

Team similarity and favouritism – an exploration of
the relationship between different types of similarity
with the peers and managers
and favouritism

Ana Margarida de Oliveira Rico
(anamargarida.rico@gmail.com)

Supervisor:
Ph. D. Henrique Duarte,
Professor in ISCTE Business School,
Business Department

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the
conferral of Master in Business Administration

September 2016

Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between the similarity in working groups with the perceived unfairness and justice violation in the workplace (favouritism). This research aims to answer the question of which types of similarity - demographic or perceived – most affects the perception of justice, including different types of justice – distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational as well as the quality of the relationship developed with the manager – Leader Member Exchange (LMX). Additionally, it is considered that the relationship between similarity and perception of similarity also relates to turnover intention and that the role played by common goals and shared results also impact favouritism and turnover intention in diverse teams.

As methodology, questionnaires were distributed (139 participants) in a multinational company with a multicultural environment. The respondents were mainly located in Netherlands, Germany and UK. They were part of teams with three or more members and did not have direct reports. A hierarchical linear regression was applied in order to test the hypotheses.

The main results indicate that perceived similarity explains the perception of favouritism whilst demographic similarity has a limited influence explaining the perception of favouritism. Furthermore, the way of organising the work and the shared results in the team contribute to the perception of favouritism. Finally, all the variables that explain favouritism also influence the turnover intention.

Key-words: Diverse teams, Team Similarity, Favouritism, LMX.

Resumo

O principal objectivo deste estudo é perceber a relação entre semelhança nos grupos de trabalho e a percepção de injustiça no local de trabalho (favoritismo). Este estudo pretende ainda identificar quais os tipos de semelhança – demográfica ou percebida – que mais afectam a percepção de diferentes tipos de justiça – distributiva, processual, interpessoal e informacional bem como a qualidade da relação desenvolvida com a chefia – Leader Member Exchange (LMX). Adicionalmente, este trabalho considera que a relação entre semelhança e percepção de semelhança também se relaciona com a intenção de deixar a equipa (turnover intention) e que o papel desempenhado por objectivos colectivos e resultados partilhados tem impacto na percepção de favoritismo e no turnover intention em equipas que apresentam diversidade.

Na metodologia foram distribuídos inquéritos (139 participantes) numa empresa multinacional com um ambiente multicultural. Os participantes encontravam-se localizados maioritariamente na Holanda, Alemanha e Inglaterra. Estes participantes integravam equipas com três ou mais membros e não tinham subordinados alocados a si. Para testar as hipóteses foram aplicadas regressões lineares.

Os resultados principais indicam que a percepção de semelhança se relaciona com a percepção de favoritismo enquanto a semelhança demográfica tem uma influência limitada na explicação da percepção de favoritismo. Salienta-se que a forma de organizar o trabalho e os prémios nas equipas contribuem para a percepção de favoritismo e que todas as variáveis que explicam o favoritismo também influenciam a intenção de deixar a equipa.

Palavras-chave: Equipas diversas, Semelhança na equipa, Favoritismo, LMX.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my parents Maria José Rico and Fernando Rico for all their support during my studies and in my personal life. Their presence in the background allowed me to have the peace of mind needed to accomplish the targets along the way.

I would especially like to thank Prof. Henrique Duarte for all the support and motivation he gave me as well as all the valuable insights provided even under the difficult circumstances of working from distance. I would also like to thank my colleague Catarina Carnaz who contributed with valued input for some of the scales used in this work based on some overlapping areas of research, which she is developing for her PhD. I would also like to thank Prof. Ana Lúcia Martins, for all the support provided from a friendship and motivational perspective and during my academic life in ISCTE,.

I would also like to thank Stephen Taylor and Sofia Silva for the English revision and formatting, and most of all for being my companions during the painful moments in Amsterdam where this thesis was mostly written.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends for listening to me and for always being there when I needed them.

Table of Contents

Abstract	II
Resumo	III
Acknowledgements	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Tables	VII
1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical background and hypotheses	3
2.1 Diversity	3
2.1.1 Diversity and Dissimilarity Measurement	5
2.2 Theories of Diversity	6
2.2.1 Self-categorisation / Social identity	6
2.2.2 Attraction / Similarity	7
2.3 Diversity and Leadership Member Exchange (LMX).....	8
2.4 LMX and perception of favouritism.....	9
2.5 LMX, Diversity and perceived Favouritism.....	11
2.6 In-Group Favouritism.....	12
2.7 Collective Goals and Shared Results.....	14
2.8 Turnover Intention.....	15
3 Methodology	18
3.1 Participants	18
3.2 Data collection procedure.....	19
3.3 Instrumentation.....	19
3.3.1 Diversity.....	19
3.3.2 Perceived Similarity	20
3.3.3 LMX – Leader Member Exchange Relationship.....	21
3.3.4 Unfairness	21
3.3.5 Justice.....	21
3.3.6 Collective goals and Shared results in the the team.....	21
3.3.7 Turnover Intention.....	22
3.3.8 Control Variables	22
4 Results and Discussion	23
5 Conclusions	33
6 Limitations and future research	35
References:	36

Appendix I. Questionnaire.....	42
Appendix II. Factorials for collective goals and shared results	52
Appendix III. Factorials for team perceived similarity	53
Appendix IV. Factorials for LMX	54
Appendix V. Factorials for manager perceived similarity	55
Appendix VI. Factorials for Unfairness	56
Appendix VII. Factorials for distributive justice	57
Appendix VIII. Factorials for procedural justice.....	58
Appendix IX. Factorials for interactional justice.....	59
Appendix X. Factorials for informational justice.....	60
Appendix XI. Factorials for team’s turnover	61

List of Tables

Table 1: Manager Similarity.....	24
Table 2: LMX.....	25
Table 3: Manager Similarity – Distributive and Procedural Justices	26
Table 4: Manager Similarity – Interpersonal and Informational Justices	27
Table 5: Manager Similarity – Unfairness and Turnover Intention	27
Table 6: Team Similarity – Distributive and procedural justices.....	30
Table 7: Team Similarity - Interpersonal and informational justices.....	30
Table 8: Team Similarity – Unfairness and turnover intention.....	31
Table 9: Team Similarity – LMX.....	31
Table 10 – Team Similarity.....	32

1 Introduction

Nowadays, diversity is a reality in the majority of companies and one of the most explored areas of research. On one hand, advantages of diverse teams have been identified such as creativity (Wang et al. 2013) or innovation (Wang et al. 2013; Han et al. 2014). On the other hand, challenges in the work environment seem to be common. Counterproductive team behaviours have been identified such as misunderstandings in communication, concealment of information and conflict, which can lead to long term consequences such as turnover and favouritism (Mannix & Neale 2005; Jackson et al. 2003; Qin et al. 2013).

Diversity can be defined in two different types: visible diversity and invisible diversity. Visible diversity results from demographic attributes such as age, gender, ethnicity, tenure and education. This is also defined as a superficial diversity that can be easily identified (Hofhuis et al. 2013; Riordan & Wayne 2007). On the other hand, invisible diversity can be defined based on values, beliefs and behaviours. This is a deeper level diversity that is not perceived until deeper relationships between people are established. Nevertheless, this type of diversity has been presented as the one responsible for a perception of similarity/ dissimilarity among the members of a group (Hofhuis et al. 2013; Riordan & Wayne 2007).

The perception of similarity/ dissimilarity can create heterogeneity in the relationships inside the team. The perception of one being similar with other members can create in-group positive or negative discrimination and ultimately lead to in-group favouritism by other team members and especially by the ones that have power to distribute resources, which commonly occurs with supervisors. In contrast, perception of the group as a whole is likely to create a more homogeneous application of the justice rules and consequently less favouritism.

Taking into consideration the role that supervisors have on the allocation of resources and on the influence they play in groups, much research has been devoted to the interpersonal dynamics of supervisor-subordinate relationships in diverse groups. Specifically, the perception of similarity/ dissimilarity can affect the leader-member exchange relationships (LMX) that are established between the manager with different team members. LMX is described as the quality of relationships between leaders and their followers (Bowler et al. 2010; Harris et al. 2014). The establishment of different relationships with each member of the team might lead to situations where supervisors display favouritism towards some members, and conversely unfairness to the others. Likewise, perception of dissimilarity between leader and members of the team might contribute to the establishment of asymmetric relationships.

From the perspective of the members, it needs to be highlighted that the perception of favouritism can occur because the person is in fact favoured or just because there is a perception of similarity that leads to this perception. In this sense favouritism could depend on the eyes of the beholder and not necessarily derive from the actions of the supervisors.

Considering the importance that favouritism and perceived unfairness have on team members, the main goal of this study is to understand the relationship between similarity, or more specifically the perception of similarity, in working groups with the perceived unfairness and justice violation in the workplace (favouritism) by team members. This research aims to answer the question of which types of diversity - demographic or perceived – most affects the perception of justice, including different types of justice – distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational. The demographic similarity and the perception of similarity between the team members will be explored as well as the similarity and perception of similarity between the member of the team and respective team leader.

As the perception of favouritism will be measured and not the actual favouritism, conclusions will be made based on which variables might influence these perceptions the most, but not examine if favouritism was indeed performed by supervisors, only dyadic studies would allow such conclusions.

Due to the paucity in studies of the outcomes of diversity in terms of skills with turnover intention and the interplay with leadership (Jackson et al. 2003), this study also aims to explain the relationship between visible diversity and these outcomes. Finally, as context and organisation of the work seems to be related to the way individuals perceive themselves as similar to the group (Van der Vegt 2005), this study will analyse if the existence of the common goals in the team affects the perceptions of similarity and, consequently, perception of favouritism and turnover intention.

2 Theoretical background and hypotheses

2.1 Diversity

Diversity in the workplace is a common reality nowadays. Among the main causes for this are the globalisation and growth of multinationals as well as migratory movements and the increase in female representation in companies (Jackson et al., 2003).

As some defend that diversity is more advantageous than disadvantageous for companies, some advocate that we should be careful when in such assumptions and remain cautious with the context and conditions in which diversity is being measured or considered (Jackson et al., 2003).

Which arguments are used by these optimistic versus pessimistic supporters? What are the consequences of diversity for working groups and organisations? What is the influence of diversity on the establishment of relationships between manager and subordinate and also among colleagues inside the team? What is the role of context? These are all valid questions one must consider when talking about diversity. They are quite interesting issues to study, but first of all, what can we classify as diversity? And how will it be reflected in the perceptions of individuals as being more or less similar toward other group members? One of the most commonly and general definition used is “any attribute that another person may use to detect individual differences” (Williams & O’Reilly III 1998: P.81).

Most of the authors classify diversity according to the groups below (Jackson, 1995):

- 1) Demographic characteristics such as age, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, physical status, religion and education.
- 2) Tasks, knowledge, skills and abilities in the working group or organisation.
- 3) Values, beliefs and attitudes
- 4) Personality and behavioural styles
- 5) Status and tenure in the working group or organisation.

These attributes or characteristics differ in how easily they can be noticed either inside the group or by a third party outside of the group (Mannix & Neale 2005; Jackson et al., 2003; Harrison et al., 2002). Therefore, it is also possible to divide diversity into two big groups: visible or superficial-level diversity, which is easily observable and invisible or deep-level diversity, which is more difficult to identify without a deeper interaction between individuals.

Among the superficial diversity characteristics are demographic characteristics such as gender, age or ethnicity. Among the deep diversity characteristics, task related knowledge, skills and abilities can be

found. Values, beliefs and attitudes become evident only when people have a deeper knowledge of each other after considerable interaction and can be classified as deep diversity characteristics (Qin et al. 2013; Mannix & Neale 2005; Riordan & Wayne 2007).

More recently, other authors have tried to redefine this concept and other definitions of diversity have emerged in order to include both sides of diversity. Van Knippenberg, et al (2004) defines diversity as the “differences between individuals on any attributes that may lead to the perception that another person is different from self”.

In the same perspective, Rico et al (2007) defines diversity as “the compositional distribution of team members on any personal attributes that potentially lead to the perception that team members differ from one another”.

