdel (1984) discover

that in the early 1980s, only a small number of studies have tested LMX theory's explanation about the quality of the leader-member relationship on low level personnel in business organizations. They consequently argue that LMX theory cannot be generalized to this group of personnel unless more testing is done. Vecchio and Gobdel (1984) justify the necessity for such testing by claiming that there is a need "to determine empirically the boundary condition of" LMX theory (Vecchio & Gobdel, 1984, p. 6). This critique is now dated however, and recent studies have offered further evidence of the value of the LMX ideas.

Furthermore, it is likely that Vecchio and Gobdel's (1984) critique has no direct effect on the application of LMX theory in studies on the quality of the AC-IA relationship because this is a relationship between high level personnel in business organizations. To note that Vecchio and Gobdel (1984) tested LMX theory's explanation about the relationship quality construct on low level personnel in business organizations and found that this explanation is "demonstrable" for this group of personnel (p. 18). Hence, this finding indicates that their study addressed their own critique.

Critiques on LMX theory have been addressed in this section. The way LMX theory is applied in this study will be revealed in the next section.

4. AC-IA RELATIONSHIP AND LMX

The purpose of this section is to consider the relationship between an audit committee and their internal auditor (AC-IA relationship), and to suggest how a theoretically informed meaning derived from the LMX literature can prove useful in its

understanding. That is, it will be suggested that the AC-IA relationship can be understood through the lens of LMX theory. This section demonstrates the possibility of applicability of LMX theory to the AC-IA situation.

LMX theory's explanation about the leader-member relationship quality construct revealed earlier implies that a degree of mutual trust, respect, and obligation between parties signal an LMX type relationship. Indeed, the audit committee and the internal auditor relationship reflects such qualities as a high quality AC-IA relationship is characterized by a high degree of mutual trust, respect, and obligation. So for example, the high level personnel (in this case, the audit committee members) are generally obligated protect the lower level personnel (in this case, the internal auditor) in circumstances in which the internal auditor raises issues of importance to governance. The internal auditor, in turn, can become the audit committee's reliable (trusted) watchdog when it comes to operational matters.

The internal auditor roughly operates in the role of a 'middle manager', usually held accountable to senior management and ultimately the governing board (and thereby audit committee) (Van Peurse, 2006). The results of interviews conducted by Mat Zain and Subramaniam (2007) also show that internal auditors' description about a high quality AC-IA relationship is similar to an explanation provided by LMX theory about the characteristics of a high quality leader-member relationship. Specifically, it is reported in Mat Zain and Subramaniam (2007) that an internal auditor who experiences a high quality AC-IA relationship describes it as follows:

We also made enquiries on the more general and affective dimensions of the [AC-IA] relationship by asking how each interviewee would describe his or her relationship with the AC. ... Some regarded the AC in high reverence,

noting the AC to be like “a father”, whereby they are expected to support and guide the IAF. For instance, as stated by one interviewee: “internal auditors will disclose all matters to the AC, and if there is any problem, AC is in the position to give advice, solutions and act like a ‘father’ to internal auditors (p. 903)

These interview results demonstrate that a chief internal auditor explains a high quality AC-IA relationship as one in which the audit committee is in a ‘helpful’ role as they ‘give[s] advice, solutions and act[s] like a father to internal auditors’ and this auditor is a reliable assistant as he ‘disclose[s] all matters to the AC’. This description corresponds with the LMX theory explanation that a high quality leader-member relationship includes a leader who supports and trusts their junior and the junior member (the internal auditor in this case) who, in turn, who becomes a reliable informant.

A low quality AC-IA relationship has a lack of mutual trust, respect and obligation among the two parties. It is noted in the literature that the AC and the IA relate to each other in accordance with their “job prescription, authority, formal directives, and so forth” only (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000, p. 153), thus setting the scene for (either) a low-level or high-level LMX-type relationship. As has been shown, an LMX theory explanation about a low quality leader-member relationship implies that in a low quality AC-IA relationship both parties, in relation with each other, would only comply to the minimum level possible with organizational and regulatory requirements.

