



Research Article

ISSN : 0975-7384
CODEN(USA) : JCPRC5

Impact of working relationship to the leadership behavior performance cognition: Based on the county government

Jiazheng Ma^{1,2}

¹School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, Shanghai, P.R. China

²Shanghai Administration Institute, Shanghai, P.R. China

ABSTRACT

This study use MLQ-5X scale as measurement tools, through empirical research, focus on under the two working relationship "generally superior" and "direct supervisor", subordinates to superior's transformational leadership, transactional leadership behavior and the laissez-faire leadership behaviors cognitive acuity and cognitive results. The SPSS analysis results showed that under the "general superior" relationship, subordinates feel the transformational leadership strongest. Under the "direct superior" relationship, subordinates feel the laissez-faire leadership behavior strongest. Independent samples T-test showed no significant differences in the impact of different working relationship for the performance output perceive subordinates to superiors' transactional leadership behavior. Understanding of the working relationship between the differentiated impacts timely for leaders show leadership skills and enhance leadership behavior affect the effectiveness and ultimate performance with a strong reference value.

Keywords: Leader-Member Relation; performance output; leadership behavior; cognitive

INTRODUCTION

According to social cognitive theory, rational analysis and judgment of the mental state, motives and intention made by the individual to others affected by a number of factors. Such as the external environment, mutual degree of closeness, personal qualities and so on. Therefore, the judgments of different individuals of the same things are often different. Specific to the inside of public organization, the judgment and evaluation made by subordinate to the performance of the behavior of superiors are firstly suffer from the impact of the proximity of the working relationship between subordinates and leaders, that is, whether there is direct mentoring relationship between subordinates and leader's cognition had great influence. This makes working contacts become the most basic and direct way of subordinate and leadership in creating awareness. Within the organization top-down leadership system is the important feature of organization exists. For members of the organization, the significant impact of leaders can be divided into two categories of "direct leadership" and "leadership". Within government agencies is also true, "direct supervisor" and "general superior" form a working relationship between a civil servants and where the levels of government leaders. Whether different working relationship would affect subordinate in the number one leading cognition behavioral ,direct impact on leadership behavior issue whether the party's conduct characterization affiliated party has been effectively receive, and this effectively receive play an effective role for the leadership behavior great significance.

2. The formulation and implementation of survey program

This study based on where there are differences in the different working relationship, under the cognition levels of government leaders' behavior, conducted a questionnaire survey, used SPSS software for statistical analysis, and analyzed the difference and the degree between the actual performance.

2.1 Variable measurement

Learn from the relevant literature, in this study, mainly related to two research variables, "working relationship" with the leadership behavior. We asked respondents to judge, *mutatis mutandis*, the description of the questions in the questionnaire according to the actual situation. The one whose job title is levels of government leaders completed the questionnaire to their own leaders before; the one whose job title is work duties as a non-civil service leaders completed the questionnaire to current leaders.

"Working relationship", refers to the relationship between leaders and respondents in their daily work. Divided into "direct supervisor" and "general superior" two categories. When the two meet one of the following descriptions, number one is considered to be the direct supervisor of the respondents.

- "He/ she will be directly assigned me the task, supervise and guide my work".

- "He/ she will be associated with the work I am responsible and make specific comments or recommendations".

- "Although he/ she does not directly give me assignments, but some of my work progress still need to report to him/ her.

The contrary, is considered to be "generally superior".

For leadership behavior, we based on the mainstream theory in the field of leadership behavior - transformational leadership theory, leadership behavioral variables are divided into the three dimensions of transformational leadership, transactional leadership behavior and laissez-faire leadership behavior, and to match with three types of behavioral measures and MLQ-5X scale academic widely recognized as a tool of variables measured. The part of the questionnaire consists of 36 questions, in the form of "Likert Scale".

2.2 Sample selection and sample results

In order to make the findings point to more prominent, more focused the final scope of the investigation is limited in county government; Gansu province counties conducted a questionnaire survey. In order to facilitate the acquisition of the survey data, we have chosen to take part in collective training institutions of the Gansu Provincial Party School, Lanzhou Municipal Party School, Lanzhou University School of Management county leadership cadre training, Lanzhou University, School of Economics, county leading cadres training courses in Gansu Province the civil service of the county government conducted the survey. The survey obtained a total of 304 supported by civil servants, mainly related to the 16 counties/ districts, remove the answers were more vacancies and answers invalid questionnaires, the last valid questionnaires are 216, the effective rate was 71.1%. Samples of basic information shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Sample Basic information

Variable	Categories	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	142	65.7
	Female	74	34.3
Age	Under 30	60	27.8
	31-40 years	77	35.6
	41-49 years	62	28.7
	Over 50	17	7.9
Length of service	less than 5 years	39	18.1
	6-10 years	28	13.0
	11 -19 years	61	28.2
	More than 20 years	88	40.7
Educational background	Below college	29	13.4
	National Education undergraduate	102	47.2

From the statistical information of the sample, we can see the survey data in all types of distributed fairly evenly, there was no over-concentration. Thus, the representative ness of the survey data is well.

