

6. Leadership, Governance and Strategy

Camgoz, E.I. and Aycan, Z. 2022. Leadership, Governance and Strategy An Overlooked Connection: Work Design Quality and Leadership Intention. In: 35th ANZAM Conference, 5th Dec 2022, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia.

An Overlooked Connection: Work Design Quality and Leadership Intention

Eyup Ilker Camgoz

Centre for Transformative Work Design, Future of Work Institute, Curtin University, Perth,
Australia

Email: ilker.camgoz@curtin.edu.au

Prof. Zeynep Aycan

College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey

Email: zaycan@ku.edu.tr

6. Leadership, Governance and Strategy

**An Overlooked Connection:
Work Design Quality and Leadership Intention**

ABSTRACT: *The present study investigated whether there is a connection between employees' perceived work design quality and their intention for a possible leadership position at their current organization. The mediating role of worries about leadership and the moderating role of motivation to lead were also examined. The results showed that there is a positive relationship between work design and leadership intention: as employees' work design quality increases, their intention to be a leader at the current organization increases correspondingly. However, the mediation effect of worries about leadership and the moderation effect of motivation to lead were not significant. Results showed the importance of employee work design for maintaining effective leader candidate pools.*

Keywords: work design quality, leadership intention, leader emergence, leadership shortage, worries about leadership (WAL), motivation to lead (MTL)

INTRODUCTION

Many organizations today suffer from what Epitropaki (2018) calls *the leadership shortage*: “Talented employees, who are by all accounts successful individual contributors, are not willing to step up in managerial positions and claim leadership” (p. 89). A substantial outcome of this shortage is that organizations frequently appoint incompetent leaders partly because of the narrower talent pools for leadership (e.g., Chamorro-Premuzic, 2019; Hogan et al., 2018). Given the importance of effective leaders for organizational success (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008), understanding the reasons behind this shortage is critical. One reason that many talented employees are not motivated for leadership positions in their current job might be that they view their current jobs as *dead-ends*, and one of the reasons why employees view their jobs as dead-ends can be related to the way their work is designed. Based on this reasoning, one can ask, could employees’ perception of their work design quality be one of the reasons for them to avoid leadership positions? The present study investigates whether there is a connection between perceived work design quality and intention to assume managerial/leadership positions (i.e., leadership intention).

Epitropaki (2018) points out the emergence of a self-selection bias in leadership, where some individuals deliberately opt out of leadership opportunities, which then probably leads to the leadership shortage. Trying to shed light on this shortage, Epitropaki (2018) reviewed the existing literature and identified two groups of factors behind this problem. The first group of these factors is related to individuals’ willingness to assume leadership roles: narcissism, gender, socio-economic status, and some specific biological characteristics (i.e., genetic and neurochemical differences). The second group of factors are associated with the reluctance to step up for leadership: lack of motivation, lack of skills, lack of developmental readiness and efficacy, and lack of leader identity. However, to the best of our knowledge, the effect of employment context (specifically employee work design) in the scope of leader self-selection has been overlooked so far.

The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior suggests that behaviors at the workplace can be explained by the interplay between personality traits and situational factors (Barrick & Mount, 2013). Situational factors in this framework are defined primarily as the characteristics of the job. According to

the theory, individuals' volitional actions are characterized by two key mechanisms: purposefulness and experienced meaningfulness. Purposefulness is defined as "having a sense of desired end states or directedness to one's behaviour, whereas experienced meaningfulness refers to the perceived significance or meaning an individual draws from engaging in work activities" (Barrick & Mount, 2013, p. 133). Purposefulness is experienced when individuals feel that they pursue their fundamental higher-order goals, which are molded mainly through personality traits. Meaningfulness is experienced when individuals feel that what they do at work has significance and is aligned with their higher-order goals (thus, they are purposeful). In other words, meaningfulness is experienced when the situation (i.e., the current work characteristics) is in accordance with personal higher-order goals. For example, an employee with high conscientiousness may have a strong strive for achievement, and if their job provides them with a sense of accomplishment (e.g., having a high task identity), then the employee would feel their actions are purposeful and have meaning. Drawing from the Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior, we investigate how specific situational factors (i.e., work design) interact with personality traits (i.e., motivation to lead) to give way to intentions about becoming a leader (i.e., leadership intention).

