

Leader–Member Exchange and Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis

Remus Ilies, Jennifer D. Nahrgang, and Frederick P. Morgeson
Michigan State University

This article provides a meta-analytic review of the relationship between the quality of leader–member exchanges (LMX) and citizenship behaviors performed by employees. Results based on 50 independent samples ($N = 9,324$) indicate a moderately strong, positive relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors ($\rho = .37$). The results also support the moderating role of the target of the citizenship behaviors on the magnitude of the LMX–citizenship behavior relationship. As expected, LMX predicted individual-targeted behaviors more strongly than it predicted organizational targeted behaviors ($\rho = .38$ vs. $\rho = .31$), and the difference was statistically significant. Whether the LMX and the citizenship behavior ratings were provided by the same source or not also influenced the magnitude of the correlation between the 2 constructs.

Keywords: leadership, meta-analysis, organizational citizenship behavior

Considerable research has shown that leaders can significantly influence individual, group, and organizational performance (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Different leadership theories articulate a number of mechanisms through which leaders have such influences (Northouse, 1997). For example, some focus on the stable dispositions of leaders (e.g., Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002), others examine what leaders actually do (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1990; Yukl, 1994), and still others examine how the effectiveness of leader actions depends on situational or contextual factors (Fiedler, 1967; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Morgeson, 2005).

Although the conceptual mechanisms that link leaders to performance are diverse, leadership theories are based on the general assumption that leaders influence performance at some macrolevel through their impact on individuals and groups who contribute to the accomplishment of broader organizational goals. In examining the impact of leaders on individual followers, most leadership researchers tend to focus on the effects of leaders' general behaviors or attitudes toward subordinates, assuming that followers are homogeneous in terms of leader influences or that leaders behave essentially the same way toward all of their subordinates in order to accomplish organizational goals (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975). An alternative approach to understanding leaders' influence on individual follower or subordinate effectiveness is through the focus on dyadic relationships between leaders and each of their subordinates (Dansereau et al., 1975). Originally termed *vertical dyad linkage* (Dansereau et al., 1975), *leader–member exchange theory* differs from other leadership theories by its explicit focus on the dyadic relationship and the unique relationships leaders

develop with each follower (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997).

The basic principle of leader–member exchange (LMX) is that leaders develop different types of exchange relationships with their followers and that the quality of these relationships affects important leader and member attitudes and behaviors (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden et al., 1997; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). Originally developed as an alternative to general leadership style approaches, LMX theory draws from social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) in order to explain the development of dyadic relationships and the linkages between leadership processes and outcomes. In short, social exchange theory suggests that there is a perceived obligation on the part of subordinates to reciprocate high-quality relationships (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960) and that dyadic relationships and work roles are developed or negotiated over time through a series of exchanges (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). In support of the theory, empirical research indeed has demonstrated that LMX has significant influences on outcomes such as task performance, satisfaction, turnover, and organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Yet another way in which LMX contributes to organizational effectiveness is through the effect that high-quality relationships have on the extent to which employees engage in behaviors beyond their prescribed roles. The importance of such behaviors for organizational effectiveness was recognized by Katz (1964), who underlined the need for employees' innovative and spontaneous activity beyond their specified roles. C. A. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) later labeled these employee behaviors "*organizational citizenship behaviors*." Citizenship behaviors are likely avenues for reciprocation because they reflect discretionary individual behavior that is less likely to be recognized by job descriptions or formal reward systems (Organ, 1988). In essence, subordinates in higher quality LMX relationships "pay back" their leaders by engaging in citizenship (i.e., discretionary) behaviors that benefit the leader and others in the work setting (Liden et al., 1997; Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996).

The idea that LMX is related to different types of performance parallels distinctions in the literature between task and citizenship

Remus Ilies, Jennifer D. Nahrgang, and Frederick P. Morgeson, Department of Management, Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Remus Ilies, Department of Management, Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University, N475 North Business Complex, East Lansing, MI 48824. E-mail: ilies@msu.edu

behavior. In the past 20 years, increased attention has been given to describing aspects of individual job performance that fall outside the bounds of traditional conceptualizations of quantity or quality of task performance (see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Researchers have adopted a variety of different labels to describe these aspects, including organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983), prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997), contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & van Scotter, 1994), and extrarole behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

It is interesting that although researchers have a considerable understanding of how LMX relates to a host of outcomes, including in-role (task) performance as well as attitudinal variables such as satisfaction with leader and organizational commitment, they have less understanding of how LMX is related to citizenship behavior. For example, the most comprehensive meta-analysis of the LMX literature examined a number of outcomes, including performance ratings, objective performance, overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, organizational commitment, role conflict, role clarity, turnover, and member competence (Gerstner & Day, 1997) but did not include organizational citizenship behavior criteria. In a small-scale meta-analysis based on 18 primary studies, Hackett, Farh, Song, and Lapierre (2003) reported a meta-analytic correlation between LMX and citizenship behaviors of .32. These authors also suggested that there were no moderating influences affecting the relationship between the two constructs.