3. The survey results and statistical analysis

3.1 The validity and reliability of the data

In order to ensure the accuracy of the findings, we first recovered data validity, reliability test. Through factor analysis we examined the construct validity of the data. As to factor analysis, we first scale KMO and Bartlett's sphericity test. The test results show that the scale KMO value of 0.862 (greater than 0.5), Bartlett's sphericity test significance level of less than 0.001, and therefore data can be considered suitable for factor analysis. Subsequent factor analysis showed that the questionnaire the lowest standardized factor loading of 0.518, in line with the basic requirements of metrology, indicating that the data has good construct validity, can be used in the follow-up study.

Reliability analysis showed that the questionnaire overall Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.864, reach minimum total scale reliability coefficient 0.8 requirements. The split-half reliability coefficient was 0.869, reached a higher value. So overall, the reliability and validity of the data obtained from this survey are available for later analysis.

3.2 Relationships between results

Make sure the data reliability, validity, we subtotals the respondents to leaders of their work, the statistics show that the number one judged to be "direct supervisor" 92, total 42.6% of the respondents, the number one judged to be "general superior" 124 points, accounting for 57.4% of the total respondents. The statistical results of working relationship shown in Table2.

Table2 The statistical results of working relationship

Working relationship	Number	Proportion
Direct supervisor	92	42.6
An indirect superior	124	57.4

3.3 Leadership behavior judgment result

We will characterize the score of the same type of leadership behavior dimension of the problem, make the arithmetic average, resulting in a single sample in each leadership behavior dimensions of the final score, specific statistical results shown in Table 3. The statistical results showed that the three types of leadership behavior in a number one on leadership behavior are reflected. From the mean score and the plural, the respondents judged the number one leadership behavior, leader's transformational leadership endorsed higher than that endorsed by the leaders of the other two types of leadership behavior.

Table 3 Leaders leadership behavior statistics

Category	Mean	Plural
Transformational leadership	3.5250	4.00
Transactional leadership	3.3812	3.33
Laissez-faire leadership	3.2060	3.00

In accordance with the high proportion of what kind of leadership behavior will be number one for the benefit of the standard of what kind of leader further classified on the statistical results, the attribution of the number one type of leadership can be obtained, in the eyes of the recipient, number one biased in favor of what type of leadership. Type of leadership shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Type of leadership

The type of leadership	Frequency	Percentage
Transformational Leadership	105	48.6
Transactional Leadership	48	22.2
Laissez-faire leadership	63	29.2
Total	216	100

The above table shows that 48.6% of the number one is determined to be a transformational leadership, the highest proportion; 29.2% of the number one is determined to laissez-faire leadership, followed by specific gravity; 22.2% of the number one is judged to be transactional leadership, the lowest proportion.

3.4 The working relationship between leadership behaviors cognition

3.4.1 Transformational leadership dimension

We used T-test to determine whether the working relationship between the difference in perception of leadership behavior had a significant effect under two working relationship, respondents leaders transformational leadership behavior cognitive outcomes. The specific test results are as follows.

According to the test results, the working relationship between the perception of transformational leadership have a significant effect ($t = 2.317$, $p < 0.05$). "Direct superior" and "general superior" relationship respondents perceived leader's transformational leadership role is very clear. Combined with cross-analysis results shown in Table 5. We can further see, when the leaders as subordinates "general superior" subordinate leaders transformational leadership perception clearer, seven percentage points higher than the direct supervisor relationship. In other words, the more "general superior" relationship, the subordinate leader transformational leadership more sensitive, the higher the degree of effective reception signal that type of behavior.

Table 5 Working relationship with the type of leadership to determine the cross-Analysis

			Total leadership type			Total
			Transformational leadership	Transactional leadership	laissez-faire leadership	
working relationship	Direct higher	Number	41	20	31	92
		Percentage	44.6%	21.7%	33.7%	100.0%
	Generally higher	Number	64	28	32	124
		Percentage	51.6%	22.6%	25.8%	100.0%

3.4.2 Transactional leadership behavior dimension

We used T-test to test two working relationship, respondents were also leaders transactional leadership behavior cognitive results of the independent samples. The test results are as follows. According to the test result of different working relationship between the perceptions of transactional leadership behavior had no significant effect ($p > 0.05$). "direct superior" and "general superior" relationship respondent's perceived leader's transactional leadership behavior had no significant effect. Combined cross analysis results, we can further see, when leaders as subordinates "general superior" subordinate leaders' transactional leadership behavior perception and perceived percentage of the direct supervisor relationship is very close, there is no obvious of the type.