Work design refers to "the content and organization of one's work tasks, activities, relationships, and responsibilities" (Parker, 2014, p. 662). Growing evidence suggests that work design quality has significant outcomes for employees (Andrei & Parker, 2018; Alarcon, 2011; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007) as well as organizations (Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2008). However, Parker, Andrei, and Van den Broeck (2019) maintain that although work design quality has been proven to be quite beneficial for all stakeholders (employees and organizations), low-quality work design practices are still prevalent. A poorly designed work can be defined as one where the employee has little or no autonomy, low task variety, low task significance, low task complexity, low social contact and support, and high job demands – some of the factors that may lead the employee to think that they are working a *dead-end job*. In a poorly designed work, employees can feel unsatisfied (i.e., low job satisfaction), unmotivated (i.e., low job motivation), anxious, stressed, burned-out,

constrained; and experience work-life imbalance and even some physical health issues (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2008).

We speculated that these two problems (i.e., leadership shortage and prevalence of poor work design) from two distinct research streams might be partly connected. We predicted that there might be a relationship between employees' perceived work design quality and their intention to become a leader in their current job at their current organization. Although leadership positions are usually considered desirable (i.e., they increase employees' power and compensation), these positions generally require tremendous dedication and sacrifice on employees' part. With the leadership position, the employee may need to work longer hours, make difficult termination decisions, be responsible for failures of the team, and so on. Thus, employees who already suffer from low-quality work design may not be willing to make these sacrifices for their organization, thinking that becoming a leader will increase their dissatisfaction at work and also the benefits will not compensate for the costs of becoming a leader.

Attempting to account for the mechanism underlying this relationship, we propose that worries about leadership (Aycan & Shelia, 2019) might mediate the relationship between work design quality and leadership intention. Aycan and Shelia (2019) define the construct as "the worries people have about the possible negative consequences of assuming a leadership role" (p. 21). We predicted that there may be a linear relationship between work design quality and worries about leadership. Poorly designed work may be associated with increased worries about leadership as employees may anticipate that their adverse conditions will become even more arduous with the leadership responsibilities. Increased worries, in turn, may lead to decreased intentions for taking leadership roles (Aycan & Shelia, 2019). Conversely, high-quality work design may be associated with decreased worries which will, in turn, be associated with higher leadership intention (see Figure 1).

However, not all employees with a low-quality work design may be reluctant about leadership opportunities. The strength of the proposed relationship between work design quality and leadership intention may be affected by employees' motivation to lead (Chan and Drasgow, 2001). Motivation to lead is an individual-difference construct that "affects a leader's or leader-to-be's decisions to assume

leadership training, roles, and responsibilities and that affect his or her intensity of effort at leading and persistence as a leader” (Chan and Drasgow, 2001, p. 482). Although some employees may perceive their work negatively in terms of its design, they may still be motivated to assume leadership roles due to various personal reasons such as extrinsic rewards (e.g., increased paycheck and power), a sense of duty, or an inclination to be in charge. Therefore, we expect motivation to lead to act as a moderator in the proposed relationship (see Figure 1).

