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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a critical review of the available literature published in journals, proceedings, books, websites etc. The emphasis is on the topics related to the study namely, Organizational Commitment, Leadership Effectiveness, Organizational Stress and Personality Dispositions. The literature related to these variables are exhaustive, an attempt has been made to show how the variables of the study were found to be highly interrelated and is reliant on several Organizational Factors.

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

In today's neck-to-neck racing business environment and service dominated organizational environment, committed employees are considered as the foundations of the business from both the management and customers' perspectives. In such organizations, the employees' service orientation, work talent, creativity, innovativeness, and that drive keep the customers intact and the firm's business flourish. Organizational Commitment, which, is the relative strength of an employee’s attachment or involvement with the organization where he or she is employed (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974). Hence studying Organizational Commitment is important because employees are the real assets of an organization and employee’s commitment reflects the employee’s perception of the top management and its HR policies. Besides committed employees are less likely to leave for another job and are more likely to perform at higher levels. The research works on Organizational Commitment and employee related factors are exhaustive. For example, according to Morrow (1993) and Meyer and Allen, (1997), organizational
commitment is a “multidimensional construct” that has the potential to predict organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover, absenteeism, tenure and organizational goals.

Loui (1995) in a study involving 109 workers examined the relationship between the broad construct of organizational commitment and the outcome measures of supervisory trust, job involvement and job satisfaction. In all three areas, positive relationships were with organizational commitment. Especially, perceived trust in the supervisor, an ability to be involved with the job, and feelings of job satisfaction were major determinants of organizational commitment.

Birdi, Allan and Warr (1997) showed that overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significantly associated with prior participation in required training courses and work-based development activity.

Angle and Perry (1991) undertook a study to determine the effect that organizational commitment had on turnover. The participants included 1,244 bus drivers. Findings revealed a negative relationship between turnover and organizational commitment.

Wiener and Vardi (1980) looked at the effect that organizational commitment had on commitment to the job and career commitment. Their participants included 56 insurance agents and 85 staff professionals. The researchers reported positive relationships between organizational commitment and the two other types of commitment.

Jermier and Berkes (1979) collected data on organizational commitment from over 800 police officers. The researchers were investigating the relationship between job
satisfaction and organizational commitment. Findings revealed that employees who were more satisfied with their job had higher levels of organizational commitment.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) undertook a study of 367 managers and their employees. The researchers examined the relationship between organizational commitment and the outcome measures of individual motivation, desire to leave, turnover, and job performance. Organizational commitment was found to be a strong predictor for each of these outcome areas.

It may be summarized that, organizational commitment is considered a useful measure of organizational effectiveness (Steers, 1975). However as Beck and Wilson (2001) notes it is very important to identify factors on which organizational commitment is dependent. Although a great deal has been written about organizational commitment, still there is no clear understanding on how the factors purported to be associated with it contribute to its development or how these organizational factors can be managed to promote the development of organizational commitment especially the perception of the ownership control seem to be scant. Though Meyer and Allen (1997) notes that human resources management practices, leadership styles and trust within the organization are some of the organizational factors that have been associated with organizational commitment.

According to Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974), concern an individual's identification with the goals and values of an organization. Porter and associates believe that individuals tend to show emotional attachment or loyalty to their organization and get actively involved in its affairs because they have accepted its values and goals. On the other hand, other scholars (Becker, 1960) suggest a cost based commitment, where an
individual assesses the perceived 'gains' associated with continued membership of an organization and the perceived 'costs' associated with leaving and the ultimate decision (leaving or staying) is made based on its comparative advantage. Hall and Schneider (1972) consider both identification and involvement as forming the basis of moral attachment to the organization. Thus organizational commitment is that committed individuals do possess four common characteristics: (1) internalisation of the goals and values of the organization, (2) involvement in an organization role in the context of these goals and values, (3) desire to remain in the organization over an extended period of time in order to serve its goals and values, and (4) willingness to exert effort in the interest of the organization's goals and values apart from the instrumentality of this effort for the attainment of the individual's goals (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987). Therefore, committed employees are likely to take pride in organizational membership, believe in the goals and values of the organization, create strong emotional bondage with their organization, show up on their work regularly, and exhibit higher levels of performance and productivity.

Walker Information (2001) conducted a research how does employee / organizational commitment changes in the era of globalization. The Walker Information Global Network's Survey Report suggests, "Employee commitment is the single greatest conduit, or barrier, to full-scale globalisation" (Walker Information, 2001). But Morrow (1993) and Steers (1977) propose further research that has to be conducted in different cultures and organizational setup. According to Morrow (1993) organizational commitment still remains to be a very argumentative organizational construct. After reviewing 29 commitment studies, Morrow concluded as, 'Commitment has consumed an inordinate amount of researchers' attention without a commensurate increase in
understanding of its fundamental nature. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) emphasizes that organizational commitment needs to be understood across divergent cultures, samples and demographics. According to Kassahun (2005) there is a dearth of empirical research regarding organizational commitment in developing environment like India.

One aspect of commitment and its effects which has been reviewed in depth is the level of Employee Commitment. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and DeCotiis and Summers (1987) committed employees are more likely to perform better for their organization than less committed ones and be more productive and more satisfied than their less committed counterparts. Fully committed workers are willing to go the extra mile to get the job done and often serve as role models for their peers (Walker Information, 2001). Further, a growing body of behavioural research also shows that employee commitment is strongly and negatively correlated with withdrawal behaviours such as employee turnover, absenteeism and tardiness (Morrow, 1993; Steers, 1977). Thus, the availability of the truly committed employees constitutes assets.

According to the Walker Information (2001) only 34% of the world's employees are "Truly Loyal" to their employers. These Truly Loyal employees are the most desired employees. They feel a deep attachment to their organizations, want to be there, and plan to stay for at least another two years. The same report reveals that all across the world, employees are showing a general inability to commit. This pattern is consistent throughout the world, with Latin America posting relatively highest level of employee commitment, and Australia and Europe the lowest. India was ranked in the 10th position among the countries with the most Truly Loyal employees whereas Australian and European came out at the bottom, ranking the lowest of all regions studied.
A newspaper reports on the Indian Scenario states that less than 30% of employees in India are truly engaged and attached to their organizations (Hindustan Times, 2003).

While examining the antecedents of Organizational Commitment empirical studies on organizational commitment have identified several variables that are considered as either its correlates or possible predictors (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Steers, 1977). For example, Steers (1977) has grouped several correlates of organizational commitment into two major categories of antecedent Variables and labelled them as personal characteristics and situational attributes. Personal characteristics are defined as individual-based variables such as age, sex, education, and so forth. The situation category includes organizationally mediated variables such as the structural properties of the organization and human resource practices.