As interest in both LMX and citizenship behaviors at work has increased exponentially in the past 2 decades (see Podsakoff et al., 2000, and Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999), we believe that a comprehensive meta-analysis that addresses multiple aspects of the relationship between LMX and citizenship behavior via moderator analyses is needed. Such a comprehensive meta-analysis is needed for three primary reasons. First, there appears to be a high degree of variability in empirical estimates from individual studies for the strength of the relationship. For example, Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2002) found a relatively weak relationship between LMX and citizenship behavior ($r = .20$) whereas Tekleab and Taylor (2003) found a much stronger relationship ($r = .52$). Hackett et al. (2003) suggested that this variability can be explained by sampling error and differential reliability. However, these authors included only a small set of studies in their analyses (as we explain in this article, we identified and coded 33 additional studies) and based their conclusion with respect to homogeneity on analyses that did not include the 3 effect sizes (out of 18) that were most different from the mean.

Second, different authors related LMX to different types of citizenship behaviors (e.g., helping, altruism, job dedication). Because LMX may differentially influence specific citizenship behaviors, the type of citizenship behavior examined in particular studies may have influenced the nature and magnitude of the observed relationship with LMX. It is entirely possible that such differential effects explain the variability in empirical estimates of the LMX–citizenship behaviors correlation.

Third, different studies have used various methodologies, including ratings of the relationship between LMX and organizational citizenship behaviors from different rating perspectives (Tierney, Bauer & Potter, 2002; Townsend, Phillips & Elkins,

2000) and different measures with different reliabilities (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Settoon et al., 1996), and thus the estimates are not directly comparable. Furthermore, it is useful to investigate whether methodological factors, such as the rating source, further moderate the relationship between LMX and individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors.

The goal of the current research is to quantitatively summarize and evaluate the relationship between LMX and citizenship behavior. Hunter and Schmidt (1990) considered meta-analytic findings “the empirical building blocks for theory” (p. 40) and noted that integrative estimates concerning (a) the magnitude of the relationship between constructs and (b) the variability in observed estimates are important for further theory development. The current meta-analysis fills a gap in the literature by estimating both the strength and consistency of the LMX–citizenship behaviors relationship, as well as examining the role of potential moderators such as citizenship targets or dimensions, and the rating perspectives used to collect the construct scores.

Foundations of the LMX and Citizenship Behavior Relationship

High-quality leader–member relationships or exchanges are characterized by high levels of trust, interaction, support, and formal and informal rewards (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Such relationships include the exchange of material and nonmaterial goods that extend beyond what is specified in the formal job description (Liden et al., 1997; Liden & Graen, 1980). Thus, to reciprocate high LMX relationships, it is likely that subordinates will go beyond required in-role behavior and engage in citizenship behaviors in order to maintain a balanced or equitable social exchange (Wayne et al., 2002). Hackett et al. (2003) also posited that high-quality LMX should increase organizational citizenship behaviors on the part of subordinates.

Indeed, LMX research has revealed that the quality of the relationship has a positive relationship with the frequency with which followers engage in activities beyond the employment contract (Liden & Graen, 1980; Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne & Green, 1993). However, as noted, estimates of the strength of the LMX–citizenship behavior relationship have varied considerably. Our first objective was to meta-analytically estimate this relationship at the population level and estimate the extent to which sampling error and differences in the psychometric reliability of the various instruments used in individual studies explain the variability in the primary estimates. On the basis of the literature reviewed previously, we expected to see a moderately strong overall relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors. Further, we examined moderating influences on this relationship, as one explanation for the variance in the LMX–citizenship behavior relationship is that possible moderators such as target of the behavior or the rating perspectives used to assess the two constructs influence the estimates reported in different empirical studies.

Moderators of the LMX–Citizenship Behavior Relationship

Conceptually, employees’ citizenship behaviors at work can be distinguished according to the target of the behavior (Lee & Allen, 2002; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Individual-targeted behaviors are those that immediately benefit specific individuals and indirectly benefit the organization. The dimension of individual-targeted behaviors subsumes helping behaviors as well as other positive cooperative behaviors (e.g., altruism and courtesy) and interpersonal facilitation (see Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organizational-targeted behaviors, on the other hand, focus on and benefit the organization (Williams & Anderson, 1991). This dimension includes creative and innovative behaviors, and behaviors indicative of organizational loyalty, compliance, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and job dedication (see Podsakoff et al., 2000, for a comprehensive list of extrarole dimensions).

