IPA
International Journal of Psychology
Vol. 9, No. 1, Winter & Spring 2015
PP. 24-38

Iranian **P**sychological
Association

Followership Styles: The Difference of Employees in Their Job Motivation and Job Performance

Mojtaba Amanollah Nejad Kalkhoran, PhD Student*
Department of Sport Psychology
International University of ImamReza, Mashhad

Abdolzahra Naami, PhD
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Education and Psychology
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

Kiumars Beshlideh, PhD
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Education and Psychology
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

The aim of this research is to compare different kinds of employees in terms of their job motivation and job performance. Our statistical population consists of 320 employees of various parts of an industrial organization who were selected through the stratified random sampling. We employed valid tools and scales for assessing the variables of this study. The analysis of variance was used for data analysis. Findings show that there are significant differences between various followers in their job motivation and job performance and Scheffe follow-up tests revealed that exemplary and conformist followers had substantially higher numbers of these job outcomes than other followers. Therefore, we conclude that leaders and mangers of an organization should regard the worthwhile roles of their followers in the achievement and productivity of the organization.

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

Keywords: followership styles, job motivation, job performance

One of the most important subjects of organizational psychology is leadership. In the current era of information and communication, as trade and commerce have been the subject of fast changes, innovation, and attracting more customers, the type of leadership is also being changed (Niyaz Azari, Hassan Zadeh and Akbari, 2010). The main point is that in the last century the leader of an organization has had much authority and, in Rahim's opinion (1981), has been considered the most vital subject in organizational behavior (as cited by Bruke, 2009). Follet (1933) argues that the role of followers has been more neglected than that of leaders (as cited by Bjugstad, Thach, Thompson and Morris, 2006). According to Bjugstad's (2004) book title search on Amazon's website, 95,220 titles were devoted to leadership topics and only 792 of these titles discussed followership in a substantial way.

So, various studies, including Bollman and Deal (1991) and Vaill (1996), confirm that the successful performance of each group or organization is dependent on leadership.

Recently, some researchers like Chaleff (2003), Seeley (2006), Favara (2009), Burke (2009), Fobbs (2010), AmanollahNejad Kalkhoran (2012) and others have studied the importance of followers' activities and differences. The concept of followership styles show the degree to which individuals are known to, and comply with, one of the followership categories and it consists of two dimensions: 1) Critical/independent thinking and 2) Active engagement (Kelley, 1992). Daft (2008) observes that

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

critical/independent thinking represents the employees' ability to assess the importance of their organization (in connection with their cooperation with the organization's strategies and consequences). Active engagement, in Kelley's opinion (1992), is the ability of individuals to engage in organizational processes, such as moving beyond job requirements and adjusting within organizational rules (through demonstrating adherence to those of the organization).

One of the most comprehensive models of followership styles has been presented by Kelley (1992). According to Kelley (1992), there are five types of followers, namely: exemplary (those who have a high level of critical thinking and active engagement); alienated (a high level of critical thinking and low level of active engagement); conformist (a low level of critical thinking and high level of active engagement); pragmatist (an average level of critical thinking and active engagement); and passive (a low level of critical thinking and active engagement) followers.

According to Kelley (1992), the present leadership studies should indicate the values of followers in organizations and try to fit the best leaders with the best followers. For achieving this goal, there are some investigations which try to show the condition of job outcomes like job satisfaction, performance, organizational commitment and so on in various types of followers or leaders and present some suggestions about how we can improve our employees to be better followers or leaders (Seeley, 2006; Burke, 2009; Favara, 2009; Fobbs, 2010; AmanollahNejad Kalkhoran, Naami, Beshlideh, 2013). For example, Favara (2009) found that there are significant relationships between followership styles and job satisfaction and performance and on the other hand, exemplary followers have better conditions in these job outcomes. Although

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

the findings of these studies are practical for realizing the importance of followers' roles in organizations, they are limited and this issue is especially true in our country, IRAN (AmanollahNejad Kalkhoran, 2012). Furthermore, even though many studies (e.g., Almarganhi, 2008; Elding, 2005; cited by Ahmadi Chegani and Sheikh Mohamadi, 2010; Arshadi, 2007) showed the value of job motivation in the enhancement of employee productivity, the evidence regarding its status in different styles of followers is very much restricted (according to the resources to which we could have access).