These characteristics suggest, therefore, that LMX understandings can be applied to evaluate the AC-IA relationship. This is the case given that the role of the internal auditor is both manager and employee, the audit committee is comprised of senior

governing board representatives and because the relationships attributed to each of these parties seem to reasonably fit within LMX understandings.

An instrument that is appropriate for applying to the AC-IA relationship would therefore also seem to be one that can be derived from the LMX literature. It has been shown that LMX-7 is an appropriate measurement instrument for the 'leader-member relationship quality' construct and is, therefore, one that may be useful for the AC-IA relationship.

5. CONCLUSION

The relationship between the Audit Committee and its Internal Auditor is an important one. Recent internationally-influential legislation, in the form of the U.S. Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002), has revealed this to be the case. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002) requires the auditor to investigate and report on internal control and governance issues in annual reports of companies that come under its jurisdiction. The importance of the functions of the internal auditor, and the responsibilities of the audit committees and their boards, both exist and are now widely recognised.

The work of internal auditors and their relationship to their audit committee has been an important measure of how well these companies, their systems and management operate. Instruments which have been used thus far to measure and evaluate the AC-IA relationship have relied on objective, and somewhat superficial, measures of, for example, frequency of meetings and formal backgrounds of the parties involved. The potential use of LMX theory in this context, to delve into deeper social interpretations

of this all-important relationship, is seen to be an important step forward. The use of LMX theory is seen to provide a language and measure of that relationship which has not been so served in the past, and its use has the potential to serve management, corporate stakeholders and research. It is with this vision in mind that this paper now concludes.

REFERENCES

- Barge, J. K., & Schlueter, D. W. (1991). Leadership as organizing: A critique of leadership instruments. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4(4), 541-569.
- Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1538-1567).
- Berneth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2007a). Is personality associated with perceptions of LMX? An empirical study. *Organization Development Journal*, 28(7), 613-631.
- Berneth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2007b). Leader-member social exchange (LMSX): Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 979-1003.
- Bhal, K. T., & Ansari, M. A. (1996). Measuring quality of interaction between leaders and members. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26(11), 945-972.
- Bhal, K. T., & Ansari, M. A. (2007). Leader-member exchange-subordinate outcomes relationship: Role of voice and justice. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(1), 20-35.
- Boies, K., & Howell, J. M. (2006). Leader-member exchange in teams: An examination of the interaction between relationship differentiation and mean LMX in explaining team-level outcomes *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 246-257.
- Case, R. (1998). Leader Member Exchange Theory and Sport: Possible applications. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21(4), 387-395.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 331-346.
- Chen, Z., Lam, W., & Zhong, J. A. (2007). Leader-member exchange and member performance: A new look at individual-level negative feedback-seeking behavior and team-level employment climate *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 202-212.
- Cogliser, C. C., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader-member exchange: A multi-level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 487-511.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G. B., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role-making process *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dansereau, F. (1995). A dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(4), 479-490.
- Dansereau, F., Yammarino, F. J., Markham, S. E., Alutto, J. A., Newman, J., Dumas, M., et al. (1995). Individualized leadership: A new multiple-level approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 413-450.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618-634.
- Duchon, D., Green, S. G., & Taber, T. D. (1986). Vertical dyad linkage: A longitudinal assessment of antecedents, measures and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 56-60.