The most commonly studied personal characteristics include age, education, organizational tenure, and occupational level. Thus study has also committed itself to investigate the effects of these personal characteristics on organizational commitment. Among the demographic variables, employee age has consistently showed positive correlation with commitment. For example, studies (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Balaji, 1986; Steers, 1977) indicated that organizational commitment was found to be positively and significantly correlated with age. Similarly, in a meta-analytic review, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found a positively significant correlation between age and commitment. In addition, Allen and Meyer (1993) reported a positive mean correlation of 0.36 (p<.05) between age and organizational commitment.
Another personal variable closely related to age is tenure. Studies (Cohen, 1993; Balaji, 1986) found that organizational commitment was directly associated with length of service in organization. Particularly, Cohen (1993) reported that the correlation and commitment was greater among the more senior employees (i.e. those with more than nine years of experience). In another slightly different study, Meyer and Allen (1993) reported that analysis of organizational tenure generally showed a mild curvilinear relationship whereby middle-tenure employees possessed less measured commitment than new or senior level (by age) employees. In their subsequent analysis, Meyer and Allen (1997) observed, that employees need to acquire a certain amount of experience with an organization to become strongly attached to it, or that long-service employees retrospectively develop affective attachment to their organization.

Researches on levels of Organizational Commitment showed that as age and tenure of employees increase in the organization, employees' opportunities for alternative employment elsewhere diminishes, with the result that the employees may become more attached to their organization. In a study that included 290 non-managerial personnel (clerks, nurses, secretaries, radiologists, and cardiopulmonary specialists), Gregerson (1993) also found a positive correlation between the length of service in the organization and organizational commitment. In general, there seems to be a modest support in the literature for the notion that there is direct (though not necessarily linear) association between age, tenure, and organizational commitment. The explanation advanced so far for the age-tenure-commitment relationship has been that as an employee gets older and invests more in the organization in terms of energy and other resources (side-bets), his propensity to leave the current organization diminishes. As a result, the individual
perceives the present organization to be attractive and hence gets committed to it strongly. On the other hand, research evidence has repeatedly indicated that, of the personal characteristics, education has been found to be inversely related to commitment (Steers, 1977; Angle & Perry, 1981).

Balaji (1986) suggests that professionally trained employees are less committed to their organization than those without professional training. The inverse relationship is attributed to the difficulty faced by organizations in providing sufficient rewards (as perceived by employees) to equalise the exchange, when employees have higher levels of education. In other words, the more individuals learn the higher they are likely to place demands on organizations in terms of compensation and improved conditions. When their demands are not met, the employees may show resentment towards management and become less loyal to the organization. Further, highly educated employees can be clearer about their long-range interests, with the result that they are ready to quit the organization for better prospects elsewhere. These employees are likely to be less committed to their organization, but more committed to their profession. Previous studies have also found a positive relationship between job level and organizational commitment (Balaji, 1986).

The findings of Balaji's (1986) study indicated that those in senior and top management levels were found to express stronger organizational commitment than those at the junior and middle management levels. Thus, there is well established evidence that organizational commitment is stronger among those at the higher organizational hierarchy or status than those at lower levels of organizational hierarchy. Several reasons have been suggested for such results. Firstly, for those at higher levels, the scope of their
jobs is likely to be wider, thereby increasing challenge. Job scope has been found to be positively related to organizational commitment in previous research (Steers, 1977; Buchanan, 1974). Secondly, those at higher levels may have made greater investments in their jobs. Becker's Side-bet Theory (1960) suggests that increased investments may lead to stronger organizational commitment. Thirdly, those at higher levels in the management may have a wider cognitive map of the organization. Hence, their organizational commitment may be stronger. Fourthly, those at higher levels may have been associated with the organization longer and developed a feeling of belongingness or Organizational Practices and Organizational Commitment Organizational practices refer to the ways things get done in organizations and organizational climatic conditions. These are alternatively called as human resource processes and organizational climate variables (Decotiis & Summers, 1987).

The most important of organizational climate variables include work autonomy, competence development, organizational support and organizational justice (Lawler, 1986; Sheppard, Lewicki & Minton, 1992).

Specifically, Lawler (1986) suggests that some organizational processes (e.g., empowerment, competence development and reward) may influence work-related attitudes and behaviours. Studies indicate that not only work-related outcomes (e.g. rewards) but also the procedures or "means" through which "ends" are distributed play a key role in determining organizational commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Autonomy is recognised as a salient factor in the study of organizational commitment. Colarelli, Dean and Konstans (1987) defined autonomy as a construct that permits employees to use fully their "talents and ingenuity," and as a construct that
causes employees to assume personal responsibility for work. Their study results yielded a positive correlation between organizational commitment and autonomy. They also indicated that the lack of autonomy and the use of close supervision in organizations result in diminished performance and employee stress. In the view of Hart and Willower (1994), if management only emphasizes discipline, authority, and control, commitment to the organization will be eroded, or it simply will not develop in the first place. A study conducted by Mathiew and Zaajac (1990) revealed that organizational commitment and autonomy are positively related. They further noted that reasonable autonomy creates an organizational climate where organizational commitment can be nurtured and developed. Agarwal and Ferrat (1999) on their part suggest that organizations can promote motivation and commitment among their employees if they are able to create conditions that empower employees to take increasing responsibilities for their work and for decision making process. Durham, Grube, and Castaneda (1994) presented further evidence in support of the trend for positive correlation between organizational commitment and autonomy. In general, the above viewpoints suggest that creating a sense of empowerment and freedom on the job on the part of employees is likely to engender their emotional attachment to their organization.

Similarly, competence development was found to have a direct and positive effect on organizational commitment. According to Meyer (2001), Organizations are required to take-care of developing the capabilities of their staff right from the start of their joining the organization if they are to enhance their commitment and get the benefit from their untapped potential. One way in which organizations promote employees' initial propensity for commitment is through Induction Programme. Studies related to Induction
Programme consistently revealed that there is a strong association between socialisation process and organisational commitment (Jones, 1986). Dessler (2001) forwarded that steeping the new employees in the values and culture was also strongly associated with organizational commitment. Moreover, showing organizational concern for building employee (or managerial) competence through training opportunities was also found to gain strong commitment from employees (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989). These researchers found that commitment tended to be related to employees' perceptions of organizational efforts to provide them with training. Competence development practices (e.g., job rotation programmes, mentoring, and training) convey to employees that the organization considers human resources to be a competitive advantage (Schwochau, Delaney, Jarely & Fiorito, 1997) and it is seeking to establish a long term relationship with them (Agarwal & Ferratt, 1999). This will have a direct impact on organizational commitment (Agarwal & Ferratt, 1999). Meyer (2001) also reported that successful training experience could contribute to the development of organizational commitment.