Diversity can also be approached in two different constructs – “organisational demography” and “relational demography” (Qin et al., 2013). The organisational demography conceptualises the term diversity from the composition of a certain attribute or characteristic within a group. Therefore, organisational demography researchers treat diversity as an aggregate level, for instance, group performance (Qin et al., 2013; Pfeffer, 1983). In the relational demography, diversity is viewed as a social relationship between an individual and the group. In this case, individuals compare their attributes with the attributes found in the group. This is essential to determine if the individual perceives themselves as similar/ dissimilar from the group (Qin et al. 2013; Riordan & Wayne 2007).

2.1.1 DIVERSITY AND DISSIMILARITY MEASUREMENT

Different approaches have been developed in order to operationalise the measurement of diversity (Qin et al. 2013; Riordan & Wayne 2007).

Group members can differ from each other in multiple personal attributes and a method that has explored all the possible attributes still needs to be established (Qin et al. 2013).

A lot of attention has been given to the study of visible demographic attributes through the years (Riordan & Wayne 2007; Qin et al. 2013; Mannix & Neale 2005). Therefore, the most developed measurements for diversity are still the ones that attempt to quantify determine the different degree of similarity based on actual demographic characteristics by comparing the characteristics of an individual against the demographic characteristics of other members of a specific group.

Conversely, perceived similarity has become a topic as frequently studied as that of demographic diversity. Perceived similarity is the extent to which individuals view themselves as sharing relevant characteristics that can be visible or invisible with the members of a given group (Harrison et al. 1998; Riordan & Wayne 2007). Perceived similarity includes features like attitudes, beliefs and values. This information is communicated through verbal and non-verbal behaviour and it is perceived only after individualised and deeper interaction (Harrison et al. 1998).

Nevertheless, the perception of diversity seems to be influenced by time. There is evidence that actual diversity, which remains more or less unchangeable over time, tends to have an initial superficial categorisation. However, this initial categorisation influenced by demographic, visible attributes tends to be lost with the continuation of the relationships (Harrison et al. 1998). However, the deep level diversity seems to be more evident and to play a bigger role over time when the people get to know other in terms of attitudes, personality or similar behaviour (Harrison et al. 1998).

2.2 *Theories of Diversity*

Self-categorisation and social identification processes explain why individuals identify with certain social groups and display certain behaviours such as commitment and attachment to the similar people in the group by assuming characteristics that are typical of the group. Conversely, they might adopt counterproductive behaviours to the members they consider outside of the group (Hobman et al. 2004; Hofhuis et al. 2013).

2.2.1 SELF-CATEGORISATION / SOCIAL IDENTITY

Self-categorisation can be defined as the process by which people perceive themselves as belonging to a specific social group (Turner, 1985). This is a cognitive process that individuals use for positioning themselves in a category or hierarchical structure. According to Mannix & Neale (2005), self-categorisation “at a particular level become salient as a result of the fit of the category”, for instance, ratio of in-group differences versus similarities.

Social identity explains the identification with a group based in emotional and cognitive aspects (Tajfel, 1981). Therefore, under this perspective, individuals identify with the group if emotionally it is relevant for their self-esteem (emotional component) as well as if the collective interests of the group meet and satisfy the self-interests of the individual (cognitive component) (Brewer, 1995; Mannix & Neale 2005). Social identity is a process of social categorisation in which individuals compare themselves to the others using social categories that allow comparison.

These theories are especially relevant for the processes by which individuals compare themselves based on visible or obvious characteristics such as age, gender and ethnicity and are usually the source of stereotype creation. They over emphasise when identifying the differences in the group and ignore the similarities (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Mannix & Neale 2005). These are the theories most often used by demographic researchers to explain how demographic composition of the working groups affect group processes such as conflict, cohesion, communication and performance (Williams & O'Reilly III 1998).

These stereotypes are often what creates differences in the treatment and the negative consequences of the diversity as they create a perspective of in-group/ out-group membership (McGrath et al, 1995). This separation can lead to quick judgements and favouritism. Furthermore, this in-group/ out-group perspective provides explanation for the less attachment, commitment and agreement in decisions in heterogeneous groups. (Mannix & Neale 2005; Susan & Jackson et al. 2003). Relational demography uses social-categorisation theory to explain the relationships between supervisors and subordinates as

well as among individual work-group members who classify the others as in-group versus out-group (Mannix & Neale, 2005; Williams & O'Reilly III, 1998). This similarity between supervisors and subordinates it is often identified as the cause of unfairness and favouritism by the other members of the group.

2.2.2 ATTRACTION / SIMILARITY

Attraction/ Similarity is another common theory used to explain diversity effects. The main difference from the self-categorisation theories is the inclusion of the attributes presented to explain similarity. Attributes such as attitudes, values and beliefs will facilitate interpersonal attraction and liking and vice-versa. People tend to communicate more with those who they like and avoid the ones who they dislike (Mannix & Neale 2005).

Demographic composition of groups can have effects in the communication, cohesion and integration of the groups. Moreover, the amount of these effects resulted from the perception of similarity among the different team members (Pfeiffer, 1983). Findings from years of study confirm that both attitudes and values as well as demographic attributes contribute to the attraction of individuals (Williams & O'Reilly III 1998). Therefore, individuals with similar background and experiences tend to interact naturally. This is a reason why, attraction/ similarity theory is embedded in the principle of homophile and it is observed in friendships and voluntary actions (Blau, 1977).

In this study, it will be tested if the demographic characteristics contribute to the perception of similarity.

Hypothesis 1

Identical demographic characteristics (nationality, gender, age, tenure and education) contribute to the perception of similarity.

2.3 Diversity and Leadership Member Exchange (LMX)

Leaders develop different quality relationships with followers in their work groups which drive different behavioral and attitudinal reactions in the subordinates and play a significant role in shaping important follower's attitudes and behaviours. This can affect many aspects of the work processes such as Organisational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), task commitment, performance and turnover intentions (Harris et al. 2014; Lickel et al. 2000; Bakar & McCann 2014; Bowler et al. 2010).

Social exchange relationship theory is a recognised framework that describes the quality of relationships between leaders and their followers within workgroups, suggesting that leaders develop differential dyadic relationships with the different group members (Graen & Uhl-Bien 1995).

Past research suggests that demographic diversity such as gender or age correlates with the quality of the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) relationship. Moreover, it seems that the perception of similarity with the manager is related with positive evaluation of the subordinate (Turban & Jones, 1988). More recent research suggests that relational demography, which plays a determinant role in the perception of similarity, influences LMX. (Bakar & McCann 2014). Therefore, it is expected that the perception of similarity between leaders and subordinates influence the LMX. Both perception of similarity and LMX concepts have been supported by the same theories – social identity and attraction/ similarity, which contributes to explain the identification between leaders and subordinates and the establishment of better relationships (Turner, 1985; Mannix & Neale 2005).

Moreover, it is also likely that the demographic diversity plays a role in LMX, especially if these demographic characteristics contribute to explain the perception of similarity between leaders and subordinates. For instance, previous studies on supervisor–subordinate dyads have suggested that demographic characteristics can play an important role in supervisor–subordinate expectations of their LMX quality (Bakar & McCann 2014). Furthermore, high tenure differences in the supervisor-subordinate dyad are associated with lower levels of psychological attachment among work group members, while manager's perceptions of similarity to a subordinate is positively related to the manager's rating on the subordinate's performance evaluations (Turban & Jones, 1988; Turban et al., 1990 ; Bakar & McCann, 2014).

Taking the above into consideration, this study intends to analyse if the perception of similarity is positively related with LMX and the relationship between demographic diversity and LMX exploring attributes like nationality, age, gender, education and tenure.

Hypothesis 2a

Perception of similarity with the leader is positively related with LMX.

Hypothesis 2b

Demographic similarity between leader and subordinate in characteristics such as nationality, gender, age, tenure and education between subordinate and leader are positively related with LMX.

2.4 LMX and perception of favouritism

The supervisors play an important role in subordinate's professional life. They determine the opportunities for development and promotion in the organisations as well as the definition of tasks and assignments. The quality of the social exchange relationship (ranging from low to high quality) established in this dyadic relationship can be determinant for the success of the subordinate in the organisation (Bakar & McCann 2014).

Leader-member exchange theory states that the relationship between leaders and subordinates can be differentiated in terms of the quality of the exchange relationship (Bowler et al. 2010). This differentiation in the relationship with each team member might lead to positive effects on follower's outcome. Amongst these positive effects and outcomes, an increase in OCB of subordinates (Bowler et al. 2010; Harris et al. 2014) and low turnover rates (Harris et al. 2014) can be found. Thus, low LMX – when members have similar LMX among each other, might lead to the engagement of the individuals in their group. Alternatively, when LMX is high – when members have dissimilar LMX, the workgroup don't engage and relationships between individuals as well as OCB deteriorates and turnover intention increases (Harris et al. 2014). Thus, high LMX between leader and subordinate is related with low turnover of that individual in the team, but the existence of dissimilar LMX in the team can lead to high turnover of the members who present low LMX and contribute to a high turnover in the team.

LMX differentiation can also violate principles of consistency and equality, which in turn leads to more deleterious behaviours such as a decrease in the performance or an increase in the turnover (Harris et al. 2014; Bowler et al. 2010). Principles of equality and consistency can be compared to justice perceptions. Highly differentiated leader-member relationships might be indicative of leader non-neutrality and be perceived, or even lead to situations of favouritism in the workplace. Organisational justice refers to employees' perceptions of how fairly they are treated at work. It has

been measured over time predominantly using surveys that ask the participants how fairly they are treated and inquiring about fairness of the outcomes or interpersonal procedures (Shao et al. 2013; Colquitt 2001; Colquitt et al. 2013). These surveys usually also include questions about employee's attitudes such as satisfaction and behaviour such as OCB or productivity (Bowler et al. 2010; Haddock et al. 2003; Shao et al. 2015).

Justice can be measured in its different dimensions, namely procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informative (Colquitt 2001; Colquitt et al. 2013). Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness related with the decision-making in the processes and the extent they are accurate, unbiased and consistent. Distributive justice concerns with the perceived fairness of decision outcomes like distribution of benefits. These concepts are intrinsically related with fairness in terms of opportunities and compensations from the part of supervisors (Ünal et al. 2012; Colquitt 2001; Colquitt et al. 2013). Interpersonal justice reflects the perceived fairness of decision outcomes related with interpersonal treatments like truthfulness, authority or respect. Finally, informational justice is concerned with the perceived fairness in relation with dignity and respect (Colquitt 2001; Colquitt et al. 2013).

Social exchange theory also provides an explanation why justice adherence would affect compliance in subordinates. Social exchanges refer to voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others. Over time, both parties would adhere to the norm of reciprocity and develop high-quality social exchange relationships, which are characterised by mutual respect, trust, and expectations for the continued development of the relationship (Scott et al. 2009; Scott et al. 2014; Brown et al. 2005). Consequently, managers expect that their behaviours will be reciprocated by their subordinates and subordinates will be motivated to replicate these behaviours because they are valued by their managers. Some managers might violate justice rules using their power to mistreat their subordinates to elicit high performance or to send the message that mistakes will not be tolerated (Scott et al. 2009; Scott et al. 2014; Brown et al. 2005).

From the perspective of the leader, it seems that there is more favorable evaluations of the follower behavior, when both are linked by a high-quality relationship. This can be related to favouritism, however it can also be explained by the fact that high quality relationships influence the follower behaviour to reciprocate the relationship with the manager feeling the obligation to correspond beyond the expectations (Bowler et al. 2010). Moreover, not only leaders might be considered when leadership's effects on subordinate attitudes are being analysed, but also context - for instance, the relationship with co-workers. Individuals tend to make social comparisons in assessing leader relationships and the same happens in terms of favourable behaviours (Harris et al. 2014).

In this study, we will measure the results based on the responses of the individual and not the complete team. Therefore, it is expected that the individuals with high LMX scores with the manager will

perceive more justice and less favouritism as they will feel fairly rewarded and agree with the decisions of the manager.

