Relationship of Leaders' Career Anchors with Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Followers

By

Prof. Tripti Singh

July 2007

Please address all your correspondence to:

Prof.Tripti Singh
Organizational Behavior & Human Resources Area
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore
Bannerghatta Road
Bangalore 560 076, India
Phone : 91-80-2699 3102
Email: triptis@iimb.ernet.in

RELATIONSHIP OF LEADERS' CAREER ANCHORS WITH TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR OF FOLLOWERS

Prof. Tripti Singh

Indian Institute of Management Bangalore

triptis@iimb.ernet.in

+91 (80) 26993102 (o)

+91 (0) 9986530171(m)

+91 (80) 26584050 (Fax)

Web: http://www.iimb.ernet.in

Relationship of Leaders' Career Anchors with Transformational Leadership

and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Followers

Abstract

This study explores the relationship of leaders' career anchors with transformational leadership (TL), and the organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) of followers. Technical anchor supervisors are considered transformational. Several leaders' anchors significantly relate to the OCBs of followers. 342-respondents i.e. 114 groups of supervisors, subordinates, and peers participated in this study.

Introduction

Leaders' dispositional characteristics play an important role in building transformational relationship (Bass, 1985). Career anchors are important dispositional variables related to an individual's career. Much research focuses on dispositional variables as antecedents to TL (Ross & Offermann, 1997). Career anchors influence employees' career decisions and shape their orientation towards work. However, relationship of career anchors with TL is missing in research literature. This paper attempts to fill this lacuna by studying the relationship between career anchors of leaders and transformational leadership.

An individual's orientation towards work is likely to influence his/her professional behavior. Competitive advantage of organizations depends largely on the performance of employees beyond their specified duties i.e. OCBs (Organ & Moorman, 1993). Studies have found that career anchors of individuals affect their OCBs

(Fernandes & Premarajan, 2001; Chompookum & Derr, 2002). However, no study has explored how leaders' anchors relate to followers' OCBs. The present study attempts to unearth the same.

Importance of Transformational Leadership

The term TL was first coined by Downtown; however it was only in Burns' (1978) work that it emerged as an important approach to leadership. TL is operationalized to include charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1990). The present study uses the term 'charismatic' and 'transformational' interchangeably.

According to Burns (1978: 4-5), a transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy their higher needs, and engages the full person of the followers. Research studies on TL have repeatedly emphasized the tremendous impact that TL has on followers and organizational performance. House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) found that an individual leader's personality, characteristics and charismatic relationship with the followers influenced both the leader's and the organization's performance. TL influences, both directly and indirectly the followers' performance mediated through their trust and value-congruence (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Posner & Schmidt, 1992). Studies have found that TL positively influences subordinates' satisfaction, motivation, and commitment to the organization (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Judge & Bono, 2000; Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1987; Hater & Bass, 1988).

Sosik (1997) found that groups working under leaders with high-level TL reported high level of perceived performance, extra-effort, and satisfaction with the leader, as compared to groups working with leaders with low levels of TL. Sosik, Avolio,

and Kahai (1997) found that in a Group Decision Support System (GDSS) environment, anonymity increased the positive influence of TL on group potency and group effectiveness. Considering the enormity of influence that TL has on the performance of individuals and groups in an organization, many studies focus on the factors influencing the emergence and effectiveness of TL.

Factors Influencing Transformational Leadership

Bass (1985) discussed organizational and individual personality variables as antecedents to TL. Conger (1999) gave an overview of the evolution of charismatic leadership and TL. He said that the following factors influenced TL: a) Leaders' behaviors and the effect of such behaviors on the followers; b) Followers dispositions and dependency dynamics; c) Contextual factors; d) Institutionalization and succession force; e) The liabilities of charismatic and transformational leaders. I categorize these factors into three groups to discuss them briefly.

Contextual factors: According to House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991), behavioral charisma emerges when leaders with the potential to be charismatic find themselves in organizations or situations that favor its emergence. The value system surrounding the leader, the level of crisis that the leader faces and the development of mass media are some situations that influence emergence of charismatic leadership. The most common position argues that periods of stress and turbulence, situations characterized by high levels of anxiety and uncertainty, intensifying processes of attribution, projection and transference are most conducive for the emergence of charismatic leadership (Conger, 1999; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Popper & Zakkai, 1994).

Emotional intelligence (EI): Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2001) found that EI was an underlying competency of TL. Shivanathan and Fekken (2002) found that followers perceived their leaders who reported higher levels of EI as high in TL and more effective. Results of the study by Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) had similar findings; three aspects of TL i.e. idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration, differed according to the levels of EI, when controlled for attribution style. According to Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) leaders who have a high EI, and are in control of their emotions, are more effective in projecting an impression of being truly transformational, regardless of their intentions or motives.

Behavioral and personality characteristics of leaders: Followers attribute transformational characteristics to some distinguishable behavioral components of leaders. According to Ross and Offermann (1997), an enabling personality profile characterized by pragmatism, encouragement, and acceptance was strongly predictive of high TL ratings. TL ratings significantly related to the need for change, self-confidence, and dominance. Javidan and Waldman (2003) found that the public sector characterized charismatic leaders by factors such as showing energy and determination, vision, creating emotional challenges, encouragement, and willingness to take risks. Crant and Bateman (2000) found that a proactive personality is related positively to the perception of charisma and has an impact on it over and above the influence of the big five personality factors, in-role behavior, and social desirability. Judge and Bono (2000) found that extroversion and agreeableness positively predict TL. Spreitzer and Quinn (1996) found that people consider individuals with high levels of self-esteem, job effect, and social support as being more transformational.

Career anchors are an important dispositional variable based on an individual's self-concept about one's talent, values, and motives. This helps an individual to understand one's career orientation. It also empowers a person to make career choices and decisions consistent with what one truly values and how one sees oneself. Yet, this dispositional variable has never been studied as a likely antecedent to TL. Before exploring the relationship between career anchors and TL, I would like to elaborate a little more on career anchors.

Career Anchors

A career is more than a job, or even a long-term sequence of jobs. It is also more than luck or happen-stance. It has a sense of direction that comes from the individual careerist (Derr, 1986). Career anchors give some direction to an individual's career. A person's career anchor is his or her self-concept, consisting of: a) self-perceived talents and abilities, b) basic values that govern one's work related choices, and c) the evolved sense of motives and needs pertaining to career (Schein, 1996). Anchors are self-concepts and do not necessarily include the individual's actual needs, drives, or talents. One does not really have a career anchor until one has worked for a number of years and has had relevant feedback from those experiences. (DeLong, 1982a). However, once a career anchor evolves, it lives roughly to about ten years after one has started work. It becomes a stabilizing force in the total personality that guides and constrains future career choices (Schein, 2003). Career anchors, which do not take into consideration one's talent, are merely an individual's career orientation. According to Delong (1982a), career anchor is one thing that a person would not give up, if forced to make a choice.