According to Morello and Claps (2000); Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Hite (1995), training, coaching, job rotation programmes, and opportunities for experimentation also send a clear message that management is seeking to establish a long-term relationship and a relational contract with employees. In order to make such practices to be really effective, managers must help employees shape and direct their careers, so that they can gain experience within the enterprise rather than outside it.

Researchers have also discovered a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mottaz, 1988). Perceived organizational support was defined as "the extent to which
employees perceived that the organization valued their contribution and cared about their well-being" (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). The support that is provided by the organization is directly related to employees’ commitment. Employees exchange commitment to the organization for greater care, concern, and support from the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington & Sava, 1986). Similarly, DeCotiis and Summers (1987) reported that when employees were treated with consideration, they displayed greater levels of commitment. In another study, Taormina (1999) found that 'organizational understanding' was significantly and positively related to all of the components of organizational commitment (viz., affective, continuance, and normative commitment). It has also been reported that the extent to which management is perceived as receptive to employee ideas and its efforts to solve employee problems is positively associated with organizational commitment (Iversion & Buttigie, 1999). Shore and Wayne (1993) concluded that organizational support was an important factor with respect to organizational commitment.

Studies have also linked organizational commitment with perceived organizational justice or fairness. More specifically, research evidence reveals that developing a sense of justice on employees can engender employee commitment. Derived from the fields of law and political science, organizational behaviourists distinguish between two common forms of justice, i.e. distributive and procedural justice (Folger, 1977). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of various job outcomes including compensation conditions, performance evaluations, promotions, and job assignments. When employees are evaluating if an outcome is appropriate or fair, they are making a distributive justice decision (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Employees’
feelings of inequity (unfairness) are associated with dissatisfaction and low level of commitment (Brief, 1998). Procedural justice relates to the perceived fairness of the means, rules and/or procedures used to assign jobs, rewards, and performance evaluation criteria (Folger, 1977). The concern for how employee outcomes are determined rather than what outcomes are received defines procedural justice. Research on procedural justice has been examined in a variety of settings such as performance appraisals (Greenberg, 1986), employee layoffs (Brockner & Greenberg, 1990), and equity in promotional opportunities (Taormina, 1999). As a whole, these studies have found that people perceive the process as fairer when they are given a "voice" in the process versus a "mute" condition when they are not allowed input (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). This research has shown that procedural justice plays a key role in determining employees' attitude to their management and their commitment to their organization (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Further, studies indicate that the more organizational staff members perceive high levels of distributive and procedural justice reflected in an organization, the more it is likely that employees get attached to the organization's goals and values, and the less they intend to quit the organization (Folger, 1977). Fair treatment by employers connotes that they value employees and care about their well-being and reinforces employees' expectations that they will be fairly treated throughout their tenure (Moorman, 1991). In return, employees pay their management by being emotionally attached to their organization and getting highly involved in the affairs of organization. Studies examining the relative importance of distributive and procedural justice on personal and organizational attitudes suggest that because procedural justice focuses on the perceived fairness of the means used to determine the amount of punishment or
reward, how outcomes are determined may be more important than the actual rewards (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). This implies that procedural justice seems to have more pervasive effect on outcomes than distributive justice, in that employees seem less concerned about outcomes when processes used to determine those outcomes were deemed fair (Barling & Phillips, 1993). In another study, Welbourne (1998) reported that procedural justice is more important when outcomes are positive, plentiful (high), and/or group-based, while distributive justice is more important when outcomes are negative, scarce (low), and/or individual-based. Overall, the research suggests that a link exists between employees’ perceptions of organizational justice (i.e. distributive and procedural justice) and organizational commitment. Distributive justice relates to the ends achieved, while procedural justice relates to the means used to achieve those ends. In essence, organizational justice theory posits that equity perceptions are influenced by: (a) how workplace decisions are made (procedural justice), and (b) the outcomes of these decisions (distributive justice).

Employees in the public and private sectors experience different working conditions and employment relationships. Therefore, it can be assumed that their attitudes toward their job and organizations, and relationships between them, are different. Markovits, Davis, Fay, and Dick (2010) tested the satisfaction–commitment link with respect to differences between private and public sector employees with a sample of 617 Greek employees (257 from the private sector and 360 from the public sector). Results confirmed the proposed relationship that extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction are more strongly related to affective commitment and normative commitment for public sector employees than for private sector ones.
Flynn and Tannenbaum (1993) studied the moderating role of sector on the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment. Results accepted their expectation that the existence of clarity and challenge were positively related to commitment. Job characteristics demonstrated a stronger relationship with commitment among private sector managers.

Zeffane (1994) studied Organizational commitment and perceived management styles among public and private sector organizations, operating in Australia. Comparisons between the two groups of employees revealed higher commitment among private sector employees. These differences were consistent with differences in perceived management styles. i.e., the degrees of organizational commitment as well as the extent of loyalty and attachment to the organization were affected positively by flexibility and adaptation and negatively by rules and regulations, in both public and private sectors. Hierarchy and role specialization seems to have a positive effect on overall commitment, but more so in terms of the degree of attachment to the organization. Organization size had a moderate negative effect on commitment, but more so in the private sector. In another study, Lyons, Duxbury, and Higgins (2006) investigated differences in general values, work values and organizational commitment among 549 private sector, public sector, and para public sector knowledge workers. Private sector employees displayed greater organizational commitment than the employees in the other two sectors.

Critics of New Public Management argue that differences between public and private organizations are so great that business practices should not be transferred to the public sector. A study conducted among Greek Public, Quasi Public, and Private Organizations indicated that commitment of managers decreases as we progress along a
continuum from private towards publicly-owned organizations; managers report the existence of a gap between the perceived and the desired organizational culture of their firm, and this “culture gap” tends to increase as we move from the private towards the public sector; organizational commitment appears to be influenced negatively by the culture gap, therefore this gap offers a plausible explanation for the lower commitment in public sector firms (Bourantas & Papalexandris, 1992).

Balfour and Wechsler (1990) investigated on the public-private dimension as an antecedent of organizational commitment and assess the effect of publicness on individual attachment to the organization. The findings suggest that (1) the strength of an individual's attachment to the organization is a function of several dimensions of organizational experience; and (2) that, public employees, in particular, may be simultaneously attracted to and repelled by the organization, with their desire to serve important values undercut by low or negative feelings of affiliation.