To summarize the arguments presented so far, the main goal of the current study is to determine whether employees’ perception of their work design quality is associated with their intention to assume a current leadership position through their worries about leadership and whether the total strength of this possible association is influenced by employees’ motivation to lead. With this goal in mind, this study attempts to contribute to both leader emergence and work design literature by focusing on the connection between work design and leadership shortage (Epitropaki, 2018). For the leader emergence literature, its contribution will be to identify the work characteristics underlying the leadership shortage. For the work design literature, it will reveal one of the potential consequences of poor work design (i.e., contribution to the shrinkage of leader talent pools). If the proposed relationship is confirmed, it may lead to a new stream of research investigating the dynamics between work design and leader emergence. Consequently, intervention programs can be implemented to improve work design quality, which will help increase the size and quality of leadership candidate pools. This way, both individuals’ work conditions and the success of organizations can be enhanced in the long term.

- Insert Figure 1 about here -

HYPOTHESES

Leadership Intention, Work Design and Mediating Role of Worries About Leadership

One of the reasons behind the leadership shortage can be the recent trend that employees are becoming less interested in these positions (Chudzikowski, 2012; Lyons, Schweitzer & Ng, 2015). However, our aim in this study is to understand whether this reluctance is also partly due to situational factors instead of being a purely generational difference. Therefore, to understand the effect of the current

context on forming an intention to become a leader, we specified our outcome variable as leadership intention to investigate the leadership shortage. Leadership intention can be defined as an employees' desire to assume a particular leadership position at their current organization at a given time. It is different from employees' motivation to lead since motivation is usually quite broad and does not necessarily involve an element of immediate and direct action. More specifically, it is possible to have a motivation for becoming a leader while having no active intention of becoming one at a particular time (Kennedy et al., 2021). Moreover, motivation to lead is a trait construct, meaning that it is a relatively stable characteristic of an individual (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Therefore, motivation to lead must be context-independent, while leadership intention is tied entirely to a specific context. Thus, an employee, for example, may have a high motivation to lead (i.e., general interest in leadership) but a low intention to assume a specific leadership role at a given time.

Current work design quality, which is a strong situational cue, may influence employees' worries associated with leadership since worries about leadership "is domain-specific and can change depending on situational cues" (Aycan and Shelia, 2019, p. 24). Well-designed work can mitigate employees' worries, while poorly designed work can trigger the worries associated with being a leader. For example, an employee who has been experiencing low-quality work design (i.e., low levels of autonomy, task variety, task significance, task complexity, social support, interdependence, etc.) may fear that these work characteristics will not improve if not get worse, when they become a leader at their current job function/work team. The employee may perceive becoming a leader as an invitation to failure as the mistakes they make will become more salient. Furthermore, employees may fear that there will be little or no work-life balance, and a possibility of harming others with the decisions they made (e.g., laying off employees who may be former peers) or get harmed by the elevated levels of stress if they become a manager/leader at their current work team. Consequently, heightened worries may decrease the employee's intention to assume a managerial/leadership position.

On the other hand, high-quality work design (i.e., high levels of autonomy, task variety, task significance, task complexity, social support, interdependence, etc.) can encourage employees to take the

risk and put themselves forward for the leadership positions as their positive work experiences can provide them with a benchmark from which they can evaluate the outcomes of the leadership position. For example, an employee with a high-quality work design can readily predict how much autonomy and responsibility the leadership position will bring as they already have significant levels of job autonomy and responsibilities. Therefore, high-quality work design might be associated with increased leadership intention of an employee through low levels of worries about leadership.

Based on this reasoning, we predicted that there would be a relationship between employees' perceived work design quality and their leadership intention, and this relationship would be mediated by employees' worries about leadership. However, we limit our prediction of this association to the immediate team level. In other words, the current work design quality may be significant only for the next hierarchical leading position, while its effect may be weaker for the intention towards more distant leading positions (e.g., director, general manager, CEO, etc.). The reason behind this limitation is that employees are primarily able to observe their immediate superior's work design thoroughly (compared to more senior managers' work design) to make decisive judgments of the desirability and feasibility of that position. For this reason, the participants were asked to indicate their intention to assume a managerial/leadership role that is hierarchically the closest to their current position. Based on these justifications, our first and second hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1. There will be a positive relationship between perceived work design quality and leadership intention, such that poor work design will be associated with decreased leadership intention while good work design will be associated with increased leadership intention.