Types of Career Anchors

Schein's original research in the mid-1970s showed that most people's self-concept revolved around five categories reflecting their basic values, motives, and needs. These are: a) Technical or functional anchor; b) General managerial anchor; c) Autonomy or independence anchor; d) Security or stability anchor; e) Entrepreneurial creativity anchor (Schein, 1996). Subsequently he identified three additional anchor categories in 1980s, which were: a) Service or dedication to cause anchor; b) Pure challenge anchor; c) Life-style anchor. Delong (1982a) identified three further career anchors: Identity anchor; Sense of service anchor; Variety anchor.

Derr (1986: 1-2) also identified five career success orientations, which are almost an overlap to Schein's career anchors. Premarajan (2001) found a new anchor called 'duty' in the Indian cultural context. Duty towards others is defined as respecting the wishes of parents while making career and life choices and considering their expectations as most important while making these decisions.

Importance of Career Anchors

Career anchors can be a guiding tool for human resource planning, development activity, and in the decision-making process. In an individual's career, these anchors function as the means of organizing experience, identifying one's area of contribution in the long run, generating criteria for kind of work settings in which one wants to function, and identifying the patterns of ambition and criteria for success, which will help in the process of self assessment (Schein, 1978: 127). According to Jiang, Klein, and Balloun (1995), career anchors are significant because they influence career choices, decisions to move, and also shape career desires. Anchors determine an individual's view of the

future and influence employee reactions to work. Barth (1993) found that Schein's career anchors theory provided a useful and relevant framework for understanding the array of career motivators, and also explained why employees left their jobs.

Career anchors predicting employment duration in an organization: Agarwal, De, and Ferratt (2001) have argued that career anchors, life stage, and competencies of the IT professionals jointly determine preferred employment duration. Employees whose career orientations are compatible with their job setting report low intention of leaving their organization (Iqbaria, Greenhaus, & Parasuraman, 1991; Feldman & Bolino, 2000). Aryee and Leong (1991) found that professional or scientific and managerial career orientations have a significant negative relationship with turnover intentions. Managerial career orientation relates to organization-based performance. Professional or scientific career orientation relates to scientific performance.

Impact of career anchors on individual's goal: Career anchors influence the goals that individuals hope to achieve from self-employment (Feldman & Bolino, 2000). In Miner and Crane's (1981) study, individuals with managerial competence continually sought positions with greater managerial responsibility. Lee and Wong (2003) found that strong security orientation had a significantly negative impact on research scientists' and engineers' (RSEs) intention to set up a business venture. On the other hand, individuals with strong autonomy and managerial anchors were involved in R&D activities and had significantly greater intentions of setting up their own business. Individuals with strong technical and creativity anchors had significantly greater intention of starting business in their own field of technical expertise. Those with stronger managerial anchors had greater intentions of starting a business outside their field of technical expertise than those with

technical anchors. Puryear's (1996) study also found that principals who were considering a career change or were aspiring to a higher position had a lower acceptance of technical competence than those who preferred to continue principal-ship, and that career anchors influenced career decisions of the principals.

Miner and Crane (1981) found that expressed and articulated vocational choices were good predictors of subsequent employment. Individuals, who were strongly motivated to manage, manifested this motivation in their career planning by describing their present and planned work as managerial in nature. They also planned for a greater degree of future change in the direction of managerial work.

Career anchors predicting individual's behavior: Chompookum and Derr (2002) found that individuals with different career orientations showed different levels of OCBs. Individuals with getting-secure orientation showed the highest levels of OCBs, individuals with getting-high and getting-free orientations showed moderate levels of OCBs. Getting-balance oriented individuals showed the lowest levels of OCBs. Fernandes and Premarajan (2001) found a number of significant connections between career anchors and OCBs. Individual initiative relates significantly to getting-balanced, getting-ahead, getting-free, getting-high, ideology, and entrepreneurship. Personal industry, relates significantly to getting-balanced, getting-secure, getting-high, and entrepreneurship. Loyal booster-ism relates to getting-balanced, getting-high, ideology, entrepreneurship, and getting-free anchor. Kumar and Premarajan (2003) found that career anchors moderated the relationship between job characteristics and OCBs. Specifically, individuals with pure-challenge anchor working on high variety tasks

displayed high OCB. Entrepreneurial creativity, challenge, and service scores moderated the relation between job characteristics and OCBs to some extent.

Career anchors are one's self-perceived needs, values and talents (DeLong, 1982a). They guide, constrain, stabilize, and integrate a person's career. They have significant consequences on an individual's career decisions and performance of both in-role and extra-role behavior. Bass (1985) has done an in-depth analysis of the extent of influence of a leader's personality on TL. Proactive personality, achievement orientation, EQ, empathy, self-esteem, and social support are some of the personality and behavioral dispositions that influence perception of charisma (Crant & Bateman, 2000; Pillai, Williams, Lowe, & Jung, 2003; Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001). It is essential to understand the influence of the leader's anchors on TL, and also how TL behavior relates to individual's career anchors.

Leader's Career Anchors and Transformational Leadership

Charismatic leadership may be socialized or personalized. Socialized charismatic leadership is based on egalitarian behavior. It serves collective interests; develops and empowers others. Personalized transformational leaders are pseudo-transformational. They may exhibit many transforming qualities, but in the long run they only cater to their own self-interests (Bass, 1998: 15). The goals of socialized transformational leaders are follower driven; provide individualized consideration to the followers and are developmental and individualistic oriented towards followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1988: 223). From an organizational point of view, socialized transformational leaders represent a force for evolutionary changes that are aligned with the organization's interests, raising the level of consciousness and the ethical aspirations of both the leader and the led. A

study by Krishnan (2001) emphasizes that transformational leader's value collective welfare more than personal welfare. They consider "a world at peace" more important than values like personal happiness, comfortable life, pleasure, social recognition, etc. Similarly, service anchor individuals also place high value on serving humanity, improving certain aspects of society, helping one's nation, etc. indicating that they are more likely to be transformational. Like a truly transformational leader, individuals oriented towards 'service or dedication to a cause' are also value driven. Their career decisions are based on the desire to improve the world in some fashion. Values such as working with people, serving humanity, and helping one's nation can be powerful anchors for these people (Schein, 1993: 45).