When assessing the validity of various predictors of citizenship behaviors, one needs to distinguish between dimensions that reflect different types of behavior and to consider the thematic correspondence between predictors and these behavioral dimensions. For example, when examining the relationship between general job attitudes and behavior at work, Organ (1994) expected such attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction) to “predict aggregations of thematically related (as opposed to topographically similar) behaviors” (p. 465). Extending this argument to the effect of LMX on work behavior, we proposed that LMX more strongly predicts thematically related behaviors when the theme that underlies behavior is aligned with the inherently interpersonal nature of LMX. Therefore, we expected that LMX would be more strongly related to individual-targeted citizenship behaviors. Our expectation for this relationship paralleled research examining the relationship between impersonal support received by employees and citizenship behavior. For example, Kaufman, Stamper, and Tesluk (2001) found stronger relationships between perceived organizational support and organizational-targeted behaviors. Furthermore, existing meta-analytic evidence supports such differential effects of organizational support on the two types of citizenship behavior (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

In sum, because LMX is interpersonal, we expected to see a stronger effect on individual-targeted citizenship behaviors than on organizational-targeted citizenship behaviors. This expectation was based on the notion that employees reciprocate the support and rewards from the supervisor by performing citizenship behaviors that benefit the supervisor and, because citizenship behaviors are not part of the formal reward system, they may, in turn, be informally rewarded through LMX. Thus, individual-targeted citizenship behaviors—targeted either directly at the supervisor or at coworkers whose performance is important to the supervisor—represent an avenue for the employee to deliver outcomes that benefit his or her supervisor (Wayne & Green, 1993). We expected to see a weaker link between LMX and organizational-targeted citizenship behaviors because organizational-targeted citizenship behaviors do not result in a direct (or immediate) benefit to the supervisor and thus these behaviors are less likely to be used by employees to maintain a balanced or equitable social exchange with their supervisors.

Methodological moderators of the relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors potentially include the rating perspective and publication status of the study reporting the correlation. In their meta-analysis, Gerstner and Day (1997) found support for the moderating role of the rating perspective on the relationships between LMX and its correlates. Following Gerstner and Day, we expected the relationships between LMX and citizenship behavior to be stronger when both constructs were measured with the same

source because of common source bias. In addition, we investigated whether the publication status of the study (published or unpublished) influenced the magnitude of the primary correlation on an exploratory basis.

Method

Literature Search

An extensive literature search was conducted to identify both published and unpublished reports that examined the relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors. The articles were identified through several methods, including electronic searches of the PsychINFO (1887–2005) database. To be inclusive, we conducted a broad search using the keywords *vertical dyad linkage*, *dyad and leader*, *LMX*, and *leader-member exchange*. The search identified 329 articles. The electronic search was supplemented with a manual search of reference lists of key empirical and theoretical articles as well as reference sections from chapters on leadership and citizenship behaviors and prior meta-analyses. In addition, we conducted a manual search for in-press articles at the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Academy of Management Journal*, and *Leadership Quarterly*, and through all the articles published in *Leadership Quarterly*. Finally, we contacted several authors active in this research area to obtain unpublished studies or conference papers.

Inclusion Criteria

The abstracts obtained from the electronic search were reviewed for appropriate content and considered for inclusion in the meta-analysis. After reading through the abstracts, we excluded studies without data and studies that did not examine the relationship of LMX to citizenship behaviors. From this review, a population of 116 studies was selected for further consideration. We read each of these studies, as well as studies selected via manual searches, to determine whether the study should be included in the meta-analysis. Decision rules used to determine which studies to include in the meta-analysis were whether the study investigated the LMX–citizenship behavior relationship and whether the study reported sufficient results to calculate an effect size for the relationship. We also contacted authors to obtain data necessary to calculate an effect size if it appeared that such data were collected but were not reported in the study. Fifty-one studies, which included 50 independent samples (2 studies used the same sample), met the inclusion criteria; these studies provided a total of 140 correlations between LMX and citizenship behaviors.

Coding

Data necessary to calculate the effect size for the relationships of interest were coded from the studies as was information such as rating perspective (same vs. different source) and the publication status of the report (published or unpublished). For the overall analysis, we included a unique estimate from each of the 50 samples, with a combined sample size of 9,324. For studies that provided multiple estimates (e.g., correlations between LMX and organizational-targeted citizenship behaviors and between LMX and individual-targeted citizenship behaviors) or the two studies that used the same sample, we combined these estimates into a single correlation using the composites formula when possible or averaging the estimates (e.g., when correlations among dimensions were not provided).