The individuals with low LMX are expected to perceive less justice and to present higher turnover intention.

Hypothesis 3

High levels of LMX are positively related with distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice and negatively related with unfairness and turnover intention.

2.5 *LMX, Diversity and perceived Favouritism*

As previously identified, there is evidence that the perception of similarity with the manager might lead to high LMX and that LMX might lead to the perception of favouritism.

In this study, we will explore in more detail whether the perception of similarity is the one responsible for creating favouritism or if it only contributes to a higher LMX between the subordinate and the manager, which will lead to the perception of favouritism. In other words, is it the LMX that is related with the perception of favouritism/ justice or is it the perception of similarity that contributes to explain the perception of favouritism? Relational demography theory suggests that demographic similarity brings out the positive attributes of each other and engender a positive social identity. Therefore, it is likely that individuals compare attributes between themselves and supervisor to determine if they are similar or dissimilar (Riordan & Wayne 2000; Riordan, 2007; Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989). Moreover, it is likely that when there is similarity, favouritism is enabled. Likewise, demographically similar individuals tend to view and treat each other less favourably (Tsui et al., 2002).

In this study, we are analysing individual questions and not the questions of the full team, thus it is likely that the low perception of demographic similarity with the manager is related to favouritism – a perception of not being similar with the manager will lead to a perception that the manager is not being fair with the self and eventually benefiting other members of the team. Besides, we would like to understand if both demographic similarity and perceived similarity with the manager are negatively correlated with the perception of favouritism.

In accordance to the previous hypothesis, as we are analysing the answers of each individual separately, it is likely that the perceived similarity with the manager is negatively related with favouritism. Individuals that perceive themselves similar to the manager will understand the decisions

of the manager as fair, which means that we should expect low unfairness and high values of distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

Hypothesis 4a

Demographic similarity (nationality, gender, education level, age) with the manager is negatively related to perception of favouritism – demographic similarity will lead to a decrease in unfairness and an increase in distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

Hypothesis 4b

Perceived similarity with the manager is negatively related to the perception of favouritism – a higher variation in perceived similarity will lead to a decrease in unfairness and an increase in distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

2.6 *In-Group Favouritism*

Groups are a constant feature in our society. At work or in our private life we take part in groups in which we identify with certain characteristics, i.e. religion, political party, nationality, social class. Regardless, we also interact with people who belong to “different groups” (Balliet et al, 2014).

It is part of human nature to differentiate between in-group and out-group people. As a consequence of this differentiation, positively biased treatments can be observed and lead to perception of favouritism for the ones in the group. In opposition, discrimination - a negatively biased treatment can emerge for the ones out of the group.

Identity and the perception of self is an outcome from a complex process of differentiation between “self” and “others”. This is the basis for the differentiation between “in-group” and “out-group” and a mechanism that helps to explain the creation of in-group favouritism vs out-group discrimination (Ben-Ner et al. 2009). In-group favouritism has been explained using social identity theory and self-categorisation theory. The categorisation of one individual in one group can be sufficient to create in-group favouritism and inter-group discrimination (Turner & Reynolds, 2012; Hertel & Kerr 2001; Balliet, D., 2014).

In meta-analysis studies, it has been demonstrated that people tend to evaluate in-group members more positively than out-group members. Furthermore, in-group members tend to be more engaged

promoting the function and performance of the ones in-group, which might provide the individuals with long-term benefits and rewards (Balliet et al., 2014). There is also evidence that in-group members tend to maximise the outcomes and differences between in-group and out-group (Brewer, 1979). However, the in-group benefits are more likely to occur than discrimination of the out-group. Discrimination is usually followed by the motivation of promoting the in-group (in-group favouritism) and not purely to damage the members out of the group (Balliet et al., 2014). People also tend to cooperate more with in-group members compared with out-group members and it seems that in-group favouritism in cooperation can occur even in the absence of an out-group – the in-group membership is sufficient (Balliet, et al., 2014).

In the team-groups the presence of demographic diversity in the team as well as the perception of similarity/ dissimilarity can contribute to the creation of in-groups. Dissimilarity as well as perception of dissimilarity are likely to be negatively related to work group involvement because people viewed as different are often excluded from important networks of information and opportunities (Hobman et al, 2004).

According to the self-categorisation and social identification processes, individuals identify with certain social groups and display attachment and commitment to the group by assuming characteristics that are typical of the group. This identification process involves categorising people into social categories such as age, gender, ethnicity, education, tenure, and professional background. Based on these categories, individuals perceive themselves and similar others as forming the in-group, and dissimilar others as forming the out- group (Tajfel&Turner, 1986).

In these theories, people categorise others into social categories, such as age, gender, ethnicity, education, tenure or professional skills and tend to feel more attached and committed to the ones with whom share the same characteristics (Hobman et al. 2004). This categorisation process is associated with perceptual and attitudinal biases that favor the in-group and consequently derogate out-group members (Hobman et al. 2004; Ben-Ner et al. 2009).

As the social identity aims to explain why similarity in terms of visible characteristics is associated with the creation of in-group, the similarity attraction paradigm is highly applicable to explain the effects of similar characteristics in terms of values and personal attitudes and beliefs. It infers that individuals who possess similar characteristics feel attracted to each other as this reinforces their personal beliefs (Hobman et al., 2004).

As both diversity and perception of similarity have an influence on the construction of in-groups and out-groups within a team, it is also likely that the teams will be perceived as “heterogeneous” and categorisation in the team at the eyes of the manager can emerge as well. It is also likely that favouritism will develop as a consequence of being diverse and/ or perceived as dissimilar on the part of the manager.

In this study, it is proposed that favouritism will be positively related to the existence of diversity and negatively related to the perception of similarity in the team through the process of in-group creation and the following hypothesis are formulated:

Hypothesis 5a

Demographic similarity in the team is negatively related to perception of favouritism – a higher variation in demographic similarity (gender, ethnicity, age, skills and tenure) will lead to a decrease in unfairness and an increase in distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

Hypothesis 5b

Perceived Similarity with the working group members is negatively related to perception of favouritism - a higher variation in perceived similarity will lead to a decrease in unfairness and an increase in distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

2.7 Collective Goals and Shared Results

Working groups can also be described on the basis of their level of interdependence and social interaction. Interdependence can be established based on the extent to which measurable goals, rewards and tasks promote the relationship and cooperation between the team members and the final result is dependent on others (Wageman, 1995). It is also important that the same resources need to be shared and there is a final collective reward that awards the team efforts and accomplishments (Hackman, 1987; Van der Vegt 2005).

Highly interdependent members can be differentiated based on pursuing the same goals, using the same resources and being equally rewarded for their results (Guillaume et al., 2012; Hackman, 1987; Van der Vegt 2005). Team interdependence and collective goals have been identified as playing a key role in facilitating contact and interaction among employees in diverse organisations (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007), i.e., they lead group members to spend time together and collaborate with each other (Guillaume et al. 2012). The degree and type of interdependence is a determinant of the quality of interpersonal interaction (Van der Vegt 2005).

Cooperative relationships can be a challenge in diverse teams (Neale & Kramer, 1995). Based on self-categorisation theory (Turner, 1987) and the similarity/ attraction framework (Byrne, 1971), individuals make inferences about similarity with other individuals.

In this study, we are analysing the effects of both diversity and perceived similarity and their consequences like favouritism and turnover intention in the teams. There is evidence that task interdependency and the existence of collective goals oblige individuals to work together and it is a way of diminishing stereotyping and categorisation bias functioning as a moderator of diversity or perceived dissimilarity (Van der Vegt 2005; Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003). This effect of task interdependency might be even more relevant in teams with skill diversity/ dissimilarity. Members can be perceived as in-group/ out-group in the team based on the perception of skill dissimilarity (Van der Vegt 2005). Task interdependence might increase the perceived similarity in the knowledge, skills, and abilities. With increasing levels of task interdependence, a team member who perceives to be dissimilar from the other team members will have more interpersonal contact with the other team members, which may reduce categorisation biases (Van der Vegt 2005).

As a result, surface-level dissimilarity such as age, gender or ethnicity may become less relevant when people have the opportunity to interact with each other (Guillaume et al. 2012) and work for common rewards. Likewise, perceived similarity might be attenuated because similar organisational values and beliefs have to be built in order to solve the same problems.

Moreover, we suspect that task interdependence and collective goals might decrease the possible negative effects of diversity and enhance the positive effects of perceived similarity. Therefore, it is proposed that collective goals and shared results are negatively related to the perception of favouritism and turnover intention in the teams reducing the effects of the diversity and enhancing the effects of perception of similarity.

Hypothesis 6

Favouritism is negatively related to collective goals (collective goals and shared results) – an increase in collective goals will lead to a decrease in unfairness and an increase in distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices.

2.8 *Turnover Intention*

Many studies about diversity have tried to explore the positive and negative effects of having a diverse team. When the extent of diversity analysis goes to more complex approaches such as the team processes, the results seem to be more negative (Mannix & Neale 2005; S E Jackson et al. 2003; Qin

et al. 2013). One of these negative effects seems to be the high turnover that can be triggered by low job dissatisfaction (Farrell 1983) and psychological contract violation (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Psychological contracts are described as the expectations and beliefs that the employees have in the organisation in terms of informal exchange (Rousseau, 1989). Psychological contract violation happens when these beliefs and expectations are not met and one of the consequences is job dissatisfaction (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect (EVLN) theory suggests at least four possible options as a response to job dissatisfaction (Hirschman, 1970) and contract violation (Turnley & Feldman, 1999). One of the responses to dissatisfaction is Exit, which reflects an intentional willing to leave a dissatisfying job. This decision requires a significant effort by the employee and means a giving up on the company or the team caused many times by painful situations that the employee believes are not going to improve (Hirschman, 1970, Farrel, 1983). Other possibilities to deal with job dissatisfaction can be “Voice” and “Loyalty”. Voice is an attempt to change the actual situation instead of leaving it behind. Loyalty can be compared as an initial denial that the conditions in the organisation are suffering a deterioration. The employee remains in the company hoping that the situation will get better at some point (Hirschman, 1970, Farrel, 1983). Finally, other behaviour to dissatisfaction can be Neglect. Neglect is characterised by less effort at work, absenteeism, less attention and less quality (Hirschman, 1970, Farrel, 1983).

Psychological contracts develop based both in the interaction with the organisation’s representatives and the perceived culture of the organisation (Turnley & Feldman, 1999). These processes can start developing as soon as the employee interacts with a company through recruitment and keep developing with his experiences in the company. In many ways, these contracts can be described as social exchanges with the company and its members (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

In this study it is proposed to investigage whether demographic and perceived similarity are related to turnover as they seem to affect social exchanges in the organisations. Moreover, it is proposed to study if these relationships like LMX also affect turnover intention as well as the work and rewards structured in the teams.

Hypothesis 7a

Demographic similarity with the manager is negatively related to turnover intention.

Hypothesis 7b

Perceived similarity with the manager is negatively related to turnover intention.

Hypothesis 7c

Demographic similarity is negatively related to turnover intention.

Hypothesis 7d

Perceived similarity with the team is negatively related to turnover intention.

3 Methodology

A deductive approach was adopted based on existing theories and a cross-sectional survey designed according to the hypothesis tested was applied.

A self-administered questionnaire (appendix I) was created for the collection of data. This questionnaire was distributed via internet to participants identified as working in a multinational company with multicultural environments. The respondents were located mainly in Netherlands, Germany and UK. They were part of teams with three or more members and didn't have direct reports.

Different scales were used to measure diversity, perceived similarity, favouritism, collective goals and turnover in the teams.

To evaluate construct validity, an exploratory factor analysis (appendix II to XI) with varimax rotation to all of the scales followed by an analysis of the adequacy of the tests using the Cronbach's α was conducted.

Afterwards, a simple regression analysis in order to test the hypothesis was applied.

3.1 *Participants*

The participants were selected based on the company in which they worked – a multinational company with high percentage of expats; the number of members – teams with three or more members; and excluding managers - participants without direct reports.