According to Conger and Kanungo (1987), charismatic leaders may take high personal risk, incur high costs, and engage in self-sacrifice to achieve a shared vision. Studies prove that leaders who display self-sacrificial behavior and have shared perspectives are considered charismatic. Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) found that followers attributed charisma to a self-sacrificing leader. Cremer and Knippenberg (2002) found that a sacrificing leader was evaluated as being more charismatic than a benefiting leader. Yorges, Weiss, and Strickland (1999) found that sacrificing and benefiting behavior, influenced charisma. Individuals oriented towards 'Service or dedication to a cause', pursue work that achieves something of value, even if it means that they have to change organizations to do so. They even refuse transfers and promotions that would take them out of work, which fulfills their values (Schein, 1993: 78), proving that they are ready to sacrifice other interests in order to pursue work that they value above anything else.

According to Gardner and Cleavenger (1998), exemplification (characterized by displays of personal integrity, a willingness to take risks, making personal sacrifices for the good of the organization or cause, and a propensity to give oneself to help others) correlated positively and significantly with every other transformational factor (idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation). Individuals oriented towards 'Service or dedication to a cause' engaged in work of values may exemplify by making personal sacrifices for the good of the organization.

Popper (2002) found significant positive correlation between narcissism and personalized charismatic leadership and significant negative correlation between narcissism and socialized charismatic leadership. Even though Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) contend that though Machiavellian persons may be perceived as being true transformational leaders, they are only pseudo transformational leaders. This also suggests that 'service or dedication to a cause' oriented individuals, unlike Machiavellians, have socialized goals and are motivated by the desire to serve others - they do not give up their value driven work even if they have to sacrifice their promotion. Such leaders are more likely to be considered as transformational.

Moreover, 'service or dedication to a cause' oriented individuals are likely to earn trust and respect by helping others and improving some aspects of society. They are likely to gain faith by refusing promotions or job changes and continuing to work for their core values (Schein: 1993: 45). Their consistent desire to work for such values may also reflect their positive and true intention. Correspondingly, these individuals are more likely to be considered as transformational. Their sincere efforts to work for a common

good that would benefit the organization may reflect their transformational characteristics (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). One can thus arrive at the following conclusion:

Hypothesis 1a: 'Service or dedication to a cause' anchor scores of leaders would be positively related to TL.

Transformational leaders attempt to raise the needs of the followers and thereby effect positive changes for individuals, groups, and organizations (Bass & Avolio, 1994: 27-28). They induce followers to work towards certain goals that represent the values and the motivations, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers (Burns, 1978:19). Transformational leaders formulate a set of future goals or visions, which are extraordinary and are an embodiment of the dreams and perspectives of the followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1998: 157-158). Through idealized influence and inspirational motivation, transformational leaders spur others to do more than they originally intended to and often even more than they themselves had thought was possible (Bass & Avolio, 1994), thus achieving shared goals of organization, self, and followers.

Individuals with a general managerial anchor are able to make decisions and manage the decision-making process. They are able to think cross functionally and in an integrative manner. These individuals are likely to posses the ability to influence, supervise, handle, control and lead people at all levels in the organization towards organizational goal achievement (Schein, 1993: 31-38). Being able to think cross functionally; influence others and achieve organizational objectives, the general managerial anchor individuals are likely to form a shared vision, which integrates various

perspectives and enables transformational leaders to inspire others towards goal achievement.

As anchors are formed on the basis of real experience and the individual's ability, talent and skills, one can infer that the general managerial anchor individuals will have the ability to identify, analyze, synthesize, and solve problems even under conditions of incomplete information and uncertainty (Schein, 1993: 31-38). Conditions of turbulence and crisis characterized by uncertainty and anxiety are postulated as a favorable environment for the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leaders by a number of authors (Conger, 1999; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Popper & Zakkai, 1994). According to Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leaders are facilitated to the extent that the environment provides situational cues, reinforcers and incentives to guide behavior for specific performance. Exceptional effort, behavior, and sacrifices are required of both the leader and follower. Individuals with managerial career anchor are more likely to be considered charismatic since they will be able to handle uncertainties.

The general managerial anchor individual possesses the capacity to be stimulated by emotional and interpersonal issues and crises rather than be exhausted or debilitated by them. Palmer et al. (2001) suggested that EI might be an underlying competency of transformational leaders. According to Hunt (1996:187), transformational leaders go beyond basic emotions such as fear, jealousy, or greed and strive for ideals and moral values like justice and liberty. Mandell and Pherwani (2003) found that the EI scores of individuals significantly predicted their TL style. Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) have suggested a relationship between components of TL and EI. Several other studies

(Shivanathan & Fekken, 2002; Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002) have found that the components of EI correlate highly with the components of TL. High EI makes the leader effective in providing idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. They have found that those high on EI are perceived as transformational. Through a clear purpose in life, personal efficacy, interpersonal control, and social self-confidence, general managerial anchor individuals are effective in achieving shared goals – both common and extraordinary. According to Gardner and Avolio (1998), leaders who vigorously monitor themselves are more aware of their influence on others. They are able to adjust their behaviors to the demands and challenges of the environmental context. Gardner and Stough (2002) found that the components of understanding emotions (external) and managing emotional were the best predictors of TL. These findings suggest that general managerial anchor individuals, being emotionally competent, are more likely to be transformational leaders. They will be able to take difficult decisions and manage interpersonal relationships, since these individuals posses the emotional maturity to understand and control emotions.

General managerial anchor individuals want to be responsible and accountable for total results and they identify their own work with the success of the organization for which they work (Schein, 1993: 76). Krishnan (2001) found that transformational leaders value 'responsibility' above competency indices like intellect, ambition, cheerfulness and imagination.

Based on the above arguments one can hypothesize as follows:

Hypothesis 1b: 'General managerial' anchor scores of leaders would be positively related to TL.