- Dunegan, K. J., Duchon, D., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1992). Examining the link between leader-member exchange and subordinate performance: The role of task analyzability and variety as moderators. *Journal of Management*, 18(1), 59-76.
- Dunegan, K. J., Uhl-Bien, M., & Duchon, D. (2002). LMX and subordinate performance: The moderating effects of task characteristic. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 275-285.
- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 321-330.
- Farr-Wharton, R., & Brunetto, Y. (2007). Organizational relationship quality and service employee acceptance of change in SMEs: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13, 114-125.
- Fix, B., & Sias, P. M. (2006). Person-centered communication, leader-member exchange, and employee job satisfaction. *Communication Research Report*, 23(1), 35-44.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Goodwin, J. (2003). The relationship between the audit committee and the internal audit function: Evidence from Australia and New Zealand. *International Journal of Auditing*, 7, 263-278.
- Goodwin, J., & Yeo, T. Y. (2001). Two factors affecting internal audit independence and objectivity: Evidence from Singapore. *International Journal of Auditing*, 5, 107-125.
- Graen, G. B. (2005). Three dyadic leadership theories: Comparative multiple hypotheses testing. In G. B. Graen (Ed.), *Global organizing designs* (Vol. 3, pp. 205-215). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership Frontiers* (pp. 143-166). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G. B., Dharwadkar, R., Grewal, R., & Wakabayashi, M. (2006). Japanese career progress: An empirical examination. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 148-161.
- Graen, G. B., Hui, C., & Taylor, E. T. (2004). A new approach to team leadership: Upward, downward, and horizontal differentiation. In G. B. Graen (Ed.), *New frontiers of leadership* (pp. 33-66). Greenwich: IAP.
- Graen, G. B., Liden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(6), 868-872.
- Graen, G. B., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 109-131.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Towards a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175-208.
- Graen, G. B., & Schiemann, W. (1978). Leader-member agreement: A vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 206-212.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professionals into self-managing and partially self-designing contributors: Towards a theory of leadership-making. *Journal of Management Systems*, 3(3), 25-39.

- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Hoye, R. (2004). Leader-member exchanges and board performance of voluntary sport organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(1), 55-70.
- Hoye, R. (2006). Leadership within Australian voluntary sport organization boards. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 16(3), 297-313.
- Huang, Y. Z. (1999). The formation and effects of employee's trust in organization. *Unpublished Thesis, Graduate School of Psychology, National Taiwan University*.
- Jablin, F. M. (1980). Superior's upward influence, satisfaction, and openness in superior-subordinate communication: A reexamination of the "pelz effect". *Human Communication Research*, 6(3), 210-220.
- Jawahar, I. M., & Carr, D. (2007). Conscientiousness and contextual performance: The compensatory effects of perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(4), 330-349.
- Kamdar, D., & Van Dyne, L. (2007). The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange relationships in predicting task performance and citizenship performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1286-1298.
- Keller, T., & Danserau, F. (2001). The effect of adding items to scales: An illustrative case of LMX. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(2), 131-143.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.
- Lapierre, L. M., Hackett, R. D., & Taggar, S. (2006). A test of the links between family interference with work, job enrichment and leader-member exchange. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 55(4), 489-511.
- Lee, J. (2001). Leader-member exchange, perceived organizational justice, and cooperative communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14(4), 574-589.
- Liang, S., Ling, H., & Hsieh, S. (2007). The mediating effects of leader-member exchange quality to influence the relationships between paternalistic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 10(2), 127-137.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. B. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 451-465.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management* 24(1), 43-72.
- Makela, L. (2005). Pregnancy and Leader-Follower Dyadic Relationships: A research Agenda. *Equal Opportunities International*, 24(3/4), 50-72.
- Mat Zain, M., & Subramaniam, N. (2007). Internal auditor perceptions on audit committee interactions: A qualitative study in Malaysia public corporations. *Corporate Governance*, 15(5), 894-908.
- Miles, E. W., Patrick, S. L., & King, W. C. (1996). Job level as a systematic variable in predicting the relationship between supervisory communication and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 277-292.