The employees were engaged in different departments, for instance, human resources, finance, supply chain, information technology among other functions.

Specifically, the sample is composed of 139 participants (64,0% female), the age of 69,0% ranged between 26-35 years old, 79% work in the company for more than 1 year and 84% has at least a Bachelor and 47% of the participants have a Master or a PhD.

3.2 *Data collection procedure*

Participants were invited to take part in the study via e-mail and social networks (LinkedIn, Facebook and other networks).

A self-report questionnaire was developed. It was stored on the internet and participants were given a web address that led them to the questionnaire.

3.3 *Instrumentation*

The questionnaire was presented in English as more than 60% of the employees of the company are expats and English is the official working language.

The instruments used are presented in more detail as follows:

3.3.1 **DIVERSITY**

The demographic characteristics: *age, gender, ethnicity, education* and *marital status* of the participant were collected as well as the same demographic characteristics in terms of composition of the team in order to measure different types of diversity.

Most of the studies considered one or two attributes, but most of them lack any analyses into all these attributes in combination. According to Jackson et al. (2003) most of the studies focus the study of gender (34% of the studies), followed by age (31% of the studies) and racial-ethnicity and task-relevant attributes (24% of the studies). In order to have a broader view of different types of diversity in combination, this study incorporates multiple attributes.

The questions were applied based on ranges for age, ethnicity, education and tenure.

In order to measure the diversity in terms of the composition of the team, the participant was asked how many members of his team were part of each range for *age, ethnicity, education* and *tenure*. In order to measure the similarity in terms of diversity between the participant and manager, it was questioned if the participant was similar in terms of *age, ethnicity, education* and *tenure* with the manager.

The measurement of the *demographic diversity* is often done using the D-Score index and the interaction term (Riordan & Wayne 2007). D-Score index was used to measure real or actual diversity in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, education and tenure. This is a Euclidean distance measure that has

been widely used to operationalise demographic similarity between an individual and other members of the working group (Riordan & Wayne 2007). An individual's demographic characteristic is first compared with the demographic characteristic of each individual in the group and then, those differences are averaged across the number of people within the group. With this index, demographic similarity is a product of the person-to-person differences within a group. There are several variations of the D-Score – for instance, algebraic or absolute of the squared. In this study, the squared difference was used. A squared difference facilitates the operationalisation of the measurement when we have variables like education that were measured using ranged values codified in numbers. The D-Score values will vary between 0 and 1 and if all the members of the team are similar with the participant, the D-Score value will be 1. The limitation of this approach is that we lose the direction of the dissimilarity as all the values will be positive.

The interaction term focuses on the individual demographic attribute relative to the group composition for the same attribute. This index is mostly used for demographic variables that are dichotomous, i.e., gender (Riordan & Wayne 2007) as it uses demographic proportions of a particular attribute. For non-dichotomous variables, i.e., age or education, a cutoff value is usually determined in which to split the group. For instance, number of team members younger or older than 40. The cutoff value is determined by the researcher and might inflate the results and therefore a limitation of this method (Riordan & Wayne 2007). This was one of the most important reasons why this score was not used in this study to analyse the data. Only an analysis was applied in order to confirm the results obtained by the D-Score. Moreover, in this case, the answers are already ranged in groups, for example, for education, there are five possible ranges “Team members with Master and/or Ph.D. Degree”, “Team members with Bachelor's degree”, “Team members with associate or technical degrees”, “Team members with high school degrees or GED” and “Team members with grade school”. The utilisation of the interaction term would just add extra “division” of the ranges. Therefore, the D-Score seemed theoretically more appropriate for this study, it was the one used for all the analysis.

3.3.2 PERCEIVED SIMILARITY

Adapted from (Hobman et al. 2004), that originally used this scale to measure dissimilarity, two items were used to three types of perceived similarity - visible, informational, and value – all measured in a 5 point scale – 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale was used to measure the perceived similarity with other members of the team as well as the perceived similarity with the manager “I feel I am visibly similar to other group members/ manager”, “In terms of visible characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity), I think I am similar to other group members/ my manager”, “I feel my work values and/ or motivations are similar to other group members/ manager.”, “In terms of principles that guide my work (e.g., company care, reward driven), I think I am similar to

other group members/ manager”, “I feel I am professionally and/ or educationally dissimilar to other group members” and “In terms of functional background (e.g. professional background and/ or work experiences), I think I am different from other group members.” Cronbach’s alpha was 0,736 for the measure of team similarity and 0,926 for the measure of manager similarity.

3.3.3 LMX – LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIP

Adapted from Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) scale (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Seven items ask team members to describe relationship with the manager, for instance “I usually know how satisfied my manager is with what I do”, “My manager usually understands my job problems and needs”.

All items were based on 5-point Likert scales, with response options from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree. The adequacy of the test was $\alpha = 0,926$.

3.3.4 UNFAIRNESS

In order to measure unfairness, it was used six items of the 46-item Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) questionnaire (Kalshoven et al. 2011). For instance, “my manager”: “Holds me accountable for problems over which I have no control”; “Holds me responsible for work that I have no control over”. The outcome measures ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha was 0,931.

3.3.5 JUSTICE

Four types of Justice Scales from Colquitt, 2001: were used: distributive, procedural, interactional and informational justice in order to measure favouritism. The outcome measures ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha was 0,952 for the distributive justice, 0,875 for the procedural justice, 0,923 for the interactional justice and 0,845 for the informational justice.

3.3.6 COLLECTIVE GOALS AND SHARED RESULTS IN THE THE TEAM

Adapted from “Perceived goal interdependence” (Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003). Three items were adapted from previous research tapped individual team members’ perception of goal interdependence (Tjosvold, 1984; Van der Vegt, Emans & Van de Vliert, 1999) “*Goal attainment for one team member facilitates goal attainment for the other team members*”, “*Gain for one team member means gain for*

the other team members” and “*Success for one team member implies success for the other team members*”.

Respondents were also asked to indicate to what extent each of the following statements described their relationship with the other team members in other additional five items that indicate shared results or incentives “The rewards received by a team member depend on the attainment of the goals obtained by other team member”, “The incentives that one team member got means that others will receive an identical incentive.”

Items were scored on five-point Likert scales ranging from ‘Completely disagree’ (1) to ‘Completely agree’ (5).

After the factorial analysis, one item was removed from the relationship group. The adequacy of the test was $\alpha = 0,839$ for the first three items related with interdependence in the team and $\alpha = 0,726$ for the remaining four items related with the relationship in the team.

3.3.7 TURNOVER INTENTION

In order to assess team turnover intention, a four-item measure adapted from company turnover intention from Kelloway et al. 1999 was adopted: “*I am thinking about leaving this team*”, “*I am planning to look for a new job*”, “*I intend to ask people about new job opportunities*” and “*I intend to ask people about new job opportunities*” . Each item was rated along a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

The adequacy of the test was $\alpha = 0,961$.

3.3.8 CONTROL VARIABLES

In this study, the control variables gender, education level, age, tenure in the team and size of the team were used.

4 Results and Discussion

As mentioned before, prior to examining the hypotheses, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to determine the validity of the measures and the Cronbach's alpha was determined in order to test the adequacy of the tests.

In order to test the hypotheses, some analysis with different models were formulated. In all the regressions, the first model presented the variables gender, education level, age, tenure in the team and size of the team as control variables.

The first simple regression (table 1) was used in order to determine which demographic variables contributed to explain the perceived similarity with the manager and to test hypothesis 1. Similar education and similar age (+2 years) with the manager present a positive relationship with manager perceived similarity (F Change=3.26, $p < 0.05$). These results corroborate **hypothesis 1** for these two characteristics. However, similar nationality or gender didn't present any relationship with manager perceived similarity.

The perceived similarity by definition is mainly characterised by invisible and deep level attributes such as values, beliefs and attitudes. Although classified as a demographic characteristic, level of education is not a superficial and observable attribute and it might contribute to a perceived similarity in interests and to positioning oneself as belonging to the same social group. Social identity explains how someone can compare himself with others and be perceived as belonging to the same group based on education (Turner, 1985, Tajfel, 1981). Age can easily be understood as contributing to the perceived similarity as people of similar ages are more likely to be sharing similar situations in their life and to have similar expectations. Attraction/ similarity theory explains how demographic attributes contribute to this identification and attraction between individuals that share the same experiences (Williams & O'Reilly III, 1998). Similar nationality or gender were not positively related with manager perceived similarity. These results might be explained because these demographic characteristics not only are superficial as it seems their effect for stereotype creation is lost over time (Harrison et al., 1998).

TABLE 1: MANAGER SIMILARITY*Regression between manager demographic similarity and perceived similarity with manager*

Independent Variables	Perceived Similarity Manager	
	1	2
Constant	3,79 *	3,53 *
Gender	-0,01	-0,01
Education level	-0,08	-0,08
Age	-0,10	-0,10
Tenure in the team	0,01	-0,01
Number of members	-0,07	-0,08
Manager similar nationality		0,10
Manager similar gender		-0,01
Manager similar education level		0,20 **
Manager +- 2 years age		0,20 **
F Change	0,49	3,26
Sig F Change	0,78	0,01
R ² Adjusted	-0,02	0,05
Δ R ² Adjusted		0,07

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

In the second analysis (table 2), it was investigated if similar demographic characteristics/ perception of similarity is related to LMX. A first model with the manager's demographic variables of similarity and a second model with the variable perceived similarity with the manager were used. In this analysis, only the manager perceived similarity presented a positive relationship with the LMX (F Change = 99.52, p<0.01). The demographic variables were not related to LMX, which means that **hypothesis 2a** was confirmed, but **hypothesis 2b** was not validated.

As confirmed in the previous hypothesis it is mainly the deep level characteristics that explain the perceived similarity with the manager. Therefore, it explains why only the perceived similarity with the manager is related to LMX. However, it could be expected that age and level of education explain LMX as they were positively related to perceived similarity with the manager. Nevertheless, this result did not verify. This might be explained by the fact that for the construction of a relationship with the manager all the demographic characteristics lose their effect over time and it is mainly the perceived similarity that contributes for LMX.

TABLE 2: LMX*Regression between different types of similarity with the manager and LMX.*

Independent Variables	LMX		
	1	2	3
Constant	3,82 *	3,64 *	0,88
Gender	-0,06	-0,05	-0,04
Education level	-0,02	-0,02	0,03
Age	-0,06	-0,06	0,02
Tenure in the team	-0,02	-0,02	-0,02
Number of members	0,06	0,05	0,11
Manager similar nationality		0,07	-0,01
Manager similar gender		0,04	0,04
Manager similar education level		0,11	-0,04
Manager +- 2 years age		0,02	-0,12
Manager perceived similarity			0,70 *
F Change	0,25	0,56	99,52
Sig F Change	0,94	0,69	0,00
R ² Adjusted	-0,03	-0,04	0,42
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,01	0,47

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

In order to test the relationship between the demographic similarity with the manager and perception of favouritism as well as the relationship between perceived similarity with the manager and perception of favouritism in **hypotheses 4a** and **4b**, respectively, favouritism was represented by the variables unfairness and the different types of justice – distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational - tables 4 and 5. Most of the variables used for the demographic similarity with the manager did not present any relationship with unfairness or any type of justice. Therefore, a relationship between manager demographic similarity and favouritism cannot be established in most of the cases. On the other hand, the perceived similarity with the manager is negatively related to unfairness (F Change=46.10, $p < 0.01$) – table 5, model 3 - and positively related to all types of justice (F Change=31.69, $p < 0.01$ for the distributive justice; F Change=32.98, $p < 0.01$ for the procedural justice; F Change=41.36, $p < 0.01$ for the interpersonal justice and F Change=57.66, $p < 0.01$ for informational justice) – table 3, models 3 and 7 and table 4, models 3 and 7.