According to Derr (1986), security anchor individuals are those who bring in a sense of security, not with their expertise or good ideas, but with their undivided loyalty. Psychologically they give comfort by guaranteeing total loyalty and dedicated work—lots of it—in exchange of lifelong employment and a secure career identity, predictable career progression, relatively stable work circumstances, respect and recognition. Security or stability anchor individuals do not want to challenge their status quo and bring about any change; hence they do not have a vision of their own. Transformational leaders on the other hand critically evaluate the existing status quo and then move from the present state to some future state (Conger, 1999). They are considered as the agents of radical change in mature organizations (Conger & Kanungo, 1998: p 8-9; Conger, 1989: 27). These leaders possess a challenging vision and goals that are far ahead of the current realities and thereby fostering change and development.

To the security or stability anchor individuals, job enrichment and job challenge do not matter as much as other intrinsic motivators like pay, working conditions, and benefits (Schein, 1993: 41). These individuals willingly give their employers the responsibility for managing their career. Once they obtain the security they are seeking, they are content to remain at the levels they have attained. They prefer predictable work and are more concerned with the context of the work than the nature of the job itself (Schein, 1993: 41). Security anchor individuals are unimaginative and un-ambitious (Derr, 1986: 81). Eisenbach, Watson, and Pillai (1999), argue that TL literature is primarily related to the capabilities required for enacting change successfully. Most studies postulate and have also found that stress and turbulence, situations characterized by high levels of anxiety and uncertainty, intensifying processes of attribution, projection

and transference are most conducive for the emergence of charismatic leadership (Conger, 1999; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Popper & Zakkai, 1994). According to Schein (1993: 84), fast breaking, rough and tumble situations that need aggressive leadership and quick decisions handicap security-anchored individuals. Since they prefer to work in a stable and predictable environment, they are likely to be unimaginative and also unwilling to take risks and bring about changes. Therefore, they are less likely to be seen as transformational.

Delong (1982b), while developing a scale to measure career anchors found that security anchor had a strong inverse relationship with managerial and variety career orientation. This indicates that security oriented individuals will not only be unwilling to influence, supervise, lead, handle and control people but would also be reluctant to take tough decisions involving risk or responsibility. Therefore, one can hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1c: 'Security' anchor scores of leaders would be negatively related to TL.

Individuals oriented towards technical or functional aspects, are committed to a life of specialization and devalue the concerns of a manager (Schein, 1993: 27). They may not be willing or able to influence others effectively or manage collective goals. They tolerate administrative or managerial work as long as they believe that it is essential to get the job done. However, such work is viewed as painful and necessary rather than as enjoyable or desirable, because it takes them out of the specialties with which they identify (Schein, 1993, 28). This means that these individuals are not likely to get

involved in individualized consideration, inspirational motivation or be willing to take up shared objectives.

Delong (1982b) conducted a study using MBA alumni and tried to determine Schein's five career anchors. A strong conceptual typology emerged from Schein's longitudinal study. The factor analysis showed that managerial orientation displayed a strong negative association with technical competence. This indicates that technical oriented individuals would be unwilling or unskilled to perform managerial oriented jobs. Due to their desire for autonomy, these individuals would not enjoy or be willing to take up the job of encouraging others to collaborate to achieve synergistic outcomes. They would not get involved in motivating people in a problem-solving process. They would be unwilling to communicate the goals to be achieved, facilitate decision-making process, implement decisions, monitor progress, or institute corrective actions. This gives fair evidence to establish the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1d: 'Technical or functional' anchor scores of leaders would be negatively related to TL.

From the discussion above, it follows that career anchors are important antecedent variables for OCBs (Kumar & Premarajan, 2003; Fernandes & Premarajan, 2001; Chompookum & Derr, 2002). OCBs play a significant role in organizational effectiveness. Leaders in turn play a significant role in enhancing OCBs of followers (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). A leader's dispositional characteristics play an important role in building transformational relationship (Bass, 1985). However, the role of a leader's career anchors in enhancing the OCBs of followers is not explored. Here we discuss OCB in brief.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

OCBs denote those organizationally beneficial behaviors and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations, nor elicited by contractual guarantee of recompense (Organ, 1990: 46). Organ later redefined OCB as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place." According to Niehoff (2000), OCBs are clearly observable behaviors. Like other behaviors, they emerge from a motive. They are purposeful rather than "random acts of kindness." Researchers maintain that OCBs stem from two motivational bases: a) disposition or personality and, b) job attitudes (Organ & Ryan, 1995). OCBs reflect an individual's predisposition to be helpful, cooperative, or conscientious (Bolino, 1999). Employees engage in OCBs in order to reciprocate the actions of their organizations.

Types of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000), in a meta-analytic study found that researchers have identified almost thirty different forms of citizenship behaviors. However, there exists conceptual overlap between the constructs; therefore, they grouped these behaviors into seven dimensions: a) Helping tendency; b) Sportsmanship; c) Organizational loyalty; d) Organizational compliance; e) Individual initiative; f) Civic virtue; g) Self-development.

Organ (1988) identified five dimensions of OCBs namely, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Later Podsakoff et al. (1990) developed a scale that showed evidence for the five-factor model.

Importance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

OCBs are discretionary employee behaviors that promote organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). When aggregated over time and people, these behaviors enhance organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et. al, 2000).

According to Organ and Moorman (1993), OCBs may enhance co-workers' productivity through helping behavior. It may enhance managerial productivity through courteous behavior of employees or through civic virtue, as civic virtue positively influences agency effectiveness (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). OCBs free resources for more productive purposes e.g. managerial time and productivity (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002). George and Bettenhausen (1990) found that extra-role performance enhances work group attractiveness and cohesiveness and subsequently decreases voluntary turnover. Helping behaviors and sportsmanship may intensify group morale, cohesiveness and sense of belonging. These behaviors improve the organization's performance and ability to attract and retain the best people, making it a desirable place to work. Employees, by being conscientious and sharing the load of those absent or with heavy workloads, may enhance stability of the work-unit performance. OCBs may also help in improving an organization's ability to adapt to environmental changes (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Empirical research studies have focused on four major categories as the antecedents to OCBs, which are, individual characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. Employee attitudes, dispositions, role perceptions, and demographic variables are sub categories of individual

characteristics (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The present study focuses on personality characteristics of leaders as the antecedent to followers' OCBs.

Leadership Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

According to Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000), leaders play a key role in influencing OCBs. Supportive leader behavior is strongly related to OCBs. Literature evidences the fact that TL behaviors had significant and consistent positive relationships with altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams (1999) also found that TL indirectly influenced OCBs through procedural justice and trust. Densten (2002) examined the relationships between inspirational motivation and extra-effort. Image based inspirational motivation had doubled the direct influence on the extra-effort than concept-based inspirational motivation. Podsakoff et al. (1990) found that the followers' trust in their leaders determined the relationship between TL and OCBs. They found that TL behaviors like articulating vision and high performance expectations, etc. enhanced the followers' trust in the leader, which in turn had a positive effect on followers' OCBs like conscientiousness. Yoon and Suh (2003) found that contract employees' trust in the manager was significantly related to OCBs. Deluga (1994) found that the quality of leader-member relationship (LMX) determined the subordinates' OCBs.