Therefore, this research aim to study the differences among employee followership styles of an Iranian company on their job motivation and performance so that it can specify the discrimination between effective and ineffective employees and the reason why our organizations should have more respectful behaviours and treatment ofbtheir followers, especially effective ones. The hypotheses of this study are posited here:

H1. There are differences in the job motivation of the employees with different followership styles

H2. There are differences in the job performance of the employees with different followership styles

Method

Statistical Population and the Research Sample

The research design is casual-comparative. The statistical population included all the employees of an industrial company (related to Oil and Gas Companies) in Ahvaz (N=412). It includes the main headquarter building, technical-engineering section, two sections of customer affairs, one section related to repairs and

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

warehouse and an education section. Through the stratified random sampling, 320 employees with diploma degrees or above were selected and took part in the study. Data were analyzed using the Pearson correlation and analysis of variance methods. Some data concerning demographic characteristics of our sample are presented here: There were 67 (20.9%) passive, 62 (19.4%) conformist, 114 (35.6%) pragmatist and 77 (24.1%) exemplary followers; 272 (85%) male and 48 (15%) female employees; finally 246 (77%) white-collar and 74 (23%) blue-collar employees. As we could not find alienated followers in the data of our sample, this kind of followership style was removed from our statistical analysis.

Tools

The Followership style questionnaire. In the present research, in order to distinguish the followership styles of various employees, Kelley's 20 item questionnaire has been used (1992). In this questionnaire all the answers have been arranged from 1 (rarely) to 7 (almost always). Here, the employees will answer the 20 questions and will express their opinions about each aspect of the followership including independent/critical thinking and active engagement by giving scores from 1 to 7. Research articles calculated the Cronbach's Alpha of this questionnaire, in respect with the critical thinking variable to be from .63 to .74 and from .69 to .87 in respect with the active engagement variable (Seeley, 2006). Moreover, Dawson and Sparks (2008) and also Mertler, Steyer & Peterson (1997) calculated its total reliability coefficient through the Cronbach's Alpha to be equal to .84.

Job motivation questionnaire. In the present research, Wright's job motivation scale (2004) has been used to measure job

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

motivation. It has 6 elements from which the first 3 ones have been scaled from 1 (Disagree) to 6 (agree) and the last 3 onets from 1(never) to 5 (always).

For the first time, (Patchen, Pelz and Allen, 1956; Patchen, 1970) provided a general scale for measuring job motivation (cited by Hayati, 2010). This questionnaire includes a 4 element collection in which it has asked the participants to classify themselves based on a 5-grade scale in relation to the direction and intensity of job behavior (Hayati, 2010). Baldwin (1990) added another element to this questionnaire to reach an acceptable internal reliability level (a= .68) and Wright (2004) added the 6^{th} element to this questionnaire to evaluate employee perseverance degree (a= .71) (cited by Hayati, 2010).

Job performance questionnaire. In the present research, Paterson's 10 element scale (1992) has been used for the measurement of job performance. The answers have been arranged based on a range from 1 (very little) to 5 (very much). Sayyahi and Shokarkon (1996) have calculated its reliability coefficient by Cronbach's alpha to be equal to 0.85 and by split-half equal to be .85 (cited by Bagheri, 2009).

Results

In this section, we first show the descriptive results and then, the results of research hypotheses are presented. Table 1 illustrates the means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients of the variables.

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

Table 1

The Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients among the Variables of this Study

Measure	M ±SD	1	2	3
1. Job Motivation	23.06 ±3.39	-	-	-
2. Job Performance	38.52 ±5.99	.489**	-	-
3.Independent/Critical Thinking	47.51 ±8.95	.279**	.391**	-
4. Active Engagement	42.98 ±7.63	.56 **	.535**	.595**

** P < 0.01

In order to examine the difference of various followers in their job motivation and performance, we first used the multivariate analysis of variance (p< .0001) in terms of these job outputs (Table 2).

Table 2

Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance of the Job Motivation and Job Performance Scores of the Employees with Various Followership Styles

Effect	Test	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Group Effect	Pillai's Trace	.303	12.873	6.000	432.000	.0001
	Wilks' Lambda	.703	13.795	6.000	430.000	.0001
	Hotelling's Trace	.413	14.719	6.000	428.000	.0001
	Roy's Largest Root	.389	27.793	3.000	216.000	.0001

Then, univariated analysis was used the results of which are shown in Table 3. As shown in Table 3, a significant difference exists

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

between styles of the followership in both of job motivation and performance, separately, at the p<0.0001 level.