In this analysis, LMX was added in order to determine if the relationship with the manager was related to the perception of favouritism in the team and to test **hypothesis 3**. LMX was also negatively related with unfairness (F Change=67.31, $p < 0.01$) – table 5, model 4 - and positively related with all types of justice (F Change=8.86, $p < 0.01$ for the distributive justice; F Change=20.45, $p < 0.01$ for the procedural justice; F Change=34.14, $p < 0.01$ for the interpersonal justice and F Change=83.88, $p < 0.01$ for informational justice) – table 3, models 4 and 8; table 4, model 4 and 8. These results corroborate **hypotheses 3** and **4b** but do not validate the **hypothesis 4a**, which means that only perceived

similarity with the manager and LMX are related to the perception of favouritism. Thus, only perceived similarity with the manager and LMX are negatively related with the perception of favouritism. In accordance to the results for hypothesis 2a and 2b, perceived similarity with the manager is more important for the establishment of relationships with the manager (LMX) as well as for some of the possible consequences of this relationship like the perception of favouritism. Nonetheless, it is not possible to conclude if this perception of favouritism is just a perception when there is not perceived similarity with the manager or low LMX or if favouritism is in fact employed.

TABLE 3: MANAGER SIMILARITY – DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICES

Regression with Manager Similarity, LMX, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justices

Independent Variables	Distributive Justice				Procedural Justice			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Constant	3,25 *	3,25 *	1,08	0,73	3,00 *	3,20 *	1,64 *	1,26 **
Gender	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04	-0,03	-0,10	-0,14	-0,12	-0,11
Education level	-0,03	-0,04	0,00	-0,01	0,02	0,01	0,04	0,03
Age	-0,04	-0,05	0,00	0,00	0,05	0,04	0,06	0,07
Tenure in the team	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04	-0,02	-0,03	-0,01	-0,01
Number of members	0,14	0,14	0,18 **	0,15	-0,01	-0,04	0,00	-0,04
Manager similar nationality		0,00	-0,04	-0,04		-0,02	-0,06	-0,06
Manager similar gender		-0,01	0,00	-0,01		-0,17	-0,16 **	-0,18 **
Manager similar education		0,06	-0,03	-0,02		0,06	-0,03	-0,02
Manager +- 2 years age		0,04	-0,05	-0,02		0,07	-0,03	0,02
Manager perceived similarity			0,48 *	0,26 **			0,48 *	0,16
LMX				0,32 *				0,46 *
F Change	0,57	0,19	31,69	8,86	0,24	1,14	32,98	20,45
Sig F Change	0,73	0,94	0,00	0,00	0,94	0,34	0,00	0,00
R ² Adjusted	-0,02	-0,04	0,17	0,22	-0,03	-0,03	0,19	0,30
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,03	0,21	0,05		0,00	0,22	0,11

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

TABLE 4: MANAGER SIMILARITY – INTERPERSONAL AND INFORMATIONAL JUSTICES*Regression with Manager Similarity, LMX, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justices*

Independent Variables	Interpersonal Justice				Informational Justice			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Constant	4,98 *	5,13 *	3,05 *	2,56 *	4,23 *	3,96 *	1,73 *	1,13 **
Gender	-0,05	-0,06	-0,06	-0,04	-0,13	-0,11	-0,11	-0,08
Education level	-0,12	-0,15	-0,11	-0,13	-0,08	-0,06	-0,01	-0,04
Age	0,01	0,00	0,06	0,05	-0,05	-0,04	0,01	0,00
Tenure in the team	-0,18	-0,18	-0,18 **	-0,17 **	-0,09	-0,10	-0,09	-0,08
Number of members	-0,04	-0,02	0,02	-0,04	0,07	0,07	0,12	0,04
Manager similar nationality		-0,11	-0,16	-0,16 **		0,06	0,00	0,00
Manager similar gender		0,03	0,04	0,02		0,10	0,10	0,07
Manager similar education		-0,03	-0,13	-0,11		0,03	-0,09	-0,07
Manager +- 2 years age		0,08	-0,02	0,04		0,08	-0,04	0,05
Manager perceived similarity			0,52 *	0,14			0,59 *	0,09
LMX				0,54 *				0,70 *
F Change	1,26	0,58	41,36	34,14	0,92	0,69	57,66	83,88
Sig F Change	0,29	0,68	0,00	0,00	0,47	0,60	0,00	0,00
R ² Adjusted	0,01	0,00	0,25	0,41	0,00	-0,01	0,31	0,59
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,01	0,25	0,16		-0,01	0,32	0,28

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

TABLE 5: MANAGER SIMILARITY – UNFAIRNESS AND TURNOVER INTENTION*Regression with Manager Similarity, LMX, Unfairness and Turnover Intention*

Independent Variables	Unfairness				Turnover Intention			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Constant	1,78 *	1,71 **	4,01 *	4,66 *	1,57	1,97 **	3,76 *	4,42 *
Gender	0,06	0,09	0,08	0,06	0,00	0,00	-0,01	-0,03
Education level	0,06	0,03	-0,01	0,01	0,05	-0,04	-0,06	-0,04
Age	-0,03	-0,02	-0,08	-0,07	0,15	0,14	0,10	0,11
Tenure in the team	0,15	0,16	0,16	0,14 **	0,20 **	0,22 **	0,22 **	0,20 **
Number of members	-0,01	-0,01	-0,06	0,02	-0,21 **	-0,18 **	-0,21 **	-0,15
Manager similar nationality		0,02	0,08	0,07		-0,21 **	-0,17	-0,16
Manager similar gender		0,06	0,06	0,09		0,12	0,11	0,13
Manager similar education		0,08	0,19 **	0,17 *		0,02	0,09	0,07
Manager +- 2 years age		-0,08	0,03	-0,05		0,03	0,09	0,03
Manager perceived similarity			-0,55 *	-0,07			-0,31 *	0,03
LMX				-0,68 *				-0,49 *
F Change	0,64	0,43	46,10	67,31	2,30	1,43	13,32	22,73
Sig F Change	0,67	0,79	0,00	0,00	0,05	0,23	0,00	0,00
R ² Adjusted	-0,01	-0,03	0,25	0,51	0,05	0,06	0,15	0,28
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,02	0,28	0,27		0,01	0,09	0,13

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

In order to analyse whether demographic similarity in the team is negatively related to favouritism (**hypothesis 5a**) and if the perceived similarity with the working group members is related to

favouritism (**hypothesis 5b**) another analysis was performed (tables 6, 7 and 8). In this analysis, the relationship between the variables that represent demographic similarity/ perception of similarity with other team members and the variables that represent the perception of favouritism and LMX were tested. Furthermore, the existence of collective goals in the team were added in order to explore their relationship with favouritism (**hypothesis 6**) and LMX.

Apart from **ethnicity similarity**, all the other demographic similarity variables with the team members did not explain favouritism (**hypothesis 5a**) – table 7, model 7. The ethnicity similarity within the team is positively related to informational justice (F Change=1.45, $p<0.05$). This result might be justified by the fact that informational justice is related to the perception of dignity and respect as well as to communication (Colquitt 2001). These are features that can be easily distorted in case of different nationalities due to different mother tongues and different values. Additionally, perceived similarity with the other members is positively related to informational justice (F Change=4.07, $p<0.05$) and negatively related to unfairness (F Change=5.79, $p<0.05$).

Manager perceived similarity is the variable that presents the most relevant changes in the models. It is positively related to all types of justice (F Change=17.27, $p<0.01$ for the distributive justice; F Change=14.99, $p<0.01$ for the procedural justice; F Change=22.06, $p<0.01$ for the interpersonal justice and F Change=40.77, $p<0.01$ for informational justice) and it is negatively related to unfairness (F Change=20.70, $p<0.01$) – tables 6, 7 and 8. Therefore, it can be concluded that it is the manager perceived similarity that mostly contributes to explain the perception of justice and fairness.

Conversely, collective goals interdependence was positively related with distributive (F Change=17.94, $p<0.01$) – table 6, model 3 - and informational justice (F Change=8.27, $p<0.01$) – table 7, model 8. Shared results variable was positively related with distributive justice (F Change=17.94, $p<0.01$) – table 6, model 3, procedural justice (F Change=15.53, $p<0.01$) – table 7, model 8 - and informational justice (F Change=8.27, $p<0.05$) – table 7, model 8. Additionally, it was negatively related with unfairness (F Change=5.7, $p<0.05$) – table 8, model 3. These results were expected and it can be concluded that collective goals, especially collective shared results contribute to increase the perception of justice and decrease the perception of unfairness and favouritism. Thus, collective goals seem to contribute for a bigger cohesion of the group and attenuation of the stereotype creation. They might also contribute to a more homogeneous treatment towards the subordinates from the manager as the rewards are similar for all the team members.

Additionally, the relationship between demographic similarity in the team, perceived similarity in the team, perceived similarity with the manager and collective goals with LMX was analysed – table 9. Perceived similarity with the team is positively related to LMX (F Change=7.85, $p<0.01$) – table 9, model 4 - as well as perceived similarity with the manager (F Change=14.99, $p<0.01$) – table 9, model 5, collective goals (F Change=12.18, $p<0.01$) – table 9, model 3, and collective shared results (F

Change=12,18, $p<0.05$) – table 9, model 3. The ethnicity similarity was the only variable that contributed to explain LMX (F Change=1.34, $p<0.01$) - table 9, model 1. Hence, it is difficult to conclude if it is these variables that explain the perception of favouritism or if they contribute to the quality of the relationship and consequently affect the perception of favouritism because of LMX.

Finally, all **hypothesis 7** in the different models were tested – tables 5 and 6. Manager similar nationality is the only demographic variable negatively related to turnover intention (F Change=1.43, $p<0.05$) – table 5, model 6. Perceived similarity with the manager (F Change=13.32, $p<0.01$) and LMX (F Change=22.73, $p<0.05$) are negatively related to turnover as well – tables 8 and 5. Once more, demographic similarity has shown a limited influence, in this case in turnover intention. Perceived similarity and the relationship with the manager (LMX) have more influence on the subordinates willing to stay in the team, which corroborates **hypothesis 7b**.

Regarding demographic similarity with the other team members, skills is the only variable that presents negative relationship with turnover intention (F Change=1.05, $p<0.01$) – table 6, model 6. Team perceived similarity also presents a negative relationship with turnover intention (F Change=4.58, $p<0.05$) – table 5, model 7 corroborating **hypothesis 7d**. Collective goals and shared results were additionally added to the analysis with turnover intention and were also negatively related with it (F Change=10.63, $p<0.01$ for both results). Thus, we can conclude that only demographic similarity with the manager or with the other members of the team is in general not significantly related to turnover intention, apart from the manager similar nationality and team similar skills (hypothesis 7a and 7c). Perceived similarity with the manager or team (hypothesis 7b and 7d), were negatively related to turnover intention as well as LMX and collective goals, which means all the variables significantly related to favouritism are also significantly related to turnover intention.

