

ONLINE APPENDIX to accompany

Avanzi, Albertini, Fraccaroli, Sarchellig, De Plato and van Dick: EXPLORING IDENTITY' DYNAMICS FROM A COMBINED SOCIAL EXCHANGE AND SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE. *International Public Management Journal*.

Marker tests to assess for common method bias

Of the possible relations, there was no significant correlation between supervisor trust and unit identification ($r = .08, p > .05$) – we are therefore not concerned about common method variance here. For the other relationships, we followed Lindle and Whitney's (2001) procedures for assessing method variance. In particular, we selected post hoc an "ideal" marker variable, that is a variable theoretically unrelated to both independent and dependent substantive variables (Richardson et al. 2009), and with the smallest positive correlation with the main variables in our data set (Jacobsen and Jensen 2015). We selected the variable "having ideas" (Massei and Zappalà 2009), that represent the individual propensity to generate original ideas (individual innovation). This variable consists of three items with responses given on a four-point scale, ranging from "never" (1) to "always" (4) (an example item is: "How often do you... get ideas on how to improve things"). This variable is theoretically unrelated to both organizational and unit identification as well as supervisor trust. Indeed, the individual propensity to get new ideas is mainly related to the personal ability (and personality) and to contextual factors such as job control (Frese et al. 1999). Supervisor trust and identification could be important in relation to innovation by their contributions to a positive climate for innovation (Frese et al. 1999; Lipponen et al. 2008). But these variables are not related to "having ideas" as outlined by Frese and colleagues: "A worker can have ideas regardless of whether or not the external environment is conducive but he or she will not submit them if the environment is not seen as supportive" (1999, 1141). Consistently, the correlation of this variable with both independent and dependent variables was non-significant (r 's = .08, .10, and .06, all p 's > .05, respectively for organizational identification, unit identification, and supervisor trust). Following Lindle and Whitney's method (2001), we run a partial correlation adjustment to "remove" the correlation accounted for by common method variance. In our sample, all significant correlations among the substantive variables remained significant after the adjustment.