- Morrow, P. C., Suzuki, Y., Crum, M. R., Ruben, R., & Pautsch, G. (2005). The role of leader-member exchange in high turnover work environment. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 20(8), 681-694.
- Mueller, B. H., & Lee, J. (2002). Leader-member exchange and organizational communication satisfaction in multiple context. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 39(2), 220-244.
- Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. *Human Communication Research*, 12(3), 395-419.
- Raghunandan, K., Read, W. J., & Rama, D. V. (2001). Audit committee composition, "gray directors", and interaction with internal auditing. *Accounting Horizons*, 15(2), 105-118.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 428-436.
- Scherbaum, C. A., Finlinson, S., Barden, K., & Tamanini, K. (2006). Application of item response theory to measurement issues in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 366-386.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1), 63-113.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., Scandura, T. A., & Tepper, B. J. (1992). Development and preliminary validation of a new scale (LMX-6) to measure leader-member exchange in organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 135-147.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Scandura, T. A., Eisenbach, R. J., & Neider, L. L. (1992). Validation of a new leader-member exchange scale (LMX-6) using hierarchically-nested maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, p. 983-992.
- Schyns, B., & Paul, T. (2005). Dyadic leadership and organizational outcomes: Different results for different instruments? In G. B. Graen & J. A. Graen (Eds.), *Global organizing designs* (pp. 173-203). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Seers, A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). The dual attachment concept: A longitudinal investigation of the combination of task characteristics and leader-member exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 33, 283-306.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennet, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social Exchange in Organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.
- Sias, P. M. (2005). Workplace relationship quality and employee information experiences. *Communication Studies*, 56(4), 375-395.
- Sparrowe, R. T., Soetjito, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Do leader's influence tactics relate to member's helping behavior? It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1194-1208.
- Stringer, L. (2006). The link between the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship and the level of the employee's job satisfaction *Public Organization Review*, 6, 125-142.
- Tekleab, A. G., & Taylor, M. S. (2003). Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organization-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 585-608.

- Tepper, B. J., Uhl-Bien, M., Kohut, G. F., Rogelberg, S. G., Lockhart, D. E., & Ensley, M. D. (2006). Subordinates' resistance and managers' evaluations of subordinates' performance. *Journal of Management*, 32(2), 185-209.
- Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved December 8, 2006, from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (2000). Implications of leader-member exchange (LMX) for strategic human resource management systems: Relationships as social capital for competitive advantage. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 18, 137-185.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Maslyn, J. M. (2003). Reciprocity in manager-subordinate relationships: Components, configurations, and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 29(4), 511-532.
- van Breukelen, W., Schyns, B., & Blanc, P. L. (2006). Leader-member exchange theory and research: Accomplishments and future challenges. *Leadership* 2, 295-316.
- Van der Velde, M., Jansen, P., & Anderson, N. (2004). *Guide to management research method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Van Peursem, KA (2005). Conversations with internal auditors: The power of ambiguity. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20(5), 489-512.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Gobdel, B. C. (1984). The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 5-20.
- Wakabayashi, M., & Graen, G. B. (1984). The Japanese career progress study: A 7 - year follow-up. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(4), 603-614.
- Wakabayashi, M., Graen, G. B., Graen, M. R., & Graen, M. G. (1988). Japanese management progress: Mobility into middle management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 217-227.
- Wakabayashi, M., Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1990). The generalizability of the hidden investment hypothesis in leading Japanese corporations. *Human Relations*, 43(11), 1099-1116.
- Walter, H. L., Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (2005). How subordinates' machiavellianism and motives relate to satisfaction with superiors *Communication Quarterly*, 53(1), 57-70.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Yagil, D. (2006). Perception of justice within leader-employee dyads. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 9(3), 291-304.
- Yifeng, N. C., & Tjosvold, D. (2008). Goal interdependence and leader-member relationship for cross cultural leadership in foreign ventures in China. *Organization Development Journal*, 29(2), 144-166.