Research by Donaldson, Ensher, and Grant-Vallone (2002) partially supported the hypothesis that protégés in high quality mentoring relationships would display higher levels of citizenship behavior at work than protégés' in low and moderate quality mentoring relationships. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) examined the relationships among three methods of leader monitoring (observation, informal discussion, and formal

meetings), employee perceptions of workplace justice, and employee citizenship behavior. The results indicated that the monitoring method of observation negatively influenced citizenship but also had a positive impact through its influence on perceptions of fairness. Zellars, Tepper, and Duffy (2002) found that the OCBs of subordinates was definitely better and more regular when their supervisors were less abusive. The relationship between abusive supervision and OCBs was stronger among employees who defined OCBs as an 'in-role'.

Leadership behavior influencing the OCBs of the followers is evident; however, no evidence exists to show if the personality disposition of these leaders has any relationship with the follower's OCBs. Considering that personality disposition determines individual's behavior and leaders have significant influence on followers' OCBs, career anchors of leaders may influence followers' OCBs. Therefore, I explore the research question:

1) Is there any relationship between the career anchors of leaders and followers' OCBs?

Methodology

The present chapter describes the modus operandi of the research. For the current study, data was collected through a survey conducted in a large scale 'Telecom' company.

Respondents and Tools Used

The present study measured TL using 20 items from a 45-items multifactor leadership questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Several studies (Garg & Krishnan, 2003; Shivanathan & Fekken, 2002) have revealed a high validity for MLQ - Multifactor

Leadership Questionnaire (1995). Focal subordinates rated their leaders on a five-point Likert scale (1=not at all, 5=frequently).

Career anchors were measured by Premarajan's (2001) scale. Culture plays an important role in determining the anchors of an individual. Premarajan (2001) augmented an existing scale while culturally validating it for the Indian population. The scale has been found significantly reliable in several studies (Kumar & Premarajan, 2003; Rallabandi & Premarajan, 2003). The supervisors self-rated their career anchors.

OCBs were measured using the scale of Podsakoff et al. (1990). This scale considers the five dimensions of the construct given by Organ (1988), and is comprehensive and complete. This study used the multi-source rating method for data collection. Both peers and supervisors of the focal subordinates rated followers' OCBs.

Sample for the Study

I gave the survey questionnaires personally to supervisors and subordinates of executive and managerial grades (138 groups = 414 respondents) of the organization. Each supervisor had at least two subordinates reporting to him/ her. Out of 138 groups, 114 groups responded. The response rate was 82.60%. Responses of 102 groups (89% of the total responses received) were useable. A group's response was considered useable when both the focal subordinate and the supervisor had minimum two years of total work experience, and the group should have worked together for minimum five months. The demographic details of the respondents are given in table No. 1.

Table No. 1 here

Reliabilities of the Scales

Combined ratings of peers and supervisors (204 respondents) were used to measure reliability of OCB scales. Reliability coefficient of OCB scales ranged from 0.59 to 0.85, for career anchor scales from 0.42 to 0.81, and for the TL scale it was 0.85. The cronbach alphas of all the scales are given in Table no. 2 and 3.

Table No. 2 & 3 here

Analysis and Results

After establishing the reliabilities of the scales, supervisors' anchors were correlated with OCBs of followers and transformational leadership, using supervisor and peer ratings of OCBs separately. Pearson's bivariate two-tailed significance correlations were used to test the hypotheses. Causality of relationship was explored using linear regressions. The results showed a number of significant and interesting findings. Technical anchor of leader had positive relation with TL.

OCBs of followers were significantly related to the anchors of the leaders. According to supervisors' ratings of OCBs, managerial and service anchors of leaders were related to conscientious behavior of the followers. Civic virtue was negatively related to stability and duty anchors of leaders, according to both supervisors' and peer ratings of OCBs. Pure challenge anchor and service or dedications to a cause anchor of leaders were positively related to altruistic behavior of the followers, according to both peers' and supervisors' ratings of followers' OCBs. Table No. 1 & 2 present the details of the correlation found along with the mean and standard deviation. Several studies found the relationship between TL and OCBs of followers to be highly significant. TL scores

were also correlated with the OCBs of the followers. Interestingly both the supervisors'
and the peers' ratings of OCBs did not show any correlation with TL.

Regression analysis was done to further explore the relationship. TL scores
(dependent variable) were regressed on the career anchors of leaders. The OCBs of
followers (dependent variables) were regressed on TL scores. No significant relationship
was found.

Discussion

The present study explores the relationship and impact of the career anchors of
leaders with TL. The results show significant findings. Technical anchor of leaders'
significantly relate to TL. Several career anchors of leaders (security anchor, duty anchor,
general managerial anchor and service or dedication to cause anchor) show significant
impact on the different OCBs of followers.

Leader's Anchor and TL

Results show that supervisors' technical anchor is positively related to TL, while
no other anchor is related, though only hypothesized. The positive relationship of
technical anchor is contrary to the hypothesized relationship. The possible explanation for
the contrary findings may be because the followers see technical anchor individuals as
their role models. Their expertise makes them inspirational to the followers. The
respondents of the study are from an organization where the area of expertise is clearly
defined. The expertise and technical know-how of an individual is much valued in the
organization. Therefore, in aspiring to become experts, the subordinates probably
consider technical oriented individuals as their role models and attribute transformational
characteristics to them. In addition, technical anchor individuals, unlike autonomy-

oriented individuals, are willing and anxious to share goal setting with the followers, once they have committed themselves to the organization (Schein, 1993). Therefore, even though the supervisors may not be taking managerial responsibilities, they may inspire the followers by involving them in goal setting.

According to McMurtrey (1997), increase in the technological complexity of work was not a problem for individuals with technical orientation. Their job satisfaction level remained unrelated to the increased complexity of technology. This shows that these individuals, along with their personal power base of expertise, gain respect and admiration as transformational leaders by showing confidence and taking personal risks (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). They are not intimidated by the challenges they face while pursuing their job. Therefore, they may be attributed transformational characteristics.