Hypothesis 2. The relationship between employees' perceived work design quality and leadership intention will be mediated by employees' worries about leadership.

Moderating Role of Motivation to Lead

What if an employee suffers from poor work design but has always felt like they need to be a leader no matter what? As discussed above, employees' motivation to lead (MTL; Chan and Drasgow, 2001) can moderate the relationship between work design quality and leadership intention. If an

employee's motivation to lead is already high, their intention to nominate themselves for a managerial/leadership position may not be affected by work design quality. Since motivation to lead is a trait (i.e., individual difference; Chan and Drasgow, 2001) construct, employees may have a high motivation to lead regardless of their perceptions about their current work characteristics. For example, if an employee has a strong sense of duty for leading others or expects significant benefits (e.g., more money or power) as a result of becoming a leader, then they may not be affected significantly by the work design quality. The opposite condition is also possible: If an employee already has a low motivation to lead, then their intention for claiming leadership positions would not increase even if they had a pretty high level of work design quality. Based on these justifications, our third hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 3. The relationship between employees' perceived work design quality and leadership intention will be moderated by employees' level of motivation to lead in such a way that this relationship is weakened by high and low (rather than moderate) levels of motivation to lead.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

The participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online crowdsourcing website that has been increasingly used in behavioral sciences for participant recruitment (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). As participants needed to evaluate their work design at their current job and their intentions for becoming a leader at their current organization, only full-time white-collar employees who had at least six months of experience at their current organization were included in the survey study. Those who did not satisfy these criteria were opted out of the study. The survey included demographic questions and scales to measure intention to assume leadership positions at the current organization, work design quality, worries about leadership, and motivation to lead. The participants who completed the survey were compensated \$0.50.

Initially, 582 responses were received through MTurk. However, 232 responses were excluded due to several reasons: Some participants filled out the survey multiple times even though they were opted out as they did not fit the inclusion criteria. Some participants were excluded due to failing at least one of

the attention check questions or completing the survey in an unreasonably short amount of time. Finally, participants who were detected as outliers or had poor OddEven index were excluded from the analysis. The final sample consisted of 350 participants (58% male, 41.4% female, and 0.6% other). The age of the participants ranged from 21 to 71 years, with an average of 39.68 years ($SD = 10.07$). Total tenure of the participants and their tenure at the current organization ranged from 1 to 50 years ($M = 13.07$, $SD = 9.58$; $M = 8.06$, $SD = 10.08$, respectively). The participants were from various industries such as technology, education, health, service, entertainment, etc. At the time of the study (during the COVID pandemic), 48.3% of the participants worked in their office, 21.1% worked remotely, and 30.6% worked hybrid (i.e., they worked sometimes remotely and sometimes at their office).

Measures

Leadership Intention

The scale for measuring intention to assume leadership roles at the current organization was developed for the purpose of this study. The items were pooled and selected by three researchers in the area of industrial and organizational psychology. Several items were combined from two previous studies (Aycan & Shelia, 2019; Auvinen et al, 2022). Additional items were developed to include behavioral components of leadership intention. The final pool of items has not been tested prior to the main study, which remains a limitation of the study. However, the data for the main study indicated no significant psychometric problems with this measure (see Appendix A for an examination of the psychometric properties of the measure). The scale consists of 6 items, and responses are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “very unlikely” (1) to “very likely” (5). Higher scores on this scale indicate higher degrees of leadership intention. A sample item is as follows: “I would nominate myself for a managerial/leadership position if there were an opening for such a position at my current organization.” As employees’ intention for a leading role within their immediate work team was the main interest of this study, the participants were explicitly instructed to think of the mentioned position as the closest managerial/leadership role to their current roles.