TABLE 6: TEAM SIMILARITY – DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICES

Regression with Team Similarity, Collective Goals, Shared Results, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justices

Independent Variables	Distributive Justice					Procedural Justice				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Constant	3,25 *	3,83 *	1,42	1,26	0,69	3,00 *	3,35 *	1,73 *	1,27	0,86
Gender	-0,04	-0,02	0,03	0,03	0,01	-0,10	-0,07	0,00	0,01	-0,01
Education level	-0,03	-0,09	-0,06	-0,06	-0,03	0,02	-0,03	-0,01	0,00	0,02
Age	-0,04	-0,09	-0,07	-0,06	-0,06	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,06	0,05
Tenure in the team	-0,04	-0,01	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04	-0,02	0,00	-0,03	-0,03	-0,02
Number of members	0,14	0,09	0,05	0,05	0,08	-0,01	-0,03	-0,07	-0,05	-0,03
DScoreGender		-0,10	-0,07	-0,07	-0,04		-0,18	-0,14	-0,16	-0,13
DScorePermanence		0,00	0,02	0,02	0,05		0,02	0,04	0,04	0,07
DScoreSkills		0,18	0,12	0,11	0,09		0,12	0,05	0,01	0,00
DScoreAge		-0,10	-0,14	-0,13	-0,15		0,05	0,03	0,04	0,03
DScoreEthnicity		-0,02	-0,06	-0,07	-0,07		0,03	-0,01	-0,02	-0,03
Collective goals			0,20 *	0,19 **	0,17 **			0,15	0,12	0,10
Shared results			0,39 *	0,38 *	0,34 *			0,40 *	0,36 *	0,32 *
Team perceived similarity				0,04	-0,11				0,14	0,01
Manager perceived similarity					0,36 *					0,34 *
F Change	0,57	1,40	17,94	0,16	17,27	0,24	1,29	15,53	2,21	14,99
Sig F Change	0,73	0,23	0,00	0,69	0,00	0,94	0,27	0,00	0,14	0,00
R ² Adjusted	-0,02	0,00	0,22	0,21	0,31	-0,03	-0,02	0,18	0,19	0,28
Δ R ² Adjusted		0,02	0,22	-0,01	0,10		0,01	0,20	0,01	0,09

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

TABLE 7: TEAM SIMILARITY - INTERPERSONAL AND INFORMATIONAL JUSTICES

Regression between Team Similarity, Collective Goals and Shared Results with Interpersonal and Informational Justices

Independent Variables	Interpersonal Justice					Informational Justice				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Constant	4,98 *	5,08 *	3,84 *	3,16 *	2,54 *	4,23 *	4,13 *	2,65 *	1,97 *	1,26
Gender	-0,05	-0,04	-0,02	0,00	-0,03	-0,13	-0,13	-0,11	-0,09	-0,13
Education level	-0,12	-0,14	-0,12	-0,11	-0,08	-0,08	-0,06	-0,03	-0,02	0,02
Age	0,01	0,03	0,03	0,05	0,05	-0,05	-0,02	-0,01	0,01	0,01
Tenure in the team	-0,18	-0,18	-0,18	-0,17	-0,17	-0,09	-0,14	-0,14	-0,14	-0,14
Number of members	-0,04	-0,03	-0,06	-0,05	-0,01	0,07	0,15	0,12	0,14	0,18 **
DScoreGender		-0,08	-0,09	-0,12	-0,08		0,02	0,02	-0,01	0,04
DScorePermanence		0,01	0,02	0,02	0,06		0,08	0,09	0,09	0,13
DScoreSkills		0,06	0,03	-0,01	-0,03		0,03	-0,01	-0,06	-0,08
DScoreAge		0,06	0,05	0,06	0,04		0,11	0,09	0,11	0,08
DScoreEthnicity		0,04	0,00	-0,01	-0,02		0,21 **	0,18 **	0,16	0,15 **
Collective goals			0,24 *	0,19 **	0,16			0,25 *	0,20 **	0,17 **
Shared results			0,11	0,06	0,01			0,19 **	0,14	0,07
Team perceived similarity				0,19	0,01				0,20 **	-0,02
Manager perceived similarity					0,43 *					0,53 *
F Change	1,26	0,36	5,39	3,47	22,06	0,92	1,45	8,27	4,07	40,77
Sig F Change	0,29	0,88	0,01	0,06	0,00	0,47	0,21	0,00	0,05	0,00
R ² Adjusted	0,01	-0,02	0,05	0,07	0,21	0,00	0,01	0,12	0,14	0,36
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,03	0,07	0,02	0,14	0,00	0,02	0,11	0,02	0,22

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

TABLE 8: TEAM SIMILARITY – UNFAIRNESS AND TURNOVER INTENTION*Regression with Team Similarity, Collective Goals and Shared Results with Unfairness and Turnover Intention*

Independent Variables	Unfairness					Turnover intention				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Constant	1,78 *	1,70 **	3,17 *	4,10 *	4,72 *	1,57	1,28	3,75 *	4,78 *	5,00 *
Gender	0,06	0,05	0,03	0,01	0,03	0,00	-0,01	-0,03	-0,05	-0,04
Education level	0,06	0,08	0,06	0,04	0,01	0,05	0,09	0,07	0,06	0,05
Age	-0,03	-0,05	-0,06	-0,09	-0,09	0,15	0,16	0,14	0,12	0,12
Tenure in the team	0,15	0,14	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,20 **	0,20 **	0,22 **	0,22 **	0,22 **
Number of members	-0,01	0,00	0,02	0,00	-0,03	-0,21 **	-0,21 **	-0,18	-0,20 **	-0,20 **
DScoreGender		0,06	0,04	0,08	0,04		0,00	-0,01	0,02	0,01
DScorePermanence		0,03	0,02	0,02	-0,02		-0,03	-0,05	-0,04	-0,05
DScoreSkills		-0,07	-0,03	0,03	0,05		-0,20 **	-0,15	-0,10	-0,10
DScoreAge		-0,04	-0,02	-0,04	-0,02		0,04	0,06	0,04	0,05
DScoreEthnicity		-0,02	0,01	0,03	0,03		-0,04	0,01	0,03	0,03
Collective goals			-0,17	-0,10	-0,07			-0,24 *	-0,18 **	-0,17 **
Shared results			-0,22 **	-0,15	-0,10			-0,25 *	-0,20 **	-0,19 **
Team perceived similarity				-0,24 **	-0,07				-0,20 **	-0,15
Manager perceived similarity					-0,42 *					-0,11
F Change	0,64	0,30	5,70	5,79	20,70	2,30	1,05	10,63	4,58	1,45
Sig F Change	0,67	0,91	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,05	0,39	0,00	0,03	0,23
R ² Adjusted	-0,01	-0,04	0,03	0,07	0,20	0,05	0,05	0,18	0,21	0,21
Δ R ² Adjusted		-0,03	0,08	0,04	0,13		0,00	0,13	0,02	0,00

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

TABLE 9: TEAM SIMILARITY – LMX*Regression with Team Similarity, Collective Goals, Shared Results and LMX*

Independent Variables	LMX				
	1	2	3	4	5
Constant	3,82 *	3,92 *	2,12 *	1,18	0,36
Gender	-0,06	-0,05	-0,03	0,00	-0,04
Education level	-0,02	-0,02	0,01	0,02	0,07
Age	-0,06	-0,04	-0,03	0,00	0,00
Tenure in the team	-0,02	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04	-0,04
Number of members	0,06	0,10	0,05	0,08	0,12
DScoreGender		-0,07	-0,08	-0,12	-0,07
DScorePermanence		-0,01	0,01	0,01	0,06
DScoreSkills		0,10	0,05	-0,01	-0,03
DScoreAge		0,08	0,06	0,09	0,05
DScoreEthnicity		0,19 **	0,14	0,12	0,11
Collective goals			0,32 *	0,24 *	0,21 *
Shared results			0,20 **	0,13	0,06
Team perceived similarity				0,26 *	0,02
Manager perceived similarity					0,59 *
F Change	0,25	1,34	12,18	7,85	61,79
Sig F Change	0,94	0,25	0,00	0,01	0,00
R ² Adjusted	-0,03	-0,02	0,14	0,19	0,46
Δ R ² Adjusted		0,01	0,16	0,05	0,28

* P < 0.01 ** P < 0.05

Additionally, the relationship between the demographic diversity variables as well as collective goals with team perceived similarity were analysed.

The only demographic variable which had a significant relationship with the team's perceived similarity was the skills (DScoreSkills) presenting a positive relationship (F Change=2.57, $p < 0.01$) – table 10, model 2. On the other hand, both interdependent and relationship collective goals are positively related to team's perceived similarity (F Change=14.41, $p < 0.01$) – table 10, model 3.

TABLE 10 – TEAM SIMILARITY

Regression between team demographic similarity in the team and perceived similarity with team

Independent Variables	Perceived Similarity Team		
	1	2	3
Constant	3,89 *	3,92 *	2,57 *
Gender	-0,11	-0,12	-0,09
Education level	-0,06	-0,10	-0,07
Age	-0,13	-0,13	-0,12
Tenure in the team	0,03	0,00	-0,01
Number of members	-0,07	-0,06	-0,11
DScoreGender		0,13	0,14
DScoreAge		-0,06	-0,08
DScoreTenure		-0,02	0,00
DScoreSkills		0,31 *	0,26 *
DScoreEthnicity		0,11	0,07
Collective Goals			0,29 *
Collective Shared Results			0,26 *
F Change	0,99	2,57	14,41
Sig F Change	0,43	0,03	0,00
R ² Adjusted	0,00	0,06	0,23
Δ R ² Adjusted		0,06	0,17

* $P < 0.01$ ** $P < 0.05$

5 Conclusions

Taking into account the growing importance of working in diverse teams, this study achieved the main goal of bringing more clarity regarding some of the outcomes of different types of diversity in the teams. The outcomes chosen are amongst the ones with bigger impact in the working environment of the companies such as favouritism and turnover intention.

One of the most relevant findings of this study was the conclusion that perceived similarity is positively related to the perception of favouritism whilst demographic similarity has a limited influence in the perception of favouritism. This result shows that despite the importance given by society to the demographic attributes, i.e., gender, age, ethnicity or education, the perception of similarity plays a more relevant role. Moreover, numerous laws and general working policies created in order to establish equality in the workplace, especially for gender and ethnicity, might prove insufficient as discussed further on.

Perceived similarity with the team was negatively related to unfairness and positively related to informational justice, partially validating hypothesis 5b. Regarding demographic variables and their relationship with favouritism, only ethnicity with the other team members presented a significant positive relationship with informational justice, partially validating hypothesis 5a. This result reinforces that informational justice is the one playing the biggest role between team members as it probably has a higher influence on the communication processes, which also might clarify why the only demographic attribute related to it is ethnicity, as similar culture and native language facilitate communication and informational processes. Perceived similarity with the manager was positively related to all types of justice chosen in the study (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and negatively related to unfairness, validating hypothesis 4b.

Furthermore, it is the perception of similarity with the manager that has the most significant effect on reducing the perception of favouritism and also leads to better quality relationships between manager and subordinate (LMX) as it was proved by the validation of hypothesis 2a. LMX per se also contributes to reduce the perception of favouritism – LMX was positively related to all types of justice and negatively related to unfairness. This result emphasises the power and influence managers have in the professional path of subordinates. Despite all the policies implemented in companies in order to trigger equality, it is very difficult to avoid the establishment of asymmetric relationships between managers and subordinates and perhaps the creation of alliances and strategies that lead to beneficial outcomes for those belonging to the in-group. Companies should dedicate special effort to the discretion given to managers and motivate the equality in the relationships established between

managers and the different subordinates. Theory shows that it is difficult to control informational and interpersonal justice as the manager discretion is higher, however strong distributive and procedural policies can prevent situations of unfairness as the manager has limited power to change organisational rules.

Moreover, perceived similarity with the other members of the team is related to higher values of LMX. Therefore, the relationship between perceived similarity with the other members of the team and an increase in justice might be explained as a result of perceived similarity or because better relationships are achieved with the manager based on the fact the manager perceives the team as a homogenous unit. Besides, one of the most interesting results is that the way of organising the work in the team contributes to reduce the perception of favouritism, mainly the common rewards or shared results. Collective goals and shared results help to maintain the cohesion of the team and to build better bonds and relationships among the team members, which ultimately leads to perceived similarity within the team. Collective goals and shared results were positively correlated to most of the justice types and negatively correlated to unfairness, corroborating hypothesis 6. Implementing collective goals and shared results can be a powerful tool for companies to promote the integration of people with different backgrounds in terms of demographic attributes as well as different values and beliefs and prevent the creation of coalitions that create in-group favouritism and that lead to the outcomes mentioned above.

As expected, the same variables that attenuated the perception of favouritism – perceived similarity with manager, perceived similarity with team members and collective goals/ shared results – also reduced the turnover intention.

Finally, we can conclude that leaders have a big influence in the team outcomes through the relationship that is established with them and through the way they distribute work and rewards. One of the main recommendations of this study is that the companies should concentrate particular attention to these details in order to avoid situations of favouritism. Favouritism might lead the company to lose the most talented people and instead to promote those that have a perceived similarity with management and a high quality relationship with them, but not necessarily those who are the most competent for the job, which ultimately might lead companies to lose competitiveness and value.