Bonner (1998) examined how individuals describe their careers when job stability is no longer assumed. The study found an emerging career anchor "Learn to earn," characterized by a pervasive need to build knowledge and skills to offset future job insecurities in the situation of downsizing. This shows that technical expertise becomes important in times of uncertainties. Since the subordinates may aspire to posses similar characteristics, these individuals may seem inspirational.

The results did not show any significant relationship between general managerial anchor and TL as hypothesized. It seems that the perception formed due to organizational culture has its role. Perceptions influence interpretations of others' behavior. Perceptual errors occur in survey research. Different connotations or meanings are possible for the same term in different organizational cultures. For example, in the sentence, 'it is extremely important for me to work in the "inner circle" that makes "key" decisions', the

term 'inner circle' may be interpreted as connoting 'the top officials who are involved in making important decisions in the organization', and therefore acquires a political slant. An individual viewed as being close to the top officials is often considered selfish and ingratiatory in the typical cultural context of the present organization. The goals of such individuals are considered as not contributing to the collective welfare but only for self-fulfillment, which is contradictory to transformational characteristics. Such an individual is considered a leader, only if his or her co-workers and subordinates sufficiently trust the intention of the person. The actual meaning of the term 'working with the core members of the group' i.e. those who take actual decisions and take the responsibility to contribute to the organizational goals can be the other interpretation for the term 'inner circle'. Such individuals want to rise up in the organization to take on higher levels of responsibility, accept opportunities of leadership, and seek opportunities to contribute to the success of the organization. Thus, they are perceived as leaders possessing transformational characteristics. The two-interpretations work in opposite directions in context to TL. As hypothesized a managerial anchor individual may have transformational characteristics, however, some followers may have discounted the TL characteristics of such individuals. Wanting to work in the 'inner circle' may have been interpreted as the characteristics of a selfish ingratiatory person. Thus, no significant relationship of 'managerial anchor' with TL is found.

Bonner (1998) found that the survivors of the downsizing company no longer considered managerial position as obtainable or attractive. The finding supports the results of the current study. No relationship is established between managerial anchor individuals and TL, perhaps because the respondents were from a downsizing company.

The results do not show any significant relationship between TL and service anchor. The prevailing insecure environment may have a role in this. In an insecure environment (where lay off is going on and VRS schemes are being pushed in), the desire for social welfare in an organization is unlikely. Higher needs are considered only when lower needs are fulfilled. People may attribute personal motives even to the sincere efforts made by the 'service or dedication to a cause' anchor individuals to improve the world in some fashion. Therefore, no significant view is established.

In Bonner's (1998) study, a majority of the subjects believed that downsizing changed their career orientation. Therefore, in this environment of insecurity, security oriented individuals may show a mixed reaction. Senior employees who have already enjoyed a secure tenure will feel little less threatened by VRS schemes than the younger security anchored managers. The young managers may start seeking job security in quarters other than their employer. They may join a larger group where they will feel secure by not being singled out or forced, and be assured of job security. Therefore, no significant relationship is found between TL and security anchor. Insecurity handicaps security anchored individuals; they may seek outside support. In the process, they may display leadership qualities by taking initiatives. Therefore, the hypothesized negative relationship is not found significant.

Leader's Anchor and Followers' OCBs

A number of studies have found that the career anchors of leaders significantly influence the OCBs of followers. This also depends on what anchor supervisors are likely to encourage what OCB of their followers. A service anchor leader is likely to enhance conscientiousness in the followers. Being conscientious him/herself, a service anchor

supervisor may want his or her subordinates to show conscientious behavior. The results also point out the differences in the perceptions of supervisors and peers regarding OCBs of followers. Supervisors feel that a managerial anchor relates to the conscientious behavior of subordinates, whereas peers feel differently. According to Chompookum (2001), individuals with the same career anchor may show different OCBs due to the difference in the stage of career. In addition, they found that there is no significant correlation between internal career orientation similarity and perceived OCBs. People's perception of OCBs of followers may also differ due to differences in the perception cues available.

Service anchor and pure challenge anchor leaders encourage altruistic behavior in their subordinates. Being service oriented and desiring to take on challenges, the supervisors assume similar attitudes in their subordinates. As the supervisors themselves want to solve the work problems of other people, they view their subordinates also as helpful and altruistic people. Service anchor individuals by disposition wish to serve others and sacrifice for their cause. Challenge anchor individuals may encourage subordinates to help others since they enjoy finding the solutions to seemingly unsolvable problems. In an uncertain environment, they may get more opportunities to help and encourage their subordinates and others too.

Both peers' and superiors' ratings show that stability and duty anchor supervisors do not view subordinates as showing civic virtue behavior. Because of an unstable environment in the organization, followers desiring security may not show civic virtue behavior. They would merely do what they are told to do, and not get involved in the political process of the organization. The superiors with this anchor may also wish the

same and may not encourage their subordinates to get involved in the larger issues of the organization. They may want their subordinates to just do their work, in order to safeguard their own jobs. Similarly, supervisors with duty orientation may be concerned about job security in these times of uncertainty and downsizing. Therefore, they may not encourage their subordinates to show civic virtue behavior. This may be true for other OCBs too. OCBs are performed to give an impression of being a valuable employee (Bolino, 1999). Due to downsizing, the psychological comfort of having lifetime employment is replaced by a more self-serving perspective (Bonner, 1998).

Implications

The findings suggest that followers perceive transformational characteristics more marked in technical anchor individuals. To enhance TL in organizations, technical anchor individuals shall be preferred. Since these individuals are perceived as inspirational role models, they may lead followers to achieve higher objectives.

Previous studies have shown that TL is related to the OCBs of the followers. However, in the present study, TL and OCBs of followers show no significant relationship. Instead, results show significant relationship of leaders' anchors with the OCBs of the followers. The results succinctly suggest that dispositional variables, and not leadership behavior, relate significantly to followers' OCBs. Further research is required to confirm this deduction. This study offers some lead to organizations for effectively deploying leaders and followers in an uncertain environment.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research

One of the strengths of this study is that the collection of data from multiple sources circumvents spurious relationships emanating from the same source variance

(Deluga, 1995). The results obtained from this study cannot be wholly attributable to common source bias. The strength of the generalizability comes from the fact that managers and subordinates come from various levels in the organization. The average years of experience of the respondents (5 yrs) gives good reflection on the career anchors of the respondents.