OTHER PAPERS IN THIS SERIES

1. Lawrence, S.L. Rational and social aspects of management accounting practice: report of a field study, June 1990.
2. Northcott, D.N. Capital budgeting in practice: past research and future directions, August 1990.
3. Cheung, J., Vos., E. and Low, C.K. IPO underpricing in New Zealand, September 1990.
4. Van Peurse, K.A. Extant research in public sector accountability, March 1991.
5. Van Peurse, K.A. New Zealand auditor perceptions: difficult and critical audit procedures, July 1991.
6. Alam, M. The budgetary process from information processing perspectives, September 1991.
7. McCracken, T. & Hooper, K. The New Zealand goods and services tax (GST): identifying the problem areas, September 1991.
8. Lowe, A. Strategic management accounting, September 1991.
9. McCracken, T. Pricing: a review of contemporary approaches, February 1992.
10. Cheung, J. Estimating costs of capital for small ventures, March 1992.
11. Cheung, J., Vos, E., & Bishop, D. Pre-holiday returns in the New Zealand share market, May 1992.
12. Van Peurse, K.A. Accountability for social policy: a moral framework, June 1992.
13. Alam, M. & Poulin, B.J. Budget as a discipline: lessons from a turnaround enterprise, December 1992.
14. Raj, M. Pricing options on short and long-term yields using stochastic arbitrage based models, May 1993.
15. Godfrey, A. & Hooper, K. Domesday Book: its significance as an accounting document, June 1993.
16. Van Peurse, K.A., Lawrence, S.R. & Pratt, M.J. Health management performance: a classification and review of measures and indicators, July 1993.
17. Coy, D. & Goh, G.H. Overhead cost allocations by tertiary education institutions 1989-91, September 1993.
18. Coy, D., Dixon, K. & Tower, G. The 1992 annual reports of tertiary education institutions: quality, timeliness and distribution, November 1993.
19. Van Peurse, K.A. & Tuson, C. Financial reporting in Area Health Boards 1987-1992, January 1994.
20. Vos, E. & Davey, H. Time consistent accounting standards as a necessary condition for relating "point in time" accounting information to market returns, April 1994.
21. Coy, D., Buchanan, J. & Dixon, K. The users of New Zealand tertiary education institutions' annual reports: who are they and what information do they seek? December 1994.
22. Coombes, R. & Davey, H. The New Zealand accountant's role in environmental accountability, December 1994.

23. Wells, P.K. Marketing regulation and compliance programmes, November 1995.
24. Haslam, J. Analysis of accounting as at the end of the Napoleonic war: towards a critical theoretical history of the prescribing of accounting by the British State, November 1995.
25. Haslam, J. The British state and the prescribing of accounting, 1815-1830: a focus upon the regulating of friendly societies and savings banks in the post-Napoleonic war context, November 1995.
26. Haslam, J. Accounting publicity and the revolution in government, November 1995.
27. Haslam, J. Accounting history as critique of the present: a critical theorising of interfaces between accounting and the British state of the early 1840s, November 1995.
28. Dosa, L., Gallhofer, S. & Haslam, J. Accounting's location in a transition process: a focus upon Hungary, November 1995.
29. Gallhofer, S. & Haslam, J. Accounting on the road: turnpike administration in early nineteenth century Britain, November 1995.
30. Ciancanelli, P., Gallhofer, S., Haslam, J. & Watson, R. Pay systems and social ideology: the case of profit related pay, November 1995.
31. Jenkin, Erica and Van Peurse, Karen A. Expert systems in auditing: New Zealand auditor perspectives, November 1995.
32. Wells, P.K. Marketing regulation and compliance programmes: attitudes and reactions of New Zealand marketing managers in 1988, November 1995.
33. Davey, H.B., Bowker, T. & Porter, B. New Zealand's controlled foreign company regime, November 1995.
34. Davey, H.B., Barnes, H. and Porter, B. External environmental reporting: the need for a New Zealand standard, November 1995.
35. Lawrence, Stewart, Rethinking professional ethics: a religious metaphor for accountants, November 1995.
36. Ciancanelli, P., Watson, R., Gallhofer, S. & Haslam, J. Alternative perspectives on finance: a critical analysis, November 1995.
37. Gallhofer, Sonja & Haslam, J., Beyond accounting: the possibilities of accounting and "critical" accounting research, November 1995.
38. Gallhofer, Sonja, "It really challenged everybody": accounting and critical and feminist pedagogy, January 1996.
39. Gallhofer, Sonja, and Haslam, Jim, The direction of green accounting policy: critical reflections, January 1996.
40. Wells, P.K., Marketing regulation and compliance programmes: attitudes and reactions of New Zealand marketing managers in 1995, February 1996.
41. Pratt, Michael and Coy, David, Managing teaching allocations in a university department: the TAMM model, June 1996.
42. Coy, David and Pratt, Michael, The spider's web: politics and accountability in universities, June 1996.
43. Doolin, Bill, Organisational roles of decision support systems, June 1996.