Work Design Quality

A short version of the Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006) was used for the purpose of this study since the aim of the original version is to measure general work design comprehensively, and thus, it was too long for an online survey study. The items for the short version were carefully pooled and selected from the original version by three researchers in the area of industrial and organizational psychology. A sample item for the autonomy subdimension is as follows: “The job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.” A sample item for the task significance subdimension is as follows: “The job itself is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.”

The original questionnaire contained work context items (ergonomics, physical demands, work conditions, and equipment use) which are mainly about the physical conditions of the work. However, these items were excluded in the adapted short version because the present study was conducted during the COVID19 pandemic and, thus, most of the regular white-collar employees’ physical work conditions were affected. Therefore, to prevent the physical effects of the pandemic from diverting responses, the work context items were excluded entirely. The resulting questionnaire consists of 19 items, and responses are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). Higher scores on this scale mean higher degrees of work design quality.

Worries About Leadership

The Worries About Leadership Scale (Aycan & Shelia, 2019), which is a 16-item questionnaire, was used to measure the degree of employees’ worries raised by a possible promotion to a leadership position. Responses are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “to a very little extent” (1) to “to a very large extent” (5). The participants were asked to suppose that they have been offered a managerial/leadership position at their current organization and indicate to what extent each of the items makes them worry. A sample item is as follows: “Mistakes I make being noticed more than before”.

Motivation to Lead

A short version of the Motivation to Lead Scale developed by Chan and Drasgow (2001) was used to measure employees’ general motivation toward assuming leadership. The scale consists of 12 items,

and responses are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). Higher scores on this scale mean higher degrees of motivation to lead. A sample item is as follows: “I feel that I have a duty to lead others if I am asked.”

Demographic Information Questionnaire

This questionnaire consisted of items about participants’ age, gender, employment status, area of work, total tenure and tenure at the current organization, department/team, and mode of work (i.e., at the office, remote, or hybrid).

RESULTS

Internal reliabilities of the scales, descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables are shown in Table 1. The Cronbach’s alpha scores of all variables are above the cut-off score of .70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The distribution of the data seems to be normal as the skewness and kurtosis scores are within the expected ranges (less than 1 for skewness and less than 3 for kurtosis; Muthen & Kaplan, 1985).

- Insert Table 1 about here -

One-way analyses of variance were conducted to understand whether work mode (i.e., working at an office, working remotely or hybrid) significantly affected the study variables. Results are shown in Table 2. Although some groups significantly differed, the differences in means and the effect sizes were quite small (i.e., $\eta^2 < .06$; Cohen, 1988). In terms of work design quality, only the hybrid and the office groups differed significantly from each other ($p = .005$). In terms of leadership intention, the only significant difference was between the remote and the hybrid groups ($p = .047$). In terms of worries about leadership, the hybrid group differed from both the office group ($p < .001$) and the remote group ($p < .001$). Lastly, in line with the assumption that motivation to lead is context-independent (i.e., a trait construct), none of the groups significantly differed from each other in terms of motivation to lead scores.

- Insert Table 2 about here -

To test the hypotheses, the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2013) was employed as it is suitable to conduct indirect and conditional indirect effects analyses using a bootstrapping approach

(Kisbu-Sakarya, MacKinnon, & Miočević, 2014). Model 5 of the PROCESS macro was used with 1000 bootstrapping iterations. Results are shown in Table 3.

Hypothesis 1, that employees’ work design quality would be associated with their intention to assume leadership positions, was supported as work design quality positively predicted leadership intention ($B = .829, t = 2.707, p = .007$), controlling for the mode of work (i.e., remote, office, or hybrid), $\Delta R^2 = .0001, F(2, 344) = .032, p > .05$. As employees’ work design quality increases, their intention to take leadership positions at their current job increases correspondingly.