While this study provides insights into previously unexplored relationships, several limitations do exist. This is an exploratory study, and the data was collected from one large organization. While different work units are represented, it is possible that a cultural bias is present. Researches show that downsizing affects a host of organizational behavior. Present instability in the participating organization may have influenced the survey. Consequently, the findings are somewhat limited to the participating organization.

Conclusion

The study contributes to literature by exploring the impact and relationship of leaders' career anchors with TL and OCBs of the followers. The results of the study suggest that it is important to consider career anchors of leaders if organizations wish to enhance TL and the OCBs of the followers.

Table 1. Demographic Details of Respondents

N= 204	% of Males	Avg. age	Married	Qualification	Avg. work exp. in org.	Total work experience	Avg. yrs at current job
Supervisors N=102	97.06	45	102	Diploma Engineers,	18	19	5
Subordinates N=102	98.04	41	101	Graduate Engineers, P.G.,	17	19	6
Peers N=102	98.04%	42	102	Doctorate	17	18	5

Table 2. TL, Subordinate's OCBs (Peer ratings), and Supervisor's Career Anchor.

N=101-102	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.TL	3.66	.53	(.85)													
2.Conscientiousness	4.05	.50	.03	(.68)												
3.Sportsmanship	3.54	.69	.11	.22*	(.72)											
4.Civic virtue	3.63	.52	.03	.24*	.07	(.59)										
5.Courtesy	3.83	.57	.10	.32**	.38**	.27**	(.63)									
6.Altruism	3.76	.61	.09	.37**	.36**	.29**	.40**	(.65)								
7.Managerial anchor	3.90	.65	-.01	-.06	-.15	-.04	-.04	-.13	(.44)							
8.Challenge anchor	3.93	.58	.01	.01	.13	-.05	.03	.21*	-.10	(.42)						
9.Autonomy anchor	3.94	.73	-.05	-.15	.16	.13	.09	.11	.13	.14	(.57)					
10.Service anchor	4.11	.56	.13	-.05	-.02	-.04	.08	.17†	25*	-.03	.23*	(.61)				
11.Entrepreneurial anchor	3.97	.59	-.04	-.09	.01	-.15	-.03	.08	.24*	.16	.10	.23*	(.65)			
12.Technical anchor	3.12	1.02	.23*	.07	.08	-.16	-.02	.01	17†	.04	.02	.03	-.00	(.81)		
13.Stability anchor	3.03	.96	-.10	.04	.01	-.19†	.02	.07	-.05	-.05	.04	.04	-.04	.17†	(.81)	
14.Duty anchor	2.75	.82	-.12	-.06	-.08	-.17†	.09	-.04	25*	-.05	-.05	.16	.11	.13	.30**	(.78)

Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha, and Correlation $*= p < .05.$ $** = p < .01.$ $*** = p < .001$

Table 3. TL, Subordinate's OCBs (Supervisor's ratings), and Supervisor's Career Anchor.

N=102	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	3.66	.53	(.85)													
	4.18	.53	.15	(.68)												
	3.86	.63	.07	.24*	(.72)											
	3.63	.52	.03	.00	.05	(.59)										
	3.83	.57	.10	.26**	.01	.27**	(.63)									
	3.76	.61	.09	.25*	-.02	.29**	.40**	(.65)								
	3.90	.65	-.01	.18†	-.04	-.04	-.04	-.13	(.44)							
	3.93	.58	.01	.04	.11	-.05	.03	.21*	-.10	(.42)						
	3.94	.73	-.05	.16	-.02	.13	.09	.11	.13	.14	(.57)					
	4.11	.56	.13	.17†	-.09	-.04	.08	.17†	.25*	-.03	.23*	(.61)				
	3.97	.59	-.04	.11	-.04	-.15	-.03	.08	.24*	.16	.10	.23*	(.65)			
	3.12	1.02	.23*	.07	.02	-.16	-.02	.01	.17†	.04	.02	.03	-.00	(.81)		
	3.03	.96	-.10	.02	.05	-.19†	.02	.07	-.05	-.05	.04	.04	-.04	.17†	(.81)	
	2.75	.82	-.12	.14	.09	-.17†	.09	-.04	.25*	-.05	-.05	.16	.11	.13	.30**	(.78)

Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha, and Correlation $*=p < .05.$ $** = p < .01.$ $*** = p < .001$

References

Agarwal, R., De, P., & Ferratt, T. W. (2001). How long will they stay? Predicting and IT professional's preferred employment duration, *Proceedings of the 2001 ACM Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research, ACM Press,* 132-138.

Aryee, S., & Leong, C. C. (1991). Career orientations and work outcomes among industrial and R&D professionals, *Group & Organization Studies,* 16(2), 193-205.

Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study, *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal,* 21(3), 157-161.

Barth, T. J. (1993). Career anchor theory: A useful framework for federal managers, *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 13(4), 27-43.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations,* The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Inc: New York. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through Transformational leadership,* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks: New Delhi.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Mahwah: New Jersey.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks: New Delhi.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review,* 24(1), 82-88.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the

creation of social capital in organizations, Academy *of Management Review*,

27(4), 505-522.

Bonner, D. J. (1998). *Examining Schein's career anchors in the new workplace: How*

individual survivors of downsizing perceive their careers. Unpublished doctoral

dissertation, George Washington University.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* Harper & Row: New York.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985)

conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 80(4), 468-478.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-

sacrificial leadership: An empirical test, *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 397-421.

Chompookum, D. (2001). *The effect of internal career orientation on impression*

management and perceived organizational citizenship behavior: looking good or

being good? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Utah.

Chompookum, D., & Derr, C. B. (2002). The effects of internal career orientations on

organizational citizenship behavior, Innovating Asian management in the 21st

century, *Third Asia Academy of Management Conference, Bangkok, Thailand.*

Conger, J. A. (1989). *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional*

leadership, Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Fransisco.

Conger, J. A. (1993). Max Weber's conceptualization of charismatic authority: Its

influence on organizational research, *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(3), 277-288.

Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An

insider's perspective on these developing streams of research, *Leadership*

Quarterly, 10(2), 145-179.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic

leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4),

637-647.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in*

organizational effectiveness. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Fransisco, Oxford

(1989).

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organization, "* Sage

Publications: Thousands Oks, London, New Delhi.

Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: the

impact of proactive personality, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 63-75.

Cremer, D. D., & Knippenberg, D. V. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation? The

effects of charisma and procedural fairness, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5),

858-856.

Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of

intentionality in leader-member relationships, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 615-

634.