For the moderator analyses, we categorized the primary estimates into categories according to the expected moderator variables, and we then conducted separate meta-analyses for each of the moderator categories. First, we categorized the correlations into individual- and organizational-targeted behaviors. We defined individual-targeted behaviors as behaviors reflecting altruism, helping, courtesy, interpersonal facilitation, and orga-

nizational citizenship behaviors benefiting specific individuals. Organizational-targeted behaviors were defined as creativity, innovativeness, and organizational citizenship behaviors that benefit the entire organization. Measures of conscientiousness, sportsmanship, compliance, job dedication, civic virtue, and change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., identifying and implementing organizational changes in methods, policies, and procedures) were also categorized as organizational-targeted behaviors. We relied on definitions of the dimensions of citizenship behaviors provided by Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Hui (1993) and Podsakoff et al. (2000) and on research demonstrating that altruism and courtesy load together on a second-order helping dimension (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) to aid us in this categorization. Correlations representing a combination of individual- and organizational-targeted behaviors or including general contextual performance were not used for this moderator analysis. We also did not classify safety citizenship behaviors, communal social capital investment behavior (i.e., contributions to the communal social capital of an organization, including information sharing, trustworthy behavior, and helping behavior), and voice. In all, we included 27 independent correlations between LMX and individual-targeted citizenship behavior ($N = 5,296$) and 21 correlations between LMX and organizational-targeted citizenship behavior ($N = 4,119$).

Although we tried to make our coding procedures as objective and clear as possible, some discretion was required in classifying the studies into the moderator categories, as is the case in all meta-analyses. On the basis of the definitions of individual- and organizational-targeted citizenship behaviors provided above, Jennifer D. Nahrgang and Frederick P. Morgeson categorized the primary correlation into the two categories. The coders agreed on 64 of 67 cases, which resulted in an interrater agreement percentage of 96% and an interrater reliability of .90. The disagreements were solved through discussion with Remus Ilies.

Similarly, we coded the primary correlations according to the rating perspective used to measure the predictors and criteria, which resulted in the inclusion of 38 independent correlations between constructs measured from different perspectives and 18 correlations between constructs rated by the same rater. For the large majority of the studies reporting different-source correlations, leaders rated the citizenship behaviors of their followers and followers rated LMX; followers provided most of the same-source correlations. Finally, we coded the data according to the publication status of the study; 22 correlations were provided by unpublished reports, whereas 28 correlations were reported in published studies.

Table 1
Meta-Analysis Results

Variable	k	N	r	ρ	SD_{ρ}	80% CV		90% CI	
						Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
Overall citizenship behavior	50	9,324	.32	.37	.11	.22	.51	.33	.41
Citizenship behavior target									
Individuals	27	5,296	.33	.38	.12	.23	.54	.33	.44
Organization	21	4,119	.27	.31	.07	.22	.40	.27	.35
Rating perspective									
Same perspective	18	3,808	.47	.54	.18	.31	.78	.45	.63
Different perspective	38	7,098	.28	.32	.08	.22	.42	.29	.35
Publication status									
Published reports	28	5,118	.32	.37	.11	.23	.51	.32	.42
Unpublished reports	22	4,206	.32	.37	.12	.22	.52	.31	.42

Note. Categories indicating the target of the behavior (individuals vs. organization) and the rating perspective (same vs. different perspective) are not mutually exclusive. Not all correlations could be categorized according to the target of the behavior (e.g., correlations involving overall citizenship behavior or contextual performance measures) and to the rating perspective (several studies provided correlations based on behavioral scores that were computed as the average of leader and member ratings). Therefore, the overall meta-analytic estimate is not directly comparable to the estimates for individual- and organization-targeted behaviors. k = number of correlations; ρ = true score correlation; SD_{ρ} = standard deviation of true score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval.

Meta-Analysis Procedures

Using the Schmidt–Hunter psychometric meta-analysis method (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990), we conducted a meta-analytic review that cumulated across studies the reported correlations between LMX and citizenship behaviors. We first corrected the primary estimates (correlations from individual samples) for measurement error in both the predictor and the criterion scores using the internal consistency reliability. The large majority of studies provided the reliabilities of the measured scores that we used to compute the reported correlations. For the few cases in which reliability was not provided, we used the average value across the other studies. The observed variance was corrected for sampling error and differential reliabilities.