44. Beale, Bob and Davey, Howard, The nature and origins of comprehensive income, August 1996.
45. Davey, Howard, and Holden, Mark, Emerging directions in the evaluation of foreign subsidiary performance, September 1996.
46. Kelly, Martin, A personal perspective on action-research, October 1996.
47. Doolin, Bill, Defining decision support systems, November 1996.
48. Gallhofer, Sonja, Haslam, Jim and Pratt, Mike, Developing environmental accounting: insights from indigenous cultures, November 1996.
49. Ciancanelli, Penny, Gallhofer, Sonja, Haslam, Jim and Watson, Robert, In the name of an enabling accounting: critical reflections developed and enhanced through an analysis of accounting and profit-related pay, November 1996.
50. Lowe, Alan, The role of accounting in the processes of health reform: providing a "black box" in the cost of blood products, November 1996.
51. Coy, David and Buchanan, John, Information technology diffusion among business professionals: Preliminary findings of a longitudinal study of spreadsheet use by accountants 1986-96, February 1997.
52. Beale, Bob and Davey, Howard, Total recognised revenues and expenses: an empirical study in New Zealand, March 1997.
53. Coy, David, Nelson, Mort, Buchanan, John and Jim Fisher, Spreadsheet use by accountants in Australia, Canada and New Zealand: preliminary findings, March 1998.
54. Wells, P.K., Manapouri: catalyst or consequence? October 1998.
55. Lowe, Alan, Tracing networks through case studies, October 1998.
56. Kim, S.N. and Mfodwo, K., Prospects for the establishment of Islamic banking in New Zealand: a contextual analysis, November 1998.
57. Van Peurse, K.A., Method for a methodology: a new approach for the middle range, November 1998.
58. Locke, Joanne and Perera, Hector, An analysis of international accounting as a catalyst for the re-integration of accounting research, August 1999.
59. Julian, Aileen and Van Peurse, Karen, Ethics education and the accounting curriculum: can ethics be taught?, August 1999.
60. Van Peurse, K.A., Wells, P.K. and L'Huillier, B. Contracting services in SMEs: A New Zealand professional accounting firm case study, September 1999.
61. Lowe, Alan, Accounting in health care: providing evidence of a real impact, September 1999.
62. Alam, Manzurul and Wells, Philippa, Control systems of government-owned business enterprises: a critical analysis of the New Zealand model, November 1999.
63. Kelly, Martin, In Praise of Holistic Education in Accounting, December 1999.
64. Smith, Susan Ann and Coy, David, The quality of city council annual reports, 1996-97 and 1997-98: Preliminary findings, March 2000.
65. Hooper, Keith and Low, Mary, Representations in accounting: the metaphor effect, June 2000.