Table 3
Results of the Univariate Analysis of Variance of Job Motivation and Performance Scores in Employees with Various Followership Styles

Effect	Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Group	Job Motivation	535.703	3	178.568	10.397*	.0001
	Job Performance	1705.860	3	568.620	19.890*	.0001

For a follow-up comparison of average scores of our job outcomes in these styles, the Scheffe test findings showed that the rates of differences in both of them in exemplary followers is more than that of passive, and pragmatic followers significantly, but the difference between this type of employee and conformist followers is not significant. Therefore, their ranking order in job motivation and performance was: exemplary, conformist, pragmatist and passive.

Discussion

This investigation was designed to compare the job motivation and performance of different followers and to study the causes of these variations. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance tests showed significant differences between followership styles in job motivation and job performance. It should be said that each of the passive followership styles show different combinations of followership components, such as dependent/critical thinking and active engagement. However, it should be said that followers'

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

independent/critical thinking level, more than their active engagement level, influences differences between followership styles in their organization's output variables because according to Kelley (and Table 1), a person's active engagement is probably related more to emotional characteristics and it can better explain the differences between the followers in variables such as job motivation and performance, but on the basis of Daft's definition (2008), independent/critical thinking has a conflicting nature. In other words, for example, people who have a high level of critical/dependent thinking don't necessarily have more job satisfaction or motivation, because these people often have more critical views toward managerial decisions and might challenge, disagree, or reject them. In this respect, it is possible that the managers welcome their opinions and criticisms (and reinforce the valuable feelings in them) or by showing negative treatment and behavior, the management will make these followers feel undervalued, leading to a decrease in their job outcome variables (motivation & Performance).

In addition, regarding the outputs of univariate analysis Table 3) and Scheffe follow-up test, there are significant differences between followership styles in both their job motivation and performance (separately) and their ranking order in these outcomes was: exemplary, conformist, pragmatic and passive styles. So, we should explain the reasons for these differences in order to indicate the values of followers in the organizations. Among these styles, exemplary followers have the highest level of job motivation and performance and these levels can be explained by Kelley opinion (1992), in that these followers (besides having a high level of activity) don't perform only what leaders order or decide, instead

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

they evaluate the leader's decisions and orders logically, and they might also express their opinions to the leader about advantages and disadvantages of the orders and help him to review and possibly make better or more logical decisions. Therefore, exemplary followers might always be reasonable in performing the orders they receive and in doing their duties. As implicated above, these points may also lead to the development of the followers' self-confidence and cause them to feel more valuable, thus, gaining more enthusiasm in doing their duties.

Now we should ask why conformist employees have higher rates of job outcomes than pragmatists. The cause may be that the motivation and performance is more closely tied to the active engagement component than to the independent/critical thinking component. The result of the correlation coefficients between these variables in Table 1 confirms this claim. Furthermore, this finding is compatible with Ray (2006) and Csikszentmihalyi (1997) descriptions, which take job motivation as a kind of internal and dynamic engagement in achieving job goals, and also follower responsibility. Moreover, this result is similar to such research as done by Gallop (2002) (as cited by Seeley, 2006) and International Survey Research or ISR (2005), which argues that more enthusiastic employees are more active in their work and have a key role in the success of the organization. Probably, conformist followers possess more job inspiration, hence they are more motivated in doing their duties. On the other hand, according to Kelley (1992) and Colango (2000), although conformists might be accused of being brown-nosers, or less creative, by the management of the organization, because of their reliance and interest in the management, they are more likely to be supported than other

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

employees. Often this is because leaders of the organization feel that conformist followers help the organization in achieving its goals better than others. This subject is true about their job performance as inquiries like Almarganhi (2008), Elding (2005) and so on showed that job motivation is one of the best predictors of performance and has a high relationship with it (cited by Ahmadi Chegani and Sheikh Mohamadi, 2010). Due to this fact, more active people have more motivation and more motivated people have higher performance.

Regarding job motivation and performance of pragmatic followers, it should be said that such employees are more apt to be profit-seeker and result-oriented (for themselves), with a medium level of enthusiasm in executing orders and duties. As Kelley (1992) presents, these employees express their criticism of management decisions but don't insist on them, and finally accept leadership decisions. Considering the above explanation, it is reasonable to conclude that pragmatic followers have less motivation in doing their duties than conformist followers, although this finding is contrary to that of Favara (2009).