But, some studies argued the differences between public and private owned organizations are negligible. For example, Boyne (2002) argued that except the differences in bureaucratic nature, decreased materialism and weaker organizational commitment, private and public organizations are similar in employee values. Further, Kyung-Ho and Seok-Hwan (2001) argued that the literature on public-private distinction has failed to distinguish among different types of organizational culture found in the public sector, while recognizing other important differences. Korean public managers score higher on their perceived job prestige and perceived centralization than do their counterparts in the private sector. The differences are attributed to the cultural background of the Nation.
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Several reasons indicate that there should be a relationship between leadership and performance. The first reason relates to practice. Today’s intensive, dynamic markets feature innovation-based competition, price/performance rivalry, decreasing returns, and the creative destruction of existing competencies (Santora, Seaton & Sarros, 1999; Venkataraman, 1997). Scholars and Practitioners suggest that effective leadership behaviours can facilitate the improvement of performance when organizations face these new challenges (McGrath & MacMillan, 2000; Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997).

Understanding the effects of leadership on performance is also important because leadership is viewed by some researchers (Zhu, Chew & Spangler, 2005) as one of the key driving forces for improving a firm’s performance. Effective leadership is seen as a potent source of management development and sustained competitive advantage for organizational performance improvement (Avolio, 1999; Lado, Boyd & Wright, 1992; Rowe, 2001).

The empirical evidence in a study on UK companies by Ogbonna and Harris (2000), show that the relationship between leadership style and performance is mediated by the form of organizational culture that is present. Several recent research works by Bass and Riggio (2006) Boerner, Eisenbeiss and Griesser, (2007), Garcia-Morales, Matias-Reche and Hurtado-Torres (2008), have shown that leadership increases employee and organizational performance.

Effective leadership also has been proven to increases employee commitment, loyalty, and satisfaction; reduces social loafing; and lessens stress in the workplace (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Adebayo (2005), Bono and Judge, 2003; Masi and Cooke, 2000 also argue that leadership styles especially transformational leadership increases employee motivation and creativity (Jung, 2000/2001).
During the past four decades, the impact of leadership styles on organizational performance has been a topic of interest among academics and practitioners working in the area of leadership (Cannella & Rowe, 1995; Giambatista, 2004; Rowe et al., 2005). Perhaps the most prominent reason for this interest is the widespread belief that leadership can affect the performance of organizations (Rowe et al., 2005). The style of leadership adopted is considered by some researchers (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Conger, 1999; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson & Spangler, 1995; Yammarino, Spangler & Bass, 1993) to be particularly important in achieving organizational goals, and in evoking performance among subordinates (Barling, Weber & Kelloway, 1996; Berson, Shamair, Avolio & Popper, 2001; Zacharatos, Barling & Kelloway, 2000).

However as Jing and Avery (2008) notes that the concept of leadership lacks coherence and agreement. Most of the leadership literature confuses the definition of effective leadership by failing to make clear distinctions in some definitions, such as between leaders and non-leaders, effective and ineffective leaders, as well as overlooking the definition of the levels of leadership (Bennis, 1998; Bergsteiner, 2005; House & Aditya, 1997). Further, there has been limited research that has specifically addressed the relationship between leadership behaviour and organizational performance.

However as Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt (2002); Judge and Piccolo (2004); Keller (2006); McGrath and MacMillan (2000); Purcell et al. (2004); Yukl (2002) points out that leadership creates the vital link between organizational effectiveness and people’s performance at an organizational level. And concurrently substantial numbers of management scholars have debated the effectiveness of leadership styles and behaviours (Avolio, 1999; Avery, 2004; Drath, 2001; House & Aditya, 1997;
Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 1999; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Yukl, 1999) show that the existing research leaves many unanswered questions and gaps.

Similarly researches have also shown that different leadership paradigms could affect performance differently, depending on the context (Avery, 2004; Bryman, 1992; Drath, 2001; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Yukl, 1999). Hence, in the leadership-performance relationship, the context needs to be taken into account and more paradigms need to be considered.

However, in general, according to House and Aditya’s review (1997) leadership studies have been focussing excessively on superior-subordinate relationships to the exclusion of several other functions that leaders perform, and to the exclusion of organizational and environmental variables that are crucial to mediate the leadership-performance relationship. A further problem with existing leadership research is that the results depend on the level of analysis. House and Aditya (1997) distinguished micro-level research that focuses on the leader in relation to his or her subordinates and immediate superiors, and macro-level research that focuses on the total organization and its environment. Other scholars also suggest that leaders and their leadership style influence both their subordinates and organizational outcomes.

Researches in Indian scenario have focussed mainly on leadership styles. For example, Singh (1990) found that in India managers are highly characterised by centralised controls and authoritarian leadership styles. Ganguli (1983) found that Indian Managers have authoritarian leadership approach, contrary to Srivastav and Sharad Kumar (1984), who found that Indian Managers have participative style of leadership. Balaraman (1989) concluded that authoritarian adaptive style is a strong predictor of
ineffectiveness. Singh (1979), in a sample of Indian Managers noted that managers favoured both ineffective as well as effective styles of leadership. Dwivedi (2001), in this study, found that among successful Indian Managers, consultative/participative and transformational leadership styles were most preferred. Chakraborty (1995) argued that Indian model of leadership is that of the Rajarishi, a combination of the consciousness of the sage and the action orientation of the king. Sinha (1980) formulated the task nurturant leadership model in Indian context. Nurturant leaders met their expectations by caring, directing, guiding and safe-guarding the interests of their subordinates. This model has been widely used for research in Indian context and also has been compared with various models developed in the west (Sinha, 1995). Many studies were conducted to relate values with leadership styles. Yammorino and Jung (1998), in their study of Asian American Leadership, found that cultural values do influence the leadership styles of managers. Gamble and Gibson (1999) found that decision making in organizations is influenced by the personal values of decision makers. Sometimes it is not possible to understand the intentions of a decision. It is especially true in Asian Cultures which emphasize collective values. Agarwal and Krishnan (2000), in their study of relationship between leadership styles and value systems, found that relationship-oriented leadership is positively related to values such as benevolence, universalism, tradition and security. They also found that task-oriented leadership is positively related to values of achievement, self-direction and power. Singh (1979) found relationship between managerial goal values and decision-making styles of different departments of an organization. He concluded that values such as 'freedom from supervision' is assigned highest priority by autocratic and benevolent autocratic groups followed by value such as
'adventurous experience and challenge'. Values such as 'chance to earn a good deal of money' and 'stable and secure future' were given least priority by autocratic and benevolent autocratic groups. Consultative and democratic groups assigned top priority to values such as 'to use special ability/talent' and 'creativity'. 'Exercising control over others' was given least priority by consultative and democratic groups. He also concluded that managers with bureaucratic orientation are less open to 'creativity' and managers with benevolent autocratic orientation tend to manage by sanctioning economic rewards and punishment.

**LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS**

Though there is a dearth of literature related to the differences in leadership effectiveness between private and public organizations, leadership styles were found to be different among these organizations. For example Hansen and Villadsen (2010) showed that public sector managers are more of participative management whereas private sector managers follow direct leadership styles. Human Resource Management practices in the private sector utilized more effective motivational techniques (that is, feedback, autonomy, task significance, empowerment, supervisory control, and performance-reward contingency) compared to those in the public sector (Mathur, Aycan & Kanungo, 1996).

Khuntia and Suar (2004) studied 340 middle level managers from two private and two public sector manufacturing companies in India. Private and public sector employees were compared on the basis of ethical leadership styles. Interestingly, private employees perceived their managers more ethical compared to the public sector employees. Moreover, such ethical supervisors enhance the job performance, job involvement and affective commitment of the subordinates.
Al-Mailam (2004) compared the perception of the employees of Kuwait private and public hospitals towards transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Results of the analysis with 266 respondents indicated that the transformational style of leadership was linked to high level of employee perception of leadership efficacy. Also, the employees in private hospitals were more likely to perceive their leaders more transformational than were employees in public hospitals.

Traditionally, leadership style is explained by the characteristics of the manager, the employees, and their job. Hansen and Villadsen (2010) explained leadership by the manager's job context such as the degree of job complexity, role clarity and job autonomy. Differences in job context explain the use of different leadership styles in the public and private sector. To clearly specify the importance of sector, the study investigates direct, mediating, and moderating effects. Based on a survey of Danish public and private managers with 949 respondents, the study showed that job context variables vary significantly between public and private sector managers.

Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) explored the differences in work motivation between the public and private sectors. Data from a survey of 3,314 private sector and 409 public sector employees in Belgium found out that public sector employees are less extrinsically motivated. Differences in hierarchical level are more important determinants of work motivation than sectoral differences. Further, any organizational change attempts from the management are more negatively perceived by the public sector employees than private sector (Harenstam, Bejerot, Leijon, Scheele & Waldenström, 2004). On the basis of researches related to problems in performance and motivation level of the public sector
employees etc., differences in the leadership effectiveness can be expected between private and public employees.

**OCCUPATIONAL STRESS**

Modern life is full of stress. Especially modern organizations as the result of dynamic technological evolutions have spawned mega-bureaucracies, micro-task specialisation and greater urbanisation. These developments are intrinsically tied with work settings which have numerous systems such as finance, production, marketing, administration as well as macro organizational sub systems like inter-organisational systems and organizational level goals, strategies, climates, cultures, structures, management styles and performance (Jain, Mishra & Kothar, 2002).

However, most of the studies on Occupational Stress have focussed on the concept of, “Role” as a vital factor for occupational stress. Role is defined in the term of position one occupies in a social system, as defined by the functions one performs in response to the expectations of the 'significant' members of a social system, and one's own expectations from that position or office (Pareek, 1993).

According to Pareek (1993), the role senders who have expectations on the basis of their perceptions of the role occupant's behaviour and role occupant who acts on the basis of his perceptions of the role and constantly interact, and the processes of role sending and role receiving together influence the role behaviour of the individual. Thus, a role episode has a feedback loop.

The research works since 1970s have been pinpointing job related stress on concepts of role, especially role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload. A branch of the role requirements showed that role strain which involves control, especially
on lack of autonomy on the job and sometimes as an excess of supervisory intervention as the reason for occupational stress.

Another set of studies show that “social support in the work setting” as an important variable, affecting job stress either directly or as a moderator of the relationship between Stressor and resulting strains. Karasek (1997) in the job strain model explains that the greater risk to physical and mental health from stress occurs to workers facing high psychological workload demands or pressures combined with low control or decision latitude in meeting those demands. Orpen (1982) reported significant relationships between subjective role conflict and measures of physical strain among middle managers, especially those classified as Type A rather than Type B personalities.

A significant number of cross sectional studies with respect to the effect of experienced role conflict on felt tension indicate that certain kinds of positions, especially those involving boundary spanning, are particularly vulnerable to role conflict leading to occupational stress.

Wisdom (1984) reports that conflicts have been reported in occupations such as military service, police work and teaching, where, the compartmentalization of time between work and family cannot be easily or dependably arranged. Similarly, Shift work, especially with rotating assignments, appears to generate similar problems (Jones and Butler, 1980).

According to Duxbury, Armstrong, Drew and Henley (1984), crisis conditions at the group or organizational level are reflected in role conflict at the individual level. Especially as the result of environmental conditions at the work place, managerial employees in the mining industry (Gavin & Axelfrod, 1977), managers in Dutch
Industries (Dijkhuizen & Reiche, 1980), teachers in Swedish Elementary Schools (Brenner, 1982), professional recreation workers in the United States (Rosenthal, 1983), all reported role ambiguity as predictor of negative affect and certain somatic symptoms.

Another well researched concept of “Role Overload” in which the conflict was experienced as a necessity to compromise quantity, time schedule, or quality. For example, in jobs where individuals deal with close detail work, poor lighting can create eye strain. On the other hand, extremely bright lighting causes problems for air traffic controllers. Health workers, too, often face a variety of noxious stimuli. Hospital lighting, for example, is usually artificial, monotonous and too bright. Oppressive visual environment became particularly stressful to nurses over a period of time (Hay & Oken, 1972).

Occupational stress has been extensively studied in the form of occupational demands, occupational role stress and its impact on job dissatisfaction (Bharati, Nagarathnam & Viswanath Reddy, 1991), burnout (Pradhan & Mishra, 1995), negative mental health (Mishra & Somani, 1993), anxiety and role efficacy (Singh & Mohanty, 1996). Differences in levels of stress due to job levels, i.e. managers and supervisors (Grover & Sen, 1994) have also been studied as personal antecedents of stress. Studies conducted in the west too, have revealed that the Air Traffic Controllers' job is highly stressful (Grandjean & Wotzka, 1971). Mishra (1984) observed that occupational stress arising from various job dimensions, namely role overload, unreasonable group and political pressures, responsibility for the persons and unprofitability are positively related to job involvement.