6 Limitations and future research

Although this study has shed some light on the relationship between demographic similarity and perceived similarity with the perception of favouritism, namely the higher importance of perceived similarity, there is still some other aspects that should be explored in the future.

The composition of the teams was measured in terms of demographic similarity using self-reports of individuals. However, it was not possible to have access to the results of entire teams or to the results of the entire team through the questionnaires due to the restrictions presented in the company in the questionnaires' distribution. Thus, it was not possible, for instance, to study concepts of groupness and measure their effects in the team.

Moreover, it was not obtained the responses of the managers. Hence it was not possible to confront team member's replies with manager's replies. Future research should explore these aspects as well as apply multilevel analyses in order to examine the responses of the full teams with manager's responses.

In addition, it would be interesting to explore further team processes and organisational context and also to measure outcomes other than turnover intention and unfairness, such as task conflict and OCB.

In this study, it was concluded that collective goals in the team decrease the perception of favouritism, especially when there are common goals and rewards. It would also be pertinent to study other variables such as how task interdependence in the team would have an effect on the perception of favouritism as this may contribute to the group cohesion or disruption.

References:

- Bakar, H.A. & McCann, R.M., 2014. Matters of demographic similarity and dissimilarity in supervisor–subordinate relationships and workplace attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, pp.1–16.
- Balliet, D. , et al., 2014, Ingroup Favouritism in Cooperation: A Meta-Analysis, *Psychology Bulletin* Vol. 140, No. 6, 1556-1581.
- Ben-Ner, A. et al., 2009. Identity and in-group/out-group differentiation in work and giving behaviors: Experimental evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organisation*, 72(1), pp.153–170.
- Bowler, W.M., Halbesleben, J.R.B. & Paul, J.R.B., 2010. If you're close with the leader, you must be a brownnose: The role of leader–member relationships in follower, leader, and coworker attributions of organisational citizenship behavior motives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(4), pp.309–316.
- Brewer, M.B., 1979. In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situations: a cognitive motivational analysis. *Psychology Bulletin* 86, 307–324.
- Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K. & Harrison, D. a., 2005. Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), pp.117–134.
- Byrne, D. 1971. *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cargill, M., O'Connor, P., 2010, *Writing scientific research articles*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Colquitt, J. a, 2001. On the dimensionality of organisational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), pp.386–400.
- Colquitt, J.A. et al., 2013. Justice at the Millennium, a Decade Later : A Meta-Analytic Test of Social Exchange and Affect-Based Perspectives, 98(2), pp.199–236.
- Field, A., 2014, *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. London: Sage.
- Farrell, D. 1983. Exit , Voice , Loyalty and Neglect as Responses to Job Dissatisfaction: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal* 26(4), pp.596–608.
- 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.
- Guillaume, Y.R.F., Brodbeck, F.C. & Riketta, M., 2012. Surface and deep-level dissimilarity effects on social integration and individual effectiveness related outcomes in work groups: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 85(1), 80–115.
- Hackman, J. R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior*, 315–342. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Haddock, G. et al., 2003. Perceptions of physical attractiveness among college students: Selected determinants and methodological matters. *Sex Roles*, 29(4), pp.137–152.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Finkelstein, S. (1987). Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes, *Research in organizational behavior*, 9, 368–406. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Han, J., Han, J. & Brass, D.J., 2014. Human capital diversity in the creation of social capital for team creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 71, 54–71.
- Harris, T.B., Li, N. & Kirkman, B.L., 2014. Leader–member exchange (LMX) in context: How LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX’s influence on OCB and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 314–328.
- Harrison, D.A., Klein, K.J., 2007. What’s the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (4), 1199-1228.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K.H. & Bell, M.P., 1998. Beyond relational demography: time and the effects of surface- and deep level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 96–107.
- Harrison, D.A. et al., 2002. Time, teams and task performance: changing effects of surface and deep level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal* , 45 (5), 1029–1045.
- Hertel, G. & Kerr, N.L., 2001. Priming In-Group Favoritism: The Impact of Normative Scripts in the Minimal Group Paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(4), 316–324.
- Hirschman, A. O., *Exit, voice and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970
- Hobman, E. V., Bordia, P. & Gallois, C., 2004. Perceived Dissimilarity and Work Group Involvement: The Moderating Effects of Group Openness to Diversity. *Group & Organisation Management*, 29(5), 560–587.
- Hofhuis, J., van der Zee, K.I. & Otten, S., 2013. Measuring employee perception on the effects of cultural diversity at work: development of the Benefits and Threats of Diversity Scale. *Quality &*

Quantity, 49(1), 177–201.

Jackson, S.E., Joshi, A. & Erhardt, N., 2003. Recent research on team and organisational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of management*, 29(6), 801–830.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D.N. & De Hoogh, A.H.B., 2011. Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 51–69.

Kelloway, E.K., Gottlieb, B.H. & Barham, L., 1999. The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: a longitudinal investigation. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 4(4), 337–346.

Lickel, B. et al., 2000. Varieties of groups and the perception of group entitativity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 78(2), 223–246.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader–member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G. R. Ferris, & K. M. Rowland(Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 15, 47–119. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Mannix, E. & Neale, M. a., 2005. What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organisations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, Supplement*, 6(2), pp.31–55.

Northcraft, G. B., Polzer, J. T., Neale, M. A., Kramer, R. M. 1995. Diversity, social identity, and performance: Emergent social dynamics in cross-functional teams. In S. E. Jackson&M. N. Ruderman, *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace*: 69-97. Washington, DC: APA

Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 299-357.

Pfeffer, J. (1985). Organizational demography: Implications for management. *California Management Review*, 28(1), 67-81.

Pieterse, A, Knippenberg, D. & Dierendonck, D., 2013. Cultural diversity and team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56 (3), 782–804.

Qin, J., Muenjohn, N. & Chhetri, P., 2013. A Review of Diversity Conceptualizations: Variety, Trends, and a Framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 13(2), 133–157.

Rico, R., Molleman, E., Sanchez-Manzanares, M., & Van der Vegt, G. S. (2007). The effects of diversity faultlines and team task autonomy on decision quality and social integration. *Journal of Management*, 33(1), 111-132.

- Riordan, C. M. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions and new directions. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19, 131–174
- Riordan, C.M. & Wayne, J.H., 2007. A Review and Examination of Demographic Similarity Measures Used to Assess Relational Demography Within Groups. *Organisational Research Methods*, 11(3), 562–592.
- Rousseau, D.M. Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1989, 2, 121-139.
- Scott, B. a, Colquitt, J. a & Paddock, E.L., 2009. An actor-focused model of justice rule adherence and violation: the role of managerial motives and discretion. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 94(3), 756–69.
- Scott, B.A., Garza, A.S. & Conlon, D.E., 2014. Why do managers act fairly in the first place? A daily investigation of "hot" and "cold" motives and discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57 (6), pp.1571–1591.
- Shao, R., Rupp, D.E. & Skarlicki, D.P., 2013. Employee Justice Across Cultures : A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management*, 39 (1), 263–301.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J. (2012). Self-categorization theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 399-417). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Turnley, H., Feldman, D. (1999). *The Impact of Psychological Contract Violations on Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect*. *Human Relations*, 52 (7)
- Tsui, A. S., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 402–423.
- Tsui, a. S., Porter, L.W. & Egan, T.D., 2002. When Both Similarities and Dissimilarities Matter: Extending the Concept of Relational Demography. *Human Relations*, 55(200208), pp.899–929.

- Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor–subordinate similarity: Types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 228–234.
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15–40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ünal, A.F., Warren, D.E. & Chen, C.C., 2012. The Normative Foundations of Unethical Supervision in Organisations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(1), pp.5–19.
- Van der Vegt, G. S., & Janssen, O. (2003). Joint impact of interdependence and group diversity on innovation. *Journal of Management*, 29(5), 729-751.
- Van der Vegt, G.S., 2005. Effects of Perceived Skill Dissimilarity and Task Interdependence on Helping in Work Teams. *Journal of Management*, 31(1), 73–89.
- Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1008-1022
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 515–541.
- Wang, Z., Waldman D, Zhang, Z., 2012. *A multilevel investigation of leader member exchange, informal leader emergence and individual and team performance*, *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 49-78.
- Wang, P. et al., 2013. A Workgroup Climate Perspective on the Relationships Among Transformational Leadership, Workgroup Diversity, and Employee Creativity. *Group & Organisation Management*, 38(3), 334–360.
- Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., & Lehman, E. (2005). Team diagnostic survey: Development of an Instrument. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41, 373–398
- Williams, K.Y. & O'Reilly III, C. a, 1998. Demography and Diversity in Organisations: A Review of 40 Years of Research. *Research in organisational behavior*, 20, p.77.
- Williamson, O. E. (1963). Managerial discretion and business behavior. *American Economic Review*, 53, 1032–1057.

APPENDIXES

Appendix I. Questionnaire

Block 1

I am conducting a research about managers' and team members dynamics within teams in order to conclude my Master Degree studies.

This survey is only applicable to you if you are NOT supervising a team and if your team has 3 or more members (excluding the manager).

Please note that in this study, a team is considered as a group of people that are directly under the supervision of a manager, following their orders directly and with no intermediaries (other people not covered by this concept are not considered when referring to team/ team members).

The survey should only take around 20 minutes and your responses are completely anonymous. You can only take the survey once, but you can edit your responses until the survey is closed, during the current week.

If you have any questions about the survey, please email me: anamargarida.rico@gmail.com.

I really appreciate your input!

1) Do you manage a team?

- yes
 No

2) Does your team have three or more members (excluding the manager/ team-leader)?

- yes
 No

Default Question Block

3) How many people are currently in your team? (excluding the manager/ team-leader)

A) In terms of gender, how many...(excluding the manager/ team-leader)

- 4) Males are part of your team?
6) Females are part of your team?

B) How many members of your team belong to each age group (excluding the manager/ team leader)?

- 6) Less than 25 years old
7) Between 26 and 35 years old
8) Between 36 and 45 years old
9) Between 46 and 55 years old
10) Between 56 and 65 years old

11) More than 66 years old

C) How many members of your team are working in the team for (excluding the manager/ team-leader)?

12) Less than 6 months?

13) Between 6 months and less than 1 year?

14) Between 1 year and less than 3 years?

15) Between 3 and 5 years?

16) More than 5 years?

D) How many skilled (education level) members have you in the team you're now supervising? Please indicate the number of elements depending on their level of skills (excluding team-member/ leader).

17) Team members with Master and/or Ph.D. degree

18) Team members with Bachelor's degree

19) Team members with associate or technical degrees

20) Team members with high schools degrees or GED

21) Team members with grade school only

E) In terms of ethnicity/origin (race) please specify the origin of all your team members by indicating the number of people under each ethnicity/origin (please exclude your manager/ team-leader)

22) Asian

23) North-American

24) South-American

25) African

26) Oceania

27) Central-American

28) Middle-Eastern

29) European (UK, Ireland)

30) European (Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg)

31) European (Portugal, Spain, Andorra)

32) European (France, Monaco, Switzerland)

33) European (Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Iceland)

34) European (Italy, San Marino, Vatican City, Malta, Greece)

35) European (Germany, Liechtenstein, Austria, Hungary)

36) European (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia)

37) European - Other countries

F) How many nationalities do you have in your team?

38) Excluding your team-leader / manager

39) Including your team-leader / manager

G) Regarding to my manager....

	yes	No
40) Does he/ she have the same nationality I do?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41) Does he/ she have the same gender I do?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42) Does he/ she have the same education level I do?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43) Does he/ she have the same age I do (+- 2 years old)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

44) For how long does your team-leader/ manager is leading the team?

- Less than 6 months
- Between 6 months and less than 1 year
- Between 1 year and less than 3 years
- Between 3 and 5 years
- More than 5 years

H) In your opinion to what extent do you identify yourself with the team members from your team with respect to . . . ?

	To an Extremely Small Extent	To a Small Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Large Extent	To an Extremely Large Extent
45) Sharing the same vision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46) Having the same passion for the job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47) Having the same type of skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48) Working in the same way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
49) Sharing the same goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion. Concerning the team I am part of...