DeLong, T. J. (1982a). Re-examining the career anchor model, *Personnel*, 3, 50-61.

DeLong, T. J. (1982b). *The career orientations of MBA alumni: A multidimensional*

model In C. L. Cooper (1982), Career issues in human resource management,

Prentice-Hall Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Ch. 4.

Deluga, R. J. (199). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange, and

   organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational

   Psychology*, 67, 315-326.

Densten, L. L. (2002). Clarifying inspirational motivation relationship to extra-effort,

   Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23(1), 40-44.

Derr, C. B. (1986). *Managing the new careerists,* Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco

Donaldson, S. I., Ensher, E. A., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Longitudinal examination

   of mentoring relationships on organizational commitment and citizenship

   behavior. *Journal of Career Development,* 26(4), 233-249.

Eisenbach, R., Watson, K., & Pillai, R. (1999). Transformational leadership in the

   context of organizational change, *Journal of Organizational Change

   Management,* 12(3), 80-88.

Feldman, D. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2000). Career patterns of the self-employed: Career

   motivations and career outcomes, *Journal of Small Business Management,* 38(3),

   53-68.

Fernandes, T. J., & Premarajan, R. K. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior and

   career anchors: An exploratory study, *2001 Business & Economics Society

   International Conference, Paris, France.*

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical

   perspective, *Academy of Management Review,* 23(1), 32-58.

Gardner, W. L., & Cleavenger, D. (1998). The impression management strategies

   associated with transformational leadership at the world-class level: A psycho

   historical assessment, *Management Communication Quarterly,* 12(1), 3-41.

Gardner, W. L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(2), 68-78.

Garg, G. & Krishnan, V. R. (2003). *Transformational leadership and organizational structure: The role of value-based leadership,* In S. Bhargava (Ed.), Transformational leadership: Value-based management for Indian organizations (pp. 82-100), Response Books (Sage Publications): New Delhi.

George, J. R., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75 (6), 698-709.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perception of transformational and transactional leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 695-702.

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.

Hunt, J. G. (1996). *Leadership: A new synthesis,* Sage Publications, Newbury, New Delhi.

Iqbaria, M., Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1991). Career orientations of MIS employees: An empirical analysis, *MIS Quarterly*, 15(2), 151-169.

Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences, *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 229-242.

Jiang, J. J., Klein, G., & Balloun, J. (1995). The diverse career orientations of MIS

personnel, *Computer Personnel*, 11, 3-14.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, E. B. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and

transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation

of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational

leadership, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, (2000), 949-964.

Krishnan, V. R. (2001). Value systems of transformational leaders, *Leadership &*

Organization Development Journal,, 22 (3), 126-131.

Kumar, S. & Premarajan R. K. (2003). The effect of career anchors on the relationship

between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior, *2003*

Business & Economics Society Paper presented B&ESI Conference, San

Francisco, USA.

Lee, S., & Wong, P. (2003). *An exploratory study of technopreneurial intentions: A*

career anchor perspective. [Accessed on 27/05/2003]

http://scte.mgmt.rpi.edu/phanresearch/teernm/D2S1P1.pdf

Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and

transformational leadership style: A gender comparison, *Journal of Business and*

Psychology, 17 (3), 387-404.

McMurtrey, M. E. (1997). *Determinants of job satisfaction among system professionals:*

An empirical study of the impact of CASE tool usage and career orientations.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.

Miner, J. B., & Crane, D. P. (1981). Motivation to manage and the manifestation of a managerial orientation in career planning, *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 626-633.

Niehoff, B. P. (2006). A motive based view of organizational citizenship behaviors: Applying an old lens to a new class of organizational behaviors, http://www.sba.muohio.edu/management/mwAcademy/2000/3c.pdf, [Accessed on 28/01/2006].

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.

Organ, D. W. (1990). *The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior,* In B.M. Staw & L.L Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 43-72, Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Organ, D. W. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Fairness and organizational citizenship behavior: What are the connections? *Social Justice Research*, 6(1), 5-18.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior, *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-803.

Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(1), 5-10.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A. & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fair perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study, *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351-363.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262-270.

Podsakoff, P. M, MacKenzie, S. B, Moorman, R.H, & Fetter, R (1990). Transformational leader behavior and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior, *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

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(3), 513-563.

Popper, M. (2002). Narcissism and attachment patterns of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. Journal of Social and Personal Relationship, 19(6), 797-809.

Popper, M., & Zakkai, E. (1994). Transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: Conditions conducive for their predominance, *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 15(6), 3-7.

Posner, B. Z., and W. H. Schmidt (1992). 'Values and the American manager: An update updated.' *California Management Review,* Spring, 80–95.

Premarajan, R. K. (2001). Cross-cultural validation of a career anchor scale and an initial attempt to augment the scale, *Proceedings of 2001 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington.*

Puryear, P. J. (1996). *Career anchors of North Carolina principals, unpublished doctoral dissertation,* The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Ross, S. M., & Offermann, L.R. (1997). *Transformational leaders: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletien,* 23(10), 1078-1086.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs,* Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Massachusetts.

Schein, E. H. (1993). *Career anchors: Discovering you real values,* Pfeiffer & Company: London, Toronto.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Career anchor revised: Implications for career development in the 21st century, *Academy of Management Executive,* 10(4), 80-88.

Schein, E. H. (2003). "*Career anchors and job or role planning: The links between career planning and career development,*" Ch. 11, [accessed on 24/04/2003]. http://tc.unl.edu/edad/torraco/hrd/pdf/session13/Schein.pdf

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership, *Leadership Quarterly,* 10(2), 257-283.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic

leadership: A self-concept based theory, *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.

Shivanathan, N., & Fekken, G.C. (2002). Emotional intelligence moral reasoning and

transformational leadership, *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*,

23(4), 194-204.

Sosik, J. J. (1997). Effect of transformational leadership and anonymity on idea

generation in computer-mediated groups, *Group & Organization Management*

22(4), 460-487.

Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and

anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system

environment, Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(1), 89-103.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Quinn, R. E. (1996). Empowering middle managers to be

transformational leaders, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(3), 237.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of

performance appraisal processes. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 177-

186.

Yoon, M. H., & Suh, J. (2003). Organizational citizenship behaviors and service quality

as external effectiveness of contact employees. *Journal of Business Research*, 56,

597-611.

Yorges, S. L., Weiss, H. M., & Strickland, O. J. (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on

influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma, *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 84(3), 428-436.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068-1076.