In a study by Ahmad and Mehta (1997), it was found that all the ten dimensions of role stress were negatively correlated with influence, work amenities, job satisfaction
and supervisory behaviour. Some dimensions of role stress were found to be correlated significantly with sense of powerlessness, sense of normlessness and dogmatism. Experience was positively and significantly associated with inter role distance, role expectation conflict, role ambiguity, personnel inadequacy, role stagnation, rote erosion and self role distance (Pandey, 1997).

Workload as a factor of occupational stress have been viewed in two ways-quantitative overload refers simply to having too much work to do, where as qualitative overload refers to work that is too difficult for an individual (French & Caplan, 1972). Quantitative work load is usually found to be positively associated with strain (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Moss (1972) reported that mental work load stood out as a type of role conflict which confronted a sizeable number in the labour force. Situation of role overload is associated with high stress (Frankenhaeuser & Gardell, 1976). Job tension has been found to be positively related to role overload (Vandivieve, 1992).

French, Kaplan and Harrison (1982) have found that qualitative work load stress occurred when a job was either too complex or too simple for a job holder's preference. Due to introduction of new technologies into work environment, it is necessary for workers, especially blue collar workers, to adapt continually to new equipment, systems and ways of working. It is an extra burden for the new employees trained in the latest methods to cope with a boss trained in the traditional methods. It raises questions about the adequacy at supervision and about those in senior positions.

In a study of stress among executives in 10 countries (Cooper, 1984), Japanese executives suffered particularly from pressure to keep up with new technology, i.e. to maintain their technological superiority. Managers in developing countries felt pressure
due to the increasing emphasis on new technology, the need to deal with an adequately trained work force and the imposition of deadlines. Rose, Jenkins, Hurst and Levin (1978) in a study on air traffic controllers showed that some involving comparison groups in other occupations and some involving comparisons across airports with different traffic densities, identified responsibility for the welfare of others in combination with heavy and variable work load and irregular work rest cycles of occupation determined Stressors.

Alfredsson and Theorell (1983) developed standardized occupational characteristics for 118 occupational groups in a nationwide (Swedish) interview survey. Occupations characterized by high levels of demand (e.g. lifting) and low levels of control (autonomy) were associated with elevated risks of myocardial infarction. The dimensions of variety-monotony have also been studied in relation to physiological as well as psychological consequences. A case control study of 334 men showed only two work related factors associated with increased risk; monotony and shift work (Alfredsson, Karasek & Theorell, 1982).

In a study of executives Reddy and Ramamurthi (1991) found that influence of personality and general ability on the stress experience was limited but significant. Pestonjee (1987), studied the sample of Top Managers, Middle Managers and IAS Officers, found that inter-role distance and role erosion were dominant whereas role ambiguity and personal inadequacy were the least dominant contributors of role stress in all the three job categories. In a study of nurses working in state administered hospitals, Sharma, Sood and Spielberger (1998) found their Type A score was highly correlated with Occupational Stress.
Similarly, Keiv and Kahn (1979) in their study of wording executives across different levels showed that engineers who were influenced by organizational demands, such as more attention to their work, fear of failure and subsequent risks and decision making under complex circumstances lead to higher stress experienced by them. So also, Semruer (1982) and Zimmer (1982), who reported that stress is complexly determined by the nature and quality of job demands that the personnel in different jobs were confronted with.

Desai (1993), in comparison of technical and commercial people, found that technical respondents were less stress prone than the commercial ones. Similar arguments were forwarded by a number of researchers to substantiate their claims of higher stress among various levels of organization (Karasek, 1997). Another model which supports the present findings as far as occupational differences are concerned is effort-reward model, proposed by Siegrist (1996). Siegrist and Klein (1990) in a study of German factory workers found status inconsistency, job insecurity, work pressure and effort reward imbalance predict several behavioural outcomes leading to stress. Similarly, Jaques (1989) found that level of discretion or control available to an individual in his or her work situation is negatively associated with strain.

There are numerous empirical evidences which suggest that the variations in perceptions of stress are highly related to the experience of both negative emotions and physical symptoms (Watson, 1986). The higher stress experienced by Type A respondents can be attributed to high levels of Negative Affectivity (NA) associated with such personalities. Watson and Clark (1974) argued that a High NA person is extremely distressed and self dissatisfied and suffers from poor self-esteem. High NA workers are likely to report more dissatisfaction with their jobs leading to higher stress. It was further
demonstrated that these individuals are more likely to experience discomfort at all times and across situations and also tend to be more introspective on the negative side of themselves and the world (Watson & Tellegen, 1985).

As Jain, Mishra and Kothari, (2002) discusses that business organizations is constructed on the basis of ritualised systems of actions and meanings, the employees as social actors produce the spatially and temporally situated conditions of their social levels and reveal the central tension between the dynamic and inertial nature of institutional systems, in which every action is both a reflection and revision of social order producing consequences and the relative mix and dominance of the different institutional systems vary across organizational settings, thus influencing the concrete experiences of members including their experiences, interpretations, reactions of stress, ambiguity and burnout (Scott, 1987). This is supported by the contentions of Spector and Jex (1991), who argued that task identity, autonomy and feedback were negatively related to frustration and anxiety.

Mental demand involves concentration, problem solving and attention to information inputs from the environment, whereas people complexity relates to interaction with others. It was reported in earlier studies also that both excessive variety and severe lack of variety in work content can be stressful. According to Gardener and Cummings (1988), human beings have a characteristic level of activation and job stress occurs whenever job/related stimuli cause a job holder's experienced activation level to deviate substantially from one's characteristic level of activation.

According to Khandwalla (1985), there are too many differences among occupations, organizations and their operating conditions and hence, managerial styles, organizational structure and design vary from one organization to another to satisfy their
contextual operating and performance requirements. These variations further manifest into different pulls and pressures over members of the organizations leading to different reaction outcomes.

Srivastava and Sehgal (1984) who studied the effects of employees' n-achievement on their perception of occupational role stress revealed that employees who maintained high work motivation experienced significantly lower occupational role stress such as role overload, role ambiguity, role expectation conflict, unreasonable group and political pressures, responsibility for persons, poor peer relations, strenuous working conditions and unprofitability as compared to low achievement group.

Generally work stress is perceived as high for private employees compared to their public sector counterparts. Amount of work load of the private employees are attributed to that. But, literature on such differences points to contradictory conclusions. For example Malik (2004) studied the impact of occupational stress produced upon employees. Analysis of the responses of 200 employees from private and public banks shows that occupational stress is found higher among private bank employees compared to public bank employees. Among different occupational stress variables role overload, role authority, role conflict and lack of senior level support contribute more to the occupational stress.