3.4.3 Laissez-faire leadership behavior dimension

Finally, we used T-test to test two working relationship, respondents leaders laissez-faire leadership behavior cognitive results were independent, the test results are as follows. According to the results, the working relationship between the perception of the laissez-faire leadership behavior have a significant effect ($t = 1.997$, $p < 0.05$). "Direct superior" and "general superior" relationship respondents perceived number one role is very clear laissez-faire leadership behavior. Combined with cross-analysis results, we are able to see further, when the number one under the "direct superior, subordinate leaders laissez-faire leadership behavior perception clearer, higher than the direct supervisor relationship eight percentage points. In other words, the relationship between the more direct supervisor, subordinate laissez-faire leadership behavior for the leader of the more sensitive, the higher the degree of effective reception signal that type of behavior.

CONCLUSION

From the survey results it shows that: the working relationship between superiors and subordinates there are obvious affecting the transformational and laissez-faire leadership behavior cognition on superiors, no significant effect on cognition of transactional leadership. Such a situation is resulted from different working relationship and the density of the differences between leaders and subordinates.

From the leader - member exchange theory as the threshold, we can more clearly understand the causes of this situation. Leader - member exchange theory origin of the assumptions that differences in the interaction between the leader and subordinate are individual. The theory is found that the leader is not an average, the same pattern and treats all subordinates, will form a specific relationship between the leader and any subordinate. Leader in the performance of each relationship are not the same, his subordinates care or concern is always higher than the others affiliated with his subordinates relationship is always better than with some more intimate. Through research, the theory of the interaction between the leaders with a single subordinate divided to two categories: outsider relations and insiders. The more insiders, the leader in understanding the more figurative, on the contrary, the more abstract; more insiders, the leaders - members of the higher the degree of interactive exchange.

Relying on this theory, we can find that the difference in the working relationship between the superiors and subordinates is actually a direct impact on the content and methods of social exchange between leaders and subordinates. Leaders and subordinates as "generally superior" relationship, the leaders of subordinates often through speech, to create a sense of atmosphere and so inspiring ways to achieve, basically there is no direct or face-to-face communication. The subordinate cognizes his leader's leadership style more through long-range observation or reference from others, subordinate become the member of "insiders" just by chance. The degree of

exchange between leader and members is relatively low. Under this working relationship, subordinate's cognition of his leaders often tend to be conceptualization. The macro leadership style, such as charisma, vision incentive, would have a relatively deep impression.

When the leaders and subordinate is in the direct supervisor relationship, the leadership on subordinates is usually through direct face-to-face communication channels to achieve. The subordinate knows his leader's leadership style by specific tasks or events, as well as a close look. Subordinate is easy to become "insiders", but also greatly enhance the degree of leader - member exchange is relatively high. Under this working relationship, subordinates' perceptions of leaders are more specific and detailed, especially when leader gives them reward and care, even leader's insufficiencies, such as delays in decision-making, to evade responsibility belong to laissez-faire leadership behavior, will get a relatively clear impression. Therefore, the leadership behavior of concrete elements, such as transactional and laissez-faire leadership behavior, when the working relationship between leaders and subordinates is "generally superior", due to the direct contact between each other and exchange few, subordinates often difficult to detect this two types of leadership behavior elements, but clearer perception of transformational leadership behavior of some elements, such as charisma, vision incentive.

Therefore, as a leader, should recognize this difference affect by the working relationship and pay attention to their behavior under different working relationship with subordinates. Transformational leadership theory research results show that only transformational and transactional leadership can enhance the subordinate's job satisfaction, subordinate trust, organizational commitment and organizational performance output. And laissez-faire leadership behavior has a weakening effect on the above-mentioned elements. Therefore, to highlight leadership, the proper guidance from leader to subordinate needs to be based on different working relationship. Leader should choose behavior according to the subordinate's differentiated. So as to achieve efficient leading authority, then forward operation of the organization and performance.

In summary, this study analysis of superior-subordinate working relationship between the difference in the cognition aspects of leadership behavior, but the survey still has some shortcomings. First, the survey is not wide enough range, involves only a part of the counties of Gansu Province. In the future, we should expand the coverage of the study sample. Secondly, the division of leadership behavior tends to academic, not specific enough. We should further refine the leadership behavior type according to actual government work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Trottier, T., Van Wart, M. Wang, *Public Administration Review*, **2012**, 68(6), 1172 – 1174.
- [2] Baron R M, Kenny D A. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **1986**, 51: 1173-1182.
- [3] Northouse, P. G. *Leadership theory and practice (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, **2008**.
- [4] Bass, B. M. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press, **1985**.
- [5] Muterera, J. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Western Michigan University, **2012**.
- [6] Nyhan, R. C., Marlowe, H. A. *Evaluation Review*, **1997**, 21, 614-635.
- [7] Quinn, R. *Beyond rational manage*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, **1988**.
- [8] Serva, Fuller, Mayer. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **2011**, 26, 625-648.
- [9] Van Wart, M. *Public Administration Review*, **2007**, 63(2): 214-228.
- [10] Boyne, G. A. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **2010**, 13(3), 367-394.