Hypothesis 2, that worries about leadership would mediate the relationship between work design quality and leadership intention, was not supported as the indirect effect of work design quality on leadership intention was not significant, $b = .004, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.0215, .0068]$. Work design quality did not significantly predict worries about leadership ($B = -.141, t = -1.25, p > .05$) and worries about leadership did not significantly predict leadership intention ($B = .029, t = .926, p > .05$). The direct effect between work design quality and leadership intention was significant ($B = .810, t = 11.41, p < .001$).

Hypothesis 3, that motivation to lead would moderate the relationship between work design quality and leadership intention, was also not supported since the interaction between work design quality and motivation to lead was not significant ($B = -.094, t = -.972, p > .05$). There was a significant positive relationship between motivation to lead and leadership intention ($B = 1.141, t = 2.951, p = .003$).

- Insert Table 3 about here -

As both worries about leadership and motivation to lead are multidimensional constructs, post-hoc analyses were conducted to see whether the mediation and the moderation relationships can be observed at the subdimension levels of these two constructs. However, the results showed that none of the models produced with the subdimensions was significant. In other words, none of the worries about leadership’s subdimensions had a significant mediation effect and none of the motivation to lead’s subdimensions had a significant moderation effect in this study.

- Insert Table 4 about here -

DISCUSSION

The results showed that there is a linear relationship between work design quality and leadership intention. Employees with well-designed work had higher intentions to assume leadership positions at their current job, while those with poorly designed work had lower intentions. Turning to the possible mechanisms underlying the relationship between work design and leadership intention, we expected that worries about leadership would act as a mediator. However, the results showed that the mediation effect of worries about leadership was not significant. Even though work design can be a solid situational factor, this finding suggests that work design may not directly evoke employees' worries about leadership. In other words, work design quality may be related to employees' leadership intention without eliciting worries associated with becoming a leader. However, this conclusion should be treated with caution as the study design might have failed to capture employees' worries about leadership appropriately as it was a cross-sectional design. Experimental or longitudinal studies must be conducted before reaching a conclusion as worries about leadership may be better observed in these kinds of study designs.

Another prediction of this study was that employees' leadership intention would not strongly relate to their work design quality if they have already high or low motivations for assuming leadership positions. As motivation to lead is a trait construct, employees' motivation to lead may be high or low independent of their employment contexts (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). However, there was no such interaction as the results revealed that the strength of the relationship did not significantly differ at the levels of employees' motivation to lead (e.g., low, moderate, high).

Theoretical and Practical Contributions

This study is the first to bridge the gap between work design literature and leader emergence literature. It made important contributions to both streams of research. First, the present study extends the work design literature by uncovering another important work design outcome. Besides being related to employees' well-being, performance, motivation, commitment, involvement, and learning and development (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2008; Parker, Morgeson, & Johns, 2017); work design is also related to employees' intentions for becoming a leader. Second, this study contributes to the leader emergence literature by identifying one of the determinants of leadership shortage, (i.e., work design

quality). As discussed above, only the individual-related factors contributing to this problem have been identified. However, this study showed that a situational factor, current work design, can also play a role. The most significant practical contribution of this study is that it offers insights into solving the leadership shortage problem. To avoid narrow leader candidate pools and its long-run consequence of appointing incompetent leaders, organizations should pay close attention to the work design of their employees. Improving work design practices at an organization will not only benefit employees in many ways, but it will also benefit the organization in better retaining talented employees and diversifying the leader candidate pools.

Organizations can train their key personnel (e.g., human resources specialists, team leaders, directing managers, upper-level executives) to improve their work design practices as previous research shows that a good understanding of work design is very much likely to result in enriched work design (Campion & Stevens, 1991; Parker, Andrei, & Van den Broeck, 2019). Especially, work design should be added to manager/leader training and development programs as individuals at these positions have significant influences on work design practices (Parker, Morgeson, Johns, 2017; Parker, Andrei, & Van den Broeck, 2019). Parker, Andrei, and Van den Broeck (2019) underline this issue, “one might question how much attention (relative to, say, leadership) the topic of work design gets in MBA programs, executive development or leadership programs, and even supervisory training courses” (p. 923). Organizations and educational institutions (e.g., business schools) can work with psychologists specialized in industrial and organizational psychology to embed work design related topics into their training programs.