To describe variability in the meta-analytic estimates, we reported 80% credibility intervals and 90% confidence intervals around the estimated population correlations. Confidence intervals provide an estimate of the variability around the estimated mean correlation; a 90% confidence interval (around a positive value) excluding zero indicates that one can be 95% confident that the average true score correlation is larger than zero (less than 5% are zero or less and a maximum of 5% are larger than the upper bound of the interval). Credibility intervals provide an estimate of the variability of individual correlations across studies; an 80% credibility interval excluding zero indicates that at least 90% of the individual correlations in the meta-analysis were greater than zero (for positive correlations, fewer than 10% are zero or less and a maximum of 10% lie beyond the upper bound of the interval). Thus, confidence intervals estimate variability in the meta-analytic correlation, whereas credibility intervals estimate variability in the individual (primary) correlations across the samples included in the respective analysis.

Results

Table 1 presents the meta-analysis results for the overall relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors as well as the results of the moderator analyses. As expected, the overall analysis revealed that LMX was positively related to citizenship behaviors and that the relationship was moderately strong ($\rho = .37$). Neither the credibility interval nor the confidence interval included zero. Sampling error and differential reliability accounted for 31.4% of the variance in the primary estimates, which suggests that moder-

ating effects may have been present in the data (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Indeed, the results support the moderating role of the target of the behavior on the magnitude of the LMX–citizenship behaviors relationship. That is, as we predicted, individual-targeted behaviors are more strongly correlated with LMX than are organization-targeted behaviors ($\rho = .38$ vs. $\rho = .31$). The standard deviation of the true score correlations was smaller for organizational-targeted behaviors, but it was not much different for individual-targeted behaviors, ($SD_{\rho} = .07$ and $SD_{\rho} = .12$, respectively) compared with the overall analysis ($SD_{\rho} = .11$). A Hotelling–Williams test, recommended when comparing nonindependent correlations that share a variable (see Steiger, 1980), showed that the two correlations were significantly different from each other.

Whether LMX and citizenship behavior ratings were provided by the same source substantially influenced the meta-analytic correlation between the two constructs: The estimate for same-source ratings was $\rho = .54$, whereas the meta-analytic correlation between these constructs was $\rho = .32$ when different raters provided the two construct scores. The standard deviation of the true score correlation decreased when we considered only different-source estimates ($SD_{\rho} = .08$, compared with $SD_{\rho} = .11$ for the overall analysis); the variability in the estimates provided by the same source was higher ($SD_{\rho} = .18$).

Finally, the publication status of the report that provided the primary estimates had no effect on the magnitude of the meta-analytic correlation in that the true score correlations in the two categories were exactly the same ($\rho = .37$). Furthermore, the standard deviation of the true score correlation did not decrease in any of the two moderated categories ($SD_{\rho} = .12$ for unpublished studies and $SD_{\rho} = .11$ for published studies, compared with $SD_{\rho} = .11$ across both categories). This result does not support the general file-drawer hypothesis that unpublished reports are more likely to have null or weak results, compared with published studies.

Hierarchical moderator analyses can investigate whether the effects of LMX on individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors are further moderated by methodological factors and whether the moderating effect of the citizenship behavior target is confounded with other methodological moderating effects. For example, confounding would occur if most of the correlations between LMX and individual-targeted citizenship behaviors involved ratings from the same source and most correlations with organization-targeted behaviors involved ratings from different sources. Therefore, we examined whether the rating source factor further moderated the effects of LMX on individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors (the publication status of the study did not influence the effect of LMX on citizenship behaviors).

Whether the predictor and the outcome were rated by the same or different sources impacted both the relationship between LMX and individual-targeted citizenship behaviors, $\rho = .52$, $SD_{\rho} = .22$ ($k = 10$) and $\rho = .34$, $SD_{\rho} = .08$ ($k = 22$) for same and different source, respectively, and the relationship between LMX and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors, $\rho = .44$, $SD_{\rho} = .15$ ($k = 5$) and $\rho = .29$, $SD_{\rho} = .04$ ($k = 17$) for same and different source, respectively, in the same way that the rating perspective influenced the overall relationship. It is important to note that the moderating effects of the rating source and the behavior target were not confounded, as the effect of LMX on individual-targeted

citizenship behaviors was larger than the effect on organization-targeted behaviors regardless of whether the two constructs were rated by the same source or not.

Discussion

We sought to meta-analytically summarize the relationship between LMX and citizenship behavior. Overall, we found a meaningful relationship, with a population correlation of .37. The magnitude of this relationship was similar to the previously meta-analytically summarized relationship between LMX and task performance. That is, Gerstner and Day (1997) reported an observed (i.e., not corrected for imperfect reliability) overall correlation of .32 (see their Table 3, p. 833; Gerstner and Day, 1997, did not provide a true score overall meta-analytic estimate), which is identical to our observed overall correlation (see Table 1). Thus, LMX does not seem to be a stronger predictor of more discretionary aspects of job performance, compared with in-role task performance. However, the more important implications of our study do not rest on comparing these validities. We believe that our finding that LMX predicts citizenship behaviors moderately strongly has important implications for calibrating the predictive efficacy of LMX theory. That is, to the extent that the positive outcomes of employees' citizenship behaviors and of their task performance are not completely overlapping, the fact that LMX predicts citizenship behaviors as strongly as it predicts task performance suggests that the benefits associated with high-quality leader–member exchanges exceed what has been suggested by the validity of LMX in predicting task performance alone.