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Completely Agree
50) Goal attainment for one team member facilitates goal attainment for the other team members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51) Gain for one team member means gain for the other team members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52) Success for one team member implies success for the other team members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

53) The rewards received by a team member depend on the attainment of the goals obtained by other team member	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
54) The incentives that one team member got means that others will receive an identical incentive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55) The incentives calculation formulas are the same for all employees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
56) When determining the value of the bonuses to be paid, the company uses accurate information about the team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
57) The performance level required to receive a bonus is identical for all the team members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

J) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding your similarity with the other team members.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
58) I feel I am in general visibly similar to the other members of my team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
59) In terms of visible characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity), I think I am similar to other group members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60) I feel my work values and/ or motivations are similar to other group members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
61) In terms of principles that guide my work, I think I am similar to the other group members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
62) I feel I am professionally and/or educationally similar to the other group members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
63) In terms of functional background (e.g., professional background and/ or work experiences) I think I am similar to the other group members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

K) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects the tasks interdependence in your team.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
64) I work closely with others in doing my work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
65) I frequently must coordinate my efforts with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
66) My own performance is dependent on receiving accurate information from others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
67) The way I perform my job has a significant impact on others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
68) My work requires me to consult with others fairly frequently.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

L) For each question, please select the answer that best applies to the perceptions you have about the feelings/ attitudes of your team-leader/ manager

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
69) I usually know how satisfied my manager is with what I do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
70) My manager usually understand my job problems and needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
71) My manager recognises my potential	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
72) Regardless of how much formal authority my manager has built into his/ her position, he/she would use his/ her power to help me solve problems in my work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
73) Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

my manager has, he/she would "bail me out" at his/her expense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
74) I have enough confidence in my manager that I would defend and justify his/ her decision if he/she was not present to do so	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
75) My working relationship with my manager is effective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

M) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding your similarity with your team-leader/ manager.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
76) I feel I am in general visibly similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
77) In terms of visible characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity), I think I am similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
78) I feel my work values and/ or motivations are similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
79) In terms of principles that guide my work (e.g. reward driven), I think I am similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
80) I feel I am professionally and /or educationally similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
81) In terms of functional background (e.g., professional background and/ or work experiences) I think I am similar to my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

N) For each sentence and according to your opinion, please select the best answer to describe the reciprocity in your relationship with your team-leader/ manager.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
82) My manager and I have a two-way exchange relationship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
83) I do not have to specify the exact conditions to know my manager will return a favour	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
84) If I do something for my manager, he or she will eventually repay me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
85) I have a balance of inputs and outputs with my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
86) My efforts are reciprocated by my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
87) My relationship with my manager is composed of comparable exchanges of giving and taking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
88) When I give effort at work, my manager will return it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
89) Voluntary actions on my part will be returned in some way by my manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

O) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding the fairness in your team. My team-leader/ manager..

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
90) Holds me accountable for problems over which I have no control	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
91) Holds me responsible for work that I have no control over	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
92) Holds me responsible for things that are not my fault	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
93) Pursues his/her own success at the expense of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
94) Focused mainly on reaching his/her own goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
95) Manipulates subordinates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

P) For each question, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding the distribution of rewards received.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
96) Does your rewards received reflect the effort you have put into your work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
97) Are your rewards received appropriate for the work you have completed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
98) Does your rewards received reflect what you have contributed to the organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
99) Is your rewards received justified, given your performance?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q) For each question, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding the procedure of rewards received.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
100) Have you been able to express your views and feelings during the procedure of rewards received?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
101) Have you had influence over the rewards procedure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
102) Have those procedures to receive rewards been applied consistently?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
103) Have those procedures been free of bias?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
104) Have those procedures been based on accurate information?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
105) Have you been able to appeal the rewards received at by those procedures?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
106) Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

R) For each question, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding the interaction with your manager.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
107) Has your manager treated you in a polite manner?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
108) Has your manager treated you with dignity?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
109) Has your manager treated you with respect?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
110) Has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

S) For each question, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion regarding the information received from your manager.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	----------------------------	-------	----------------

111) Has your manager been candid in his/her communication with you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
112) Has your manager explained the procedures thoroughly?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
113) Has your manager communicated details in a timely manner?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
114) Has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
115) Has your manager seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals' specific needs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

T) For each sentence and according to your opinion, to what extent do you agree with the following sentences.

	To a very small extent	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	To a very large extent
116) I adequately complete assigned duties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
117) I fulfill responsibilities specified in my job description.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
118) I perform tasks that are expected of me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
119) I meet formal performance requirements of my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
120) I engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
121) I neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
122) I fail to perform essential duties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
123) I help others who have been absent from work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
124) I help others who have heavy work load.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
125) I assist my manager with his/her work (when not asked).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
126) I take time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
127) I go out of way to help new team members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
128) I take a personal interest in other team members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
129) I pass along information to co-workers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
130) My attendance at work is above the norm.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
131) I give advance notice when unable to come to work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
132) I take undeserved work breaks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
133) I spend a great deal of time with personal phone conversations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
134) I complain about insignificant things at work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
135) I conserve and protect organizational property.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
136) I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

U) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion concerning your intention to leave the company you are currently employed.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
137) I am thinking about leaving this company	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
138) I am planning to look for a new job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

139) I intend to ask people about new job opportunities outside the company	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
140) I don't plan to be in this company much longer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

V) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your opinion concerning your intention to leave the team you belong.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
141) I am thinking about leaving this team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
142) I am planning to look for a new job within another team of the company	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
143) I intend to ask people about new job opportunities within the company	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
144) I don't plan to be in this team much longer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

W) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your behaviour at work.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time
145) I made fun of someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
146) I said something hurtful to someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
147) I made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
148) I cursed at someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
149) I played a mean prank on someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
150) I acted rudely toward someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
151) I publicly embarrassed someone at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

X) For each sentence, please select the answer that better reflects your tasks' meaning.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
152) I learn a lot with my job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
153) My job is more than work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
154) Doing this job is worthwhile	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Y) For each question, please select the answer that better reflects the importance of your outcome.

	Not important at all	Not important	Indifferent	Important	Very important
155) How important is for you to have a high performance?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
158) How important do you need to do well in your job?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

157) You are . . .

- Female
 Male

158) What is your ethnicity?

- Asian
- North-American
- South-American
- Central-American
- African
- Oceania
- Middle-Eastern
- European (UK, Ireland)
- European ((Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg)
- European (Portugal, Spain, Andorra)
- European (France, Monaco, Switzerland)
- European (Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Iceland)
- European (Italy, San Marino, Vatican City, Malta, Greece)
- European (Germany, Liechtenstein, Austria, Hungary)
- European (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia)
- European - Other countries

159) What is your nationality?**160) What is your age?**

- Under 25
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 and over

161) What is your marital status?

- Now married
- Cohabiting
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- Never married

162) What is your education level?

- Master and/or Ph.D. degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Associate or technical degree
- High school degree or GED
- Grade school

163) How long have you been working at the company you're currently working for?

- Less than 6 months
- Between 6 months and 1 year
- More than 1 year and 3 years
- More than 3 years and 5 years
- More than 5 years

164) How long have you been part of the team in the company you're working for?

- Less than 6 months
- Between 6 months and 1 year
- More than 1 year and 3 years
- More than 3 years and 5 years
- More than 5 years

165) What grade is your position in the company?

- M3
- M4
- P1
- P2

166) Which type of contract do you have?

Type of contract	Regarding the duration		Regarding the weekly hours worked	
	Permanent	Limited	Part-time	Full-time
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the (>>) button below to submit your answers. If you want to receive the results of this research study, when available, please send me an email with your request (anamargarida.rico@gmail.com)

Thank you very much for your collaboration!

Ana Rico

ISCTE Master in Business Administration Student

Appendix II. Factorials for collective goals and shared results

Items	Interdependence	Relationship
Cronbach's α	.839	.726
Gain for one team member means gain for the other team members	.914	.017
Success for one team member implies success for the other team members	.850	.173
Goal attainment for one team member facilitates goal attainment for the other team members	.814	-.002
The performance level required to receive a bonus is identical for all the team members	-.056	.837
When determining the value of the bonuses to be paid, the company uses accurate information about the team	.154	.772
The incentives calculation formulas are the same for all employees	.045	.757
The incentives that one team member got means that others will receive an identical incentive	.355	.564

N=139. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.739, alfa de Cronbach (global) = 0.776. Variance explained 39.77% by the first factor and 25.75% by the second factor.

Appendix III. Factorials for team perceived similarity

Items	
Cronbach's α	.073

I feel my work values and/ or motivations are similar to other group members	.742
I feel I am visibly similar to other group members	.719
In terms of principles that guide my work (e.g., patient care, reward driven), I think I am similar from other group members	.702
I feel I am professionally and/ or educationally similar to other group members	.692
In terms of functional background (e.g. professional background and/ or work experiences), I think I am similar from other group members	.567
In terms of visible characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity), I think I am similar from other group members	.480

N=139. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.691

Appendix IV. Factorials for LMX

Items	
Cronbach's α	.926

My working relationship with my manager is effective	.919
My manager recognises my potential	.877
My manager usually understand my job problems and needs	.859
Regardless of how much formal authority my manager has built into his/ her position, he/she would use his/ her power to help me solve problems in my work	.851
I have enough confidence in my manager that I would defend and justify his/ her decision if he/she was not present to do so	.834
I usually know how satisfied my manager is with what I do.	.748
Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority my manager has, he/she would "bail me out" at his/her expense	.731

N=138. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.889

Appendix V. Factorials for manager perceived similarity

Items	
Cronbach's α	.831

In terms of principles that guide my work (e.g., patient care, reward driven), I think I am similar to my manager	.771
I feel my work values and/ or motivations are similar to my manager	.790
I feel I am visibly similar to my manager	.787
In terms of functional background (e.g. professional background and/ or work experiences), I think I am similar to my manager	.738
I feel I am professionally and/ or educationally similar to my manager.	.762
In terms of visible characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity), I think I am similar to my manager	.575

N=138. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.776

Appendix VI. Factorials for Unfairness

Items	
Cronbach's α	.931

Pursues his/her own success at the expense of others	.883
Holds me accountable for problems over which I have no control	.873
Holds me responsible for things that are not my fault	.873
Focused mainly on reaching his/her own goals	.859
Manipulates subordinates	.857
Holds me responsible for work that I have no control over	.848

N=136. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.848

Appendix VII. Factorials for distributive justice

Items	
Cronbach's α	.952

Are your rewards received appropriate for the work you have completed?	.955
Does your rewards received reflect what you have contributed to the organisation?	.950
Does yours rewards received reflect the effort you have put into your work?	.919
Is your rewards received justified, given your performance?	.918

N=138. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.855

Appendix VIII. Factorials for procedural justice

Items	
Cronbach's α	.875

Have those procedures been based on accurate information?	.841
Have you been able to appeal the rewards received at by those procedures?	.779
Have those procedures been free of bias?	.776
Have those procedures to receive rewards been applied consistently?	.774
Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?	.773
Have you had influence over the rewards procedure?	.730
Have you been able to express your views and feelings during the procedure of rewards received?	.633

N=137. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.859

Appendix IX. Factorials for interactional justice

Items	
Cronbach's α	.923

Has your manager treated you in a polite manner?	.936
Has your manager treated you with dignity?	.959
Has your manager treated you with respect?	.956
Has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments?	.792

N=138. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.835

Appendix X. Factorials for informational justice

Items	
Cronbach's α	.845

Has your manager explained the procedures thoroughly?	.906
Has your manager communicated details in a timely manner?	.855
Has your manager seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals' specific needs?	.805
Has your manager been candid in his/her communication with you?	.734

N=139. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.743

Appendix XI. Factorials for team's turnover

Items	
Cronbach's α	.930

I am planning to look for a new job withing the company.	.941
I am thinking about leaving this team.	.909
I don't plan to be in this team much longer.	.894
I intend to ask people about new job opportunities inside the company	.891

N=138. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index = 0.765