Finally, passive followers have the least job motivation and performance. As cited previously, these employees are less engaged with their work and are much less enthusiastic in doing their duties. They might work only when a senior employee or supervisor is present and, in his absence, they might prevent themselves from working and instead of working, they prefer to concentrate on other issues.

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

Conclusion

In short, on the basis of the findings of this study, it could be said that leaders and mangers of an organization ought to consider that each type of follower can have an important role in the achievement and productivity of the organization, if they respect the abilities and capabilities of these different followers (especially effective ones, like exemplary and conformist followers) and try to remove their limitations.

References

Ahmadi Chegani, S., & Sheikh Mohammadi, M. *Relationship between organizational justice and perceived job characteristics with job motivation*. Unpublished BA dissertation of I/O Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, 2010. [Persian]

Amanollah Nejad Kalkhoran, M. (2012). *The comparison of job motivation, job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement of employees with various followership styles in an industrial organisation.* Unpublished MA dissertation of I/O Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz. [Persian]

Amanollah Nejad Kalkhoran M., Naami A., & Beshlideh K., (2013). The comparison of employees' followership styles in their job attitudes. *Internationl Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Research*; 2(3): 115-125, Available at URL: *http://ijpbrjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Intl.-J.-Phys.-Beh.-Res.-Vol.-2-3-116-125-2013.pdf* [Persian]

Arshadi, N. (2007). *Designing and testing a model of important Precedents and outcomes of job motivation in National Iranian*

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

South Oil company employees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation of I/O Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz. [Persian]

Bagheri, A. (2009). *Effects of perceived person-job, person-person-group on job fit on job motivation, job performance and job attitudes (job satisfaction, organizational affective commitment and job involvement)*. Unpublished MA dissertation of I/O Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz. [Persian]

Bjugstad, K. *Internet Book Search on Leadership and followership*. Retrieved October 15, 2004, from http:// www. amazon. com. html.

Bjugstad, K., Thach, E., Thompson, K., & Morris, A. (2006). A fresh look at followership: A model for matching followership and leadership styles. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 7(3),* 304-319.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. L. (1991). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burke, L. M. (2009). *Correlations of followership and leadership styles of medical science liaisons within the Pharmaceutical and Biopharmaceutical Industry*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Capella Universit,.

Colango, A. J. (2000). *Followership: Leadership styles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oklahoma.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

Daft, R. (2008). *The leadership experience (4th Ed.)*. Mason, OH: Thomson.

Dawson, S., & Sparks, J. (2008). *Validation of Kelley's instrument*. Unpublished study.

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

Favara, L. F. (2009). *Examining followership styles and their relationship with job satisfaction and performance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northcentral University.

Fobbs, T. (2010). *The evaluation of a paradigm: The critical examination of the influence of followership styles and courageous follower attributes on hotel customer-contact employee job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Capella University.

Hayati, D. (2010). *The Impact of satisfaction from income on job quit decision with mediating effects of job satisfaction, organizational affective commitment and job motivation in National Iranian South Oil company employees*. Unpublished MA dissertation of I/O Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz. [Persian]

ISR Surveys. *Engaged employees drive the bottom line*. Retrieved March 17, 2005, from http://www.isrsurveys.com

Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow and followers who lead themselves*. New York: Doubleday.

Mertler, C., Steyer, S., & Peterson, G. (1997). *Teachers' perception of leadership/followership dialectic.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Niyaz Azari, K., Hassan Zadeh, R., & Akbari, H. K. (2010). Effect of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles upon Work Ethics. *Journal of Modern Industrial/Organizational Psychology, 1(2),* 59-70. [Persian]

Ray, L. K. (2006). *Follow the leader: An investigation of the relationship between hierarchical levels and measures of*

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]

follower behaviors of selected North Carolina community college employees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Carolina University.

Seeley. T. A. (2006). *The impact of followership dimensions on affective commitment and in-role and extra-role performance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. San Diego Alliant International University.

Vail, P. B. (1996). The learning challenges of leadership. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Wright, B. E. (2004). The role of work motivation: A public sector application of goal and social cognition theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 14 (1),* 59-78.

Received: 29 / 4/ 2014
Revised : 23/ 11/ 2014
Accepted: 17/ 12/ 2014

[Downloaded from ijpb.ir on 2026-11-04]