More generally, our findings suggest that both required and discretionary behaviors should be considered when studying leadership in organizations, and criteria reflecting both types of behavior (i.e., task performance and organizational citizenship performance) should be used to calibrate the validity of different leadership theories or to compare leadership theories among each other in terms of validity. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that some leadership theories (such as LMX) are more effective in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors than others. Investigating such issues empirically is likely to provide fruitful avenues for future leadership research.

Our moderator analyses helped to further clarify the nature of the LMX–citizenship behavior relationship. The fact that LMX was more strongly related to individual-targeted than to organization-targeted citizenship behaviors further supports the relational focus of LMX and indicates that reciprocation is more likely to occur in the interpersonal as opposed to organizational realm. The differential effects of LMX on the two types of citizenship behavior documented herein contribute to the general literature on organizational citizenship behavior by offering meta-analytic support for the distinction between individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors. Because the distinction between dimensions of citizenship behavior has recently been questioned (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002), we believe this is an important contribution. Furthermore, our results are entirely consistent, conceptually, with the differential validities of perceived organizational support (arguably, the “organizational” equivalent of LMX; see Kaufman et al., 2001) in predicting interpersonal and organizational citizenship behaviors reported by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) in their meta-analysis of the antecedents and

outcomes of perceived organizational support ($\rho = .22$ and $\rho = .28$ with individual- and organization-targeted behaviors, respectively).

Our results concerning the differential validity of LMX in predicting interpersonal and organizational citizenship behaviors, coupled with the meta-analytic results reported by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), suggest that the interpersonal–organizational distinction is important for calibrating the effect of social exchanges on employee behaviors at work and have important implications for theory and practice. First, these results suggest that distinct processes may explain employees' engagement in individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors. Following this distinction, it is likely that interpersonal personality traits (agreeableness) and satisfaction facets (satisfaction with coworkers) are more strongly related to interpersonal citizenship behaviors, whereas more impersonal traits (conscientiousness) and satisfaction facets (e.g., satisfaction with promotions or pay) more strongly predict organization-targeted behaviors. Second, our results suggest that managers should pay special attention to the quality of the supervisor–supervisee relationships and other interpersonal constructs (e.g., positive affect, satisfaction with coworkers) in organizations in which cooperation, helping, and altruism are important for organizational effectiveness (e.g., in team-based organizations).

The results of the present meta-analytic research suggest at least two additional avenues for future research on LMX and citizenship behavior. First, we grouped citizenship behaviors into those targeted at the individual or the organization. Another possibility is to focus on very specific types of citizenship behaviors that are targeted to specific organizational and supervisor needs or values. For example, Hofmann, Morgeson, and Gerras (2003) focused on safety citizenship behaviors in the context of a high-risk environment. They found that when supervisors valued safety, subordinates in high-quality relationships were more likely to engage in safety citizenship behaviors. This follows from the social exchange basis of LMX in that subordinates reciprocate in a way that is consistent with a leader's values. Attention to more specific behaviors and supervisor values is likely to enhance LMX theory and empirical results.

Second, Liden and Maslyn (1998) identified four distinct aspects of LMX: affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect. Notwithstanding the relatively high intercorrelations among these aspects (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001), a more differentiated conceptualization of LMX, coupled with a more complex consideration of citizenship behavior, may yield greater understanding and predictive efficacy. For example, it is likely that the contribution aspect of the leader–member relationship (which reflects the amount of effort expended toward mutual goals) will be a stronger predictor of citizenship behavior than will loyalty and professional respect, in part because citizenship behavior reflects effort expended beyond one's normal role requirements. Similarly, following Hackett et al. (2003), who suggested that the LMX–citizenship behavior link is likely of a preponderantly affective nature, we would predict that the affect dimension of LMX (along with contribution) should be a strong predictor of citizenship behaviors, relative to other dimensions. Data from five studies that report correlations between three LMX dimensions and citizenship behavior suggest support for these predictions (the meta-analytic correlations were .50, .48, and .42 for affect, contribution, and

loyalty, respectively), but these results should be viewed with caution because of the relatively small combined sample size ($k = 5$, $N = 1,258$) and the substantial variability across these studies. Furthermore, as another example, it is likely that the affective component of LMX will be most strongly related to interpersonal helping, given that positive affect leads to helping (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006; Spector & Fox, 2002).