Similarly, study on 70 Radiographers from Public and Private establishments also showed that Private Practice Radiographers were almost four times more likely to miss work due to a stress-related illness then those working in a public practice. Moreover, Radiographers in Private Practice were three times more likely to drink alcohol as a way of relieving stress compared to Radiographers in Public Practice (Eslick & Raj, 2002).
The main source of stress for employees working in private organizations is the lack of knowledge about their performance evaluation results, while this is not the case for employees working in public organizations (Ben-Bakr, Al-Shammari & Jefri, 1995).

But, Results of a study done by Macklin, Smith and Dollard (2006) on a heterogeneous community sample of public \((N = 84)\) and private \((N = 143)\) sector employees found no difference between sectors on levels of stress (Psychological Distress, Job Satisfaction). Further, Bogg and Cooper (1995) found that senior U. K. Civil Servants were significantly more job dissatisfied and displayed more mental and physical ill health than their private sector counterparts. The main sources of stress were "factors intrinsic to the job" such as poorer comparative pay and working conditions, and a strong feeling of possessing little control over their job and their organization. Similarly another study in which 200 Nurses was compared to 147 Nurses sampled from the same Hospital wards after 5 years and revealed a significant increase in Nurses' Workload, Involvement with Life and Death Situations, and Pressure from being required to perform tasks outside of their competence. Although nurses working in public hospitals generally reported more stress than private hospitals, surprisingly nurses' satisfaction with their job increased particularly in public hospitals, which may be attributable to age, improvements in monetary compensation and organizational support (Tyson & Pongruengphant, 2004).

**PERSONALITY**

According to Ones, Viswesvaran and Dilchert (2005), personality traits are enduring dispositions and tendencies of individuals to behave in certain ways. Personality has been widely reviewed in several organizational studies because it influences several Human Resource Development areas such as Occupational Stress and Coping (Bolger,
Several research studies have also showed that there is a vital link between Personality and Leadership (Eeden, Cilliers, van Deventer & van Eeden, 2008; Kok-Yee, Soon & Kim-Yin, 2008). There have been empirical evidences to show that the personality of the top management affects organizational performance. For example, in a study by Peterson, Smith, Martorana and Owens (2003) on independent observations of chief executive officer (CEO) Personality for 17 CEOs supported the relationships both between CEO personality and Group Dynamics and Organizational Performance.

Similarly Herri (2004), confirmed in a study on 117 manufacturing firms in Indonesia that the locus of control, one of the personality characteristics has a relationship with company performance. Among the several personality models the five factor model of personality has been widely reviewed.

According to Smith and Canger (2004), it has already been observed that the Big Five Factors have relationship between supervisors’ personalities and subordinates’ attitudes, including satisfaction, commitment and turnover. Hence it would be vital to understand whether it differs when the Organizational Ownership control changes and would bring differences in Leadership Effectiveness, Stress Perceptions and Commitment.

In the following pages an attempt has been made to explore how research studies in the Five Factor Model have been made.

**NEUROTICISM/EMOTIONAL STABILITY**

According to Judge and Bono (2000), neurotic individuals are likely to be considerably sub-standard regarding interpersonal relationships. In another study
conducted by Felfe and Schyns (2006), neuroticism of followers was negatively related to their perception of leaders, and neurotic followers would have lower self-esteem and higher anxiety and may experience more insecurity. Emotionally stable leaders are more secure in themselves and confident in their abilities and thus lack the nervousness and vulnerability that prevent individuals from building and managing relationships through effective communication, negotiation, compromise, and conflict resolution, as well as making sound decisions and leading through engagement (Ferris et al., 2007).

Lord, De Vader, and Alliger (1986) meta-analysis revealed a corrected correlation of 0.24 between measures of adjustment and leadership perceptions on the basis of a relatively small number of studies cumulated in their analysis. This estimate, however, could not be distinguished from zero. Bass (1990), indicated that almost all studies on the relationship of Self-confidence-indicating Low Neuroticism-to Leadership. Hill and Ritchie (1977) suggested that Self-esteem-another indicator of Low Neuroticism (Eysenck, 1990) - is predictive of leadership: Evidence also indicates that neurotic individuals are less likely to be perceived as leaders (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994). In light of this evidence and these arguments, we would expect that Neuroticism is negatively related to leader emergence and leadership effectiveness.
EXTRAVERSION

Extraversion which is strongly associated with assertiveness is a key trait to understand Leader-follower relationship (Rubin, Munz and Bommer, 2005). Although De Hoogh, Den Hartog and Koopman (2005) found no relationship between extraversion and Leadership regardless of the work environment, several other research works by Felfe and Schyns (2006), Judge and Bono (2000) and Lim and Ployhart (2004) found that extraversion seem to be attributes of transformational leaders. Extraverts are expected to be charismatic individuals who are communicative, persuasive, and able to rally others to perform. As mentioned previously, extraverts are friendly, outgoing and assertive. Ferris et al. (2007) stated that extraversion reflects an affability or sociability theme. Politically skilled individuals also possess these qualities. One dimension of political skill is networking ability, which allows individuals to make valuable connections that would assist in achieving goals. Ferris et al. (2007) also stated that individuals with political skill are adept at identifying and developing diverse contacts and networks of people to ensure organizational gains. Extraverted individuals would be more successful at initiating and maintaining these relationships and thus would be more likely to use relationship-building to influence and motivate their followers.

In Bass’s (1990) review, results linking Extraversion to leadership were inconsistent. In early studies (those completed between 1904 and 1947), Extraversion was positively related to leadership in five studies and negatively related in three, and there was no relation in four. Other reviews, however, suggest that extraverts should be more likely to emerge as leaders in groups. Extraversion is strongly related to social leadership (Costa & McCrae, 1988) and, according to Watson and Clark (1997),
extraversion predicts leader emergence in groups. Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, (1994) noted that Extraversion is related to being perceived as leader like. Extraverts tend to be energetic, lively people. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) commented, “Leaders are more likely than non leaders to have a high level of energy and stamina and to be generally active, lively, and often restless”. Adjectives used to describe individuals who emerged as leaders in leaderless group discussions included active, assertive, energetic, and not silent or withdrawn (Gough, 1988). These are the characteristics of extraverts. Indeed, Gough (1990) found that both of the major facets of Extraversion-dominance and sociability-were related to self and peer ratings of leadership. Considering this evidence, Extraversion should be positively related to both leader emergence and leadership effectiveness, although somewhat more strongly to leader emergence.

OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE

This factor relates to “openness to change” wherein leaders are expected to be more willing to consider and/or accept divergent thinking and take the risks, which relates to being open to experience or change. According to Judge and Bono (2000); and Detert and Burris, (2007) leaders that are open to experience should be more creative and inventive and thus more visionary in nature and willing to embrace change. Having a vision and being able to stimulate followers to pursue that vision, accepting and taking full advantage of change when it arises. On the contrary, Hetland and Sandal (2003) observed openness to change was significantly correlated when rated by superiors, although it showed no considerable relationship when observed through subordinates. Similarly, De Hoogh, Den Hartog and Koopman (2005), suggest that dynamic work
environment acted as a mediating variable and there was only a significant correlation when the work environment lacked stability.

Bass (1990) listed the traits that were the best correlates of leadership, originality—a clear hallmark of Openness—topped the list. Openness correlates with divergent thinking (McCrae, 1987) and is strongly related to both personality-based and behavioural measures of creativity (Feist, 1998; McCrae & Costa, 1997). Creativity appears to be an important skill of effective leaders. Creativity was one of the skills contained in Yukl’s (1998) summary of the skills of leaders. Research indicates that creativity is linked to effective leadership (Sosik, Kahai & Avolio, 1998), suggesting that open individuals are more likely to emerge as leaders and be effective leaders.

AGREEABLENESS

The trait of Agreeableness on job performance has been linked to personal characteristics such as empathy, humility, willingness to cooperate, altruism, and concern for others (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Hough, 1992). At the group level, collective agreeableness may translate as cooperation, consensus orientation, and effective conflict management. Group average agreeableness may be expected to correlate with group cohesion, viability (members’ motivation to remain with their team in the future), and performance of work that requires effective handling of interpersonal relationships with customers, suppliers, managers, and others—at least in teams homogeneous enough on agreeableness to avoid personality-related conflicts.

Agreeableness is an important personality trait that denotes being compassionate and empathic. Agreeable individuals are affectionate, generous, trusting, cooperative, and good with relationships. They are concerned with others and willing to attend to their
needs. Rubin, Munz and Bommer (2005) supported agreeableness as a predictor of transformational leaders. However, Lim and Ployhart’s (2004) study finding revealed that it is important to include contextual factors into account and being wary of generalizations when conducting empirical research. According to Ferris et al. (2007), agreeableness is linked to the political skill dimensions of interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity, all of which are valuable in transformational leadership.

Barrick et al. (1998) found group average agreeableness in manufacturing and maintenance teams positively correlated with performance and cohesion and inversely correlated with team conflict, but it was unrelated to team viability. Neuman and Wright (1999) found group average agreeableness positively correlated with supervisor-rated performance in retail service teams. Neuman and Wright’s (1999) field study of service teams found group minimum agreeableness positively correlated with supervisor - and peer-rated performance.

Two studies of manufacturing teams also found group minimum agreeableness positively correlated with supervisor-rated performance and with team cohesion (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert & Mount, (1998); Neuman, 2000). In the Barrick et al. study, minimum agreeableness also showed a strong, inverse correlation with team conflict, suggesting that the lower the agreeableness of the team’s least agreeable member, the more conflict the team experienced.

Group diversity on the agreeableness trait, indicated by group variance, correlated inversely with team performance in the Barrick et al. (1998) study and inversely with workload sharing. However, group variance on agreeableness was unrelated to
performance in the Neuman, Wagner and Christiansen, (1999) study of retail service teams, which might have had relatively homogeneous, high agreeableness.

The surplus of recent studies relating group norms, group personality composition, and group effectiveness (Halfhill, Huff, Sundstrom & Nielsen, 2003; Halfhill et al., 2005; Halfhill, Sundstrom & Nielsen, 2001), group norms may have reinforced individual inclinations through the well-documented dynamics around conformity and suppression of deviance in groups (Hackman, 1976). Group norms reflecting facets of conscientiousness may have aided group performance of key tasks through norms related to attention to detail, timeliness, organization, and other related behaviours. Similarly, norms around agreeableness may have helped groups provide excellent service through interpersonal sensitivity, responsiveness, and related behaviour. Research has found evidence that group norms may help mediate the relationship of group personality composition and group performance (Barrick, Stewart & Piotrowski, 2002). These studies and the findings presented here suggest that future research can profitably explore the role of group norms in the group-level correlates of group personality composition.

Conceptually, the link between Agreeableness and Leadership is ambiguous. On the one hand, cooperativeness tends to be related to leadership (Bass, 1990), and Zaccaro, Foti and Kenny (1991) found that interpersonal sensitivity was related to leadership. That altruism, tact, and sensitivity are hallmarks of an agreeable personality would suggest that leaders should be more agreeable. On the other hand, agreeable individuals are likely to be modest, and leaders tend not to be excessively modest (Bass, 1990). Furthermore, although it often is considered to be part of Extraversion (Watson &
Clark, 1997), many scholars consider affiliation to be an indicator of Agreeableness (Piedmont, McCrae & Costa, 1991). Need for affiliation appears to be negatively related to leadership (Yukl, 1998). These factors suggest that Agreeableness would be negatively related to leadership. In light of these conflicting justifications, the possible relationship between Agreeableness and leadership is ambiguous.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

Conscientiousness is associated with the desire and drive for achievement, it is expected that conscientious individuals would be open and willing to make necessary changes to accomplish goals. Conscientiousness trait also represents personal characteristics such as orderliness, dependability, attention to detail, self-discipline, and preference for structure. However, the results of the studies on Conscientiousness are mixed.

According to Barrick, Mount and Strauss (1993), and Hough (1992) observe that in a work group, a high collective level of conscientiousness may manifest at the group level as shared attention to accuracy, timing, and follow-through, especially within groups homogeneously high on the trait. Barrick et al. (1998) found average conscientiousness in 51 manufacturing and maintenance teams positively correlated with supervisor-rated performance. Similarly, Neuman, Wagner and Christiansen (1999) studied 82 retail service teams and found group average conscientiousness positively correlated with supervisor-rated performance. However, Barrick et al. (1998) and Neuman and Wright (1999) showed that work teams’ performance positively correlated with the groups’ minimum scores on conscientiousness. Similarly, in a study of 76 manufacturing teams, Neuman (2000) found both an objective index of work completion and supervisor-rated performance positively related to groups’ lowest conscientiousness scores.
Bass (1990) commented, “Task competence results in attempts to lead that are more likely to result in success for the leader, effectiveness for the group and reinforcement of the tendencies” Conscientiousness is related to overall job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), and this suggests that Conscientiousness will be related to leader effectiveness. Furthermore, initiative and persistence are related to leadership. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) noted, “Leaders must be tirelessly persistent in their activities and follow through with their programmes”. Because conscientious individuals have more tenacity and persistence (Goldberg, 1990), it is expected that conscientious individuals will be more effective leaders.