66. Dixon, Keith, The impact of management control across a hospital system, August 2000.
67. Lowe, Alan, Accounting information systems as knowledge-objects: some effects of objectualization, August 2000.
68. Locke, Joanne and Lowe, Alan, A market test of the ranking of accounting journals: an Australasian perspective, October 2000.
69. Francis, Graham, Humphreys, Ian and Jackie Fry, Lessons for other counties from the privatisation, commercialisation and regulation of UK municipal airports, December 2000.
70. Hooks, Jill, Coy, David and Howard Davey, Information disclosure in the annual reports of New Zealand electricity retail and distribution companies: preliminary findings, January 2001.
71. Lowe, Alan, Methodology, method and meaning in field research: Intensive versus extensive research styles in management accounting, March 2001
72. Van Peurseem, Karen, Locke, Joanne and Harnisch, Neil, Audit Standard Analysis: An Illocutionary Perspective on the New Zealand Going Concern Standard April 2001
73. France, Necia, Francis, Graham, Lawrence, Stewart and Sacks, Sydney, Measuring Performance Improvement in a Pathology Laboratory: A Case Study, April 2001
74. Hooper, Keith and Davey, Howard, Preferences on Learning Options in Accounting Education: A New Zealand/Asian Perspective, May 2002
75. Lowe, Alan and Locke, Joanne, A Paradigm Sensitive Perspective on the Ranking of Accounting Journals: A Web-based survey Approach, May 2002
76. France, Necia, Francis, Graham and Lawrence, Stewart Redesigning Clinical Laboratory Services: Securing efficient diagnoses for New Zealanders, January 2003
77. Lowe, Alan and Jones, Angela, Emergent and the Measurement of Performance: The formulation of Performance Indicator at the Micro-Level, May 2003
78. Francis, Graham, Humphreys, Ian, Ison, Stephen and Aldridge, Kelly, Airport Surface Access Strategies and Targets, September 2004
79. Bourke, Nikki and Van Peurseem, Karen, Detecting Fraudulent Financial Reporting: Teaching the 'Watchdog' new tricks, September 2004
80. Low, Mary and Francis, Graham, Improving the Research Skills of the First-Year Accounting Class by Incorporating Corporate Annual Report Analysis into the Classroom, November 2004
81. Nath, Nirmala, Van Peurseem, Karen and Lowe, Alan, Public Sector Performance Auditing: Emergence, Purpose and Meaning, February 2005
82. Bather, Andrea and Kelly, Martin, Whistleblowing: The advantages of self-regulation, September 2005
83. Samkin, Grant and Lawrence, Stewart, Limits to corporate social responsibility: The challenge of HIV/AIDS to sustainable business in South Africa, November 2005
84. Alley, Clinton and James, Simon, The interface between financial accounting and tax accounting – a summary of current research, December 2005
85. Samkin, Grant, Trader. Sailor. Spy, December 2005

86. Van Peurseem, Karen, The auditor's dilemma: an economic perspective on al old problem, December 2005.
87. Alley, Clinton and Maples, Andrew, The concept of income within the New Zealand taxation system, September 2006.
88. Francis, Graham, Lawrence, Stewart, Humphreys, Ian and Ison, Stephen, Risk Transfer and Uncertainty in Privatization: Cases from Air Transport October 2006.
89. Van Peurseem, Karen, Public Benefit vs Private Entities: A Fresh Look at Accounting Principles October 2006.
90. Bather, Andrea, The Companies Act 1993 and Directors' Duties: Small and Medium Entities are not well catered for December 2006.
91. Ryan, Jim, Tax Relief Still Available for Small Property Owners. December 2006.
92. Samkin, Grant and Scheider, Annika, Reviewing the changing face of financial reporting: The case of a public benefit entity. May 2007.
93. Lowe, Alan and Locke, Joanne, Biography of an ERP: Tracing the Fabrication of a virtual Object, May 2007.
94. Van Peurseem, Karen A., Zhou, Maiqing, Flood, Tracey and Buttimore, James, Three cases of Corporate Fraud: An Audit Perspective, June 2007.
95. Schneider, Annika and Samkin, Grant, Intellectual Capital Reporting by the New Zealand Local Government Sector, June 2007.
96. Samujh, R. Helen, IFRS for SMEs: A New Zealand perspective, July 2007.
97. James, Simon and Alley, Clinton, Reflections on the introduction of Value Added Tax in the United Kingdom and Goods and Services Tax in New Zealand, November 2007.