In sum, in this article we provide a meta-analytic estimate of the relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviors and also provide support for the moderating effect of the citizenship behaviors target (individual vs. organizational) as well as document some methodological moderating effects. In doing so, we contribute to the leadership literature by providing the first population estimate for the general LMX–citizenship behaviors link based on a comprehensive meta-analysis. Further, our results supporting differential effects of LMX on interpersonal- and organization-targeted behavior offer meta-analytic evidence for the distinctiveness of the two types of citizenship behavior and therefore contribute to the general literature on social exchanges and organizational citizenship. Finally, we certainly hope that our findings and discussion will lead to interesting and important future research endeavors.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- *Anderson, S. E., & Williams, L. J. (1996). Interpersonal, job, and individual factors related to helping processes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 282–296.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- *Basu, R., & Green, S. G. (1995). Subordinate performance, leader-subordinate compatibility, and exchange quality in leader-member dyads: A field-study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 77–92.
- *Basu, R., & Green, S. G. (1997). Leader-member exchange and transformational leadership: An empirical examination of innovative behaviors in leader-member dyads. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 477–499.
- *Bettencourt, L. A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. *Journal of Retailing, 80*, 165–180.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710–725.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 46–78.
- *Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group and Organization Management, 23*, 189–216.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 618–634.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York: Wiley.

- *Findley, H. M. (1996). Fairness in social exchange: The relationships of leader-member exchange and performance appraisal fairness to organizational citizenship behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 3644A. (UMI No. 9544747)
- *Franke, J., & Larmoyeux, M. (2005). *Leader behavior and leader-member exchange: Relationships, interactions, and outcomes*. Unpublished manuscript, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good – doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work–organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310–329.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153–170.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827–844.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 165–167.
- 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. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 219–247.
- *Greenwood, D. M. (2000). Is anybody listening? Individual differences in reactions to performance feedback. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, 5246B. (UMI No. 9949092)
- *Greguras, G. J., & Ford, J. M. (2006). An examination of the multidimensionality of supervisor and subordinate perceptions of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 433–465.
- Hackett, R. D., Farh, J., Song, L. J., & Lapierre, L. M. (2003). LMX and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the links within and across Western and Chinese samples. In G. B. Graen (Ed.), *Dealing with diversity* (A volume in LMX leadership: The series, pp. 219–264). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- *Hepperlen, T. M. (2003). Leader-member exchange (LMX) or fulfillment? The role of basic psychological needs in LMX relationships. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 6128B. (UMI No. 3074080)
- *Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. J. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 170–178.
- *Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 3–21.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ilies, R., Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 561–575.
- *Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 368–384.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765–780.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 36–51.
- *Kamdar, D., & Van Dyne, L. (2004, April). *Easier to help (than voice): Roles, LMX, motives and OCB*. Paper presented at the 19th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131–133.
- Kaufman, J. D., Stamper, C. L., & Tesluk, P. E. (2001). Do supportive organizations make for good corporate citizens? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13, 436–449.
- *Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 135–159.
- *Kraimer, M. L., Wayne, S. J., & Jaworski, R. A. (2001). Sources of support and expatriate performance: The mediating role of expatriate adjustment. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 71–99.
- *Kraus, E. (2003). Personality and job performance: The mediating roles of leader-member exchange quality and action control. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 452B. (UMI No. 3076648)
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131–142.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002) The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 52–65.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 451–465.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43–72.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47–119.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformation and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385–425.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Paine, J. B. (1999). Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salespeople? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27, 396–410.
- *Manogran, P., Stauffer, J., & Conlon, E. J. (1994). Leader-member exchange as a key mediating variable between employee's perceptions of fairness and organizational citizenship behavior. *Best Paper Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management* (pp. 249–253). Briarcliff Manor, New York: Academy of Management.
- *Maslyn, J. M., & Fedor, D. B. (1998). Perceptions of politics: Does measuring different foci matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 645–653.
- Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 697–708.
- *Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738–748.
- Morgeson, F. P. (2005). The external leadership of self-managing teams: Intervening in the context of novel and disruptive events. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 497–508.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475–480.
- *Murphy, P. J., Liden, R. C., & Wayne, S. J. (2003, April). *Interactional justice, group cohesion, and LMX: Combined impacts on outcome*. Poster session presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- *Murphy, S. M. (1998). Organizational justice: An examination of antecedents and consequences. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 4349A. (UMI No. 9815176)

- Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20, 465–478.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157–164.
- *Pierce, H. R. (2001). Employee development as an exchange process: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange and perception of benefit. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 2983B. (UMI No. 3015679)
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351–363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Hui, C. (1993). Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 11, 1–40.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513–563.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698–714.
- *Richins, S. I. (2003). Quid pro quo or quid pro quid? An empirical examination of the currencies of exchange approach to leader-member exchange. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 2428.
- *Robben, M. A. (1999). *A study of the determinants of individual innovative behavior in a high-technology product development organization*. New York: Garland.
- *Schaninger, W. S., Jr. (2002). The workplace social exchange network: An empirical examination. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 669.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Coglisier, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 63–113.
- *Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior—a path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 580–607.
- *Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: The differential effects of perceived organizational support and leader member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219–227.
- *Shalhoop, J. H. (2004). Social-exchange as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and workplace outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 5264B. (UMI No. 3108226)
- *Shull, C. K. (1995). The effects of leader-member exchange relations on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 0568B. (UMI No. 9517484)
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
- *Smith, M. L., Jr. (2003). Reciprocity and social exchange relationships in organizations: Examining why and how individuals contribute to organizational social capital. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 219A. (UMI No. 3078881)
- *Song, L. J., & Law, K. S. (2002, July). *Effects of collectivism and leader-member exchange on contextual performance: A field study*. Paper presented at the 25th International Congress of Applied Psychology (ICAP), Singapore.
- Sparrowe, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 522–552.
- *Sparrowe, R. T., Soetjijto, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. (in press). Do leaders' influence tactics relate to members' helping behavior? It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 269–292.
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 245–251.
- *Suazo, M. M. (2003). An examination of antecedents and consequences of psychological contract breach. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 988A. (UMI No. 3083200)
- *Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 195–207.
- *Tekleab, A. G., & Taylor, M. S. (2003). Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organization-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 585–608.
- *Tierney, P., & Bauer, T. N. (1996). A longitudinal assessment of LMX on extra-role behavior. *Best Paper Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, 298–302.
- *Tierney, P., Bauer, T. N., & Potter, R. E. (2002). Extra-role behavior among Mexican employees: The impact of LMX, group acceptance, and job attitudes. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 292–303.
- *Tierney, P., Farmer, S. M., & Graen, G. B. (1999). An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 591–620.
- *Townsend, J., Phillips, J. S., & Elkins, T. J. (2000). Employee retaliation: The neglected consequence of poor leader-member exchange relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 457–463.
- *Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (2001). An empirical assessment of the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3657A. (UMI No. 9988008)
- *Uhl-Bien, M., & Maslyn, J. M. (2003). Reciprocity in manager-subordinate relationships: Components, configurations, and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 29, 511–532.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L., & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17, 215–285.
- *Van Dyne, L., Jehn, K. A., & Cummings, A. (2002). Differential effects of strain on two forms of work performance: Individual employee sales and creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 57–74.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765–802.
- *Wang, H., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002, April). A structural equation model of leader-member exchange, task and contextual performance, and work outcomes. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Ontario Canada.
- *Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 420–432.
- *Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors—the mediating role of trust in the supervisor and empowerment. *Personnel Review*, 34, 406–422.
- *Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member

- exchange on employee citizenship behavior and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*, 46, 1431–1440.
- *Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader–member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 590–598.
- *Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader–member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82–111.
- *Wech, B. A. (2002). Team–member exchange and trust contexts: Effects on individual level outcome variables beyond the influence of leader–member exchange. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 2486A. (UMI No. 3021460)
- *Whittington, J. L. (1998). An integrative model of transformational leadership and follower behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 3216A. (UMI No. 9804688)
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Received August 11, 2005

Revision received December 7, 2005

Accepted December 12, 2005 ■

Low Publication Prices for APA Members and Affiliates

Keeping you up-to-date. All APA Fellows, Members, Associates, and Student Affiliates receive—as part of their annual dues—subscriptions to the *American Psychologist* and *APA Monitor*. High School Teacher and International Affiliates receive subscriptions to the *APA Monitor*, and they may subscribe to the *American Psychologist* at a significantly reduced rate. In addition, all Members and Student Affiliates are eligible for savings of up to 60% (plus a journal credit) on all other APA journals, as well as significant discounts on subscriptions from cooperating societies and publishers (e.g., the American Association for Counseling and Development, Academic Press, and Human Sciences Press).

Essential resources. APA members and affiliates receive special rates for purchases of APA books, including the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, and on dozens of new topical books each year.

Other benefits of membership. Membership in APA also provides eligibility for competitive insurance plans, continuing education programs, reduced APA convention fees, and specialty divisions.

More information. Write to American Psychological Association, Membership Services, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242.