REFERENCES

- Alarcon, G. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79, 549–562.
- Andrei, D. M., & Parker, S. K. (2018). Work Design for Performance: Expanding the Criterion Domain. In Ones, D. S., Anderson, N., Viswesvaran, C., & Sinangil, H. K. (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology, 2v: Personnel Psychology and Employee Performance; Organizational Psychology; Managerial Psychology and Organizational Approaches*. (pp. 357-377). SAGE Publications.
- Auvinen, E., Aycan, Z., Tsupari, H., Herttalaampi, M., & Feldt, T. (2022). “No Worries, there is no error-free leadership!”: Error strain, worries about leadership, and leadership career intentions among non-leaders. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(1), 6.
- Aycan, Z., & Shelia, S. (2019). “Leadership? No, thanks!” A new construct: worries about leadership. *European Management Review*, 16(1), 21–35.
- Barrick M. R. & Mount, M. K. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 38(1), 132–153.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5.
- Campion, M. A., & Stevens, M. J. (1991). Neglected questions in job design: How people design jobs, task-job predictability, and influence of training. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 6, 169–191.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2019). *Why Do So Many Incompetent Men Become Leaders? (and How to Fix It)*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Chan, K.-Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481–498.
- Chudzikowski, K. (2012). Career transitions and career success in the ‘new’ career era. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 298–306.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Ed.). Psychology Press.
- Epitropaki, O. (2018). Self-selection Bias in Leadership, Understanding Reluctant Leaders. In Riggio, R. E. (Eds), *What’s Wrong with Leadership? Improving Leadership Research and Practice* (1st ed., pp. 89-104). Routledge.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G., Kaiser, R. B., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2018). Leadership in Organizations. In Ones, D. S., Anderson, N., Viswesvaran, C., & Sinangil, H. K. (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology, 2v: Personnel Psychology and Employee*

- Performance; Organizational Psychology; Managerial Psychology and Organizational Approaches*. (pp. 55-72). SAGE Publications.
- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1332–1356.
- Kaiser, R., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. (2008). Leadership and the Fate of Organizations. *The American Psychologist, 63*(2), 96-110.
- Kennedy, J. C., Chan, K. Y., Ho, M. R., Uy, M. A., & Chernyshenko, O. S. (2021). Motivation to lead as mediator of relations between the dark triad, big five, and leadership intention. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 675347–675347.
- Kisbu-Sakarya, Y., MacKinnon, D. P., & Miočević, M. (2014). The distribution of the product explains normal theory mediation confidence interval estimation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 49*, 261-268.
- Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. W. (2015). How have careers changed? An investigation of changing career patterns across four generations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(1), 8–21.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1321–1339.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2008). Job and team design: Toward a more integrative conceptualization of work design. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (Vol. 27, pp. 39–91). London, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Retrieved March 13, 2021 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243462790_Job_and_team_design_Toward_a_more_integrative_conceptualization_of_work_design
- Muthen, B. O., & Kaplan, D. (1985). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 38*, 171–189.
- Parker, S. K. (2014). Beyond motivation: Job and work design for development, health, ambidexterity, and more. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 661–691.
- Parker, S. K., Andrei, D. M., & Van den Broeck, A. (2019). Poor work design begets poor work design: Capacity and willingness antecedents of individual work design behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(7), 907–928.
- Parker, S. K., Morgeson, F. P., & Johns, G. (2017). One hundred years of work design research: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 403–420.

- Parker, S. K., Van den Broeck, A., & Holman, D. (2017). Work design influences: a synthesis of multilevel factors that affect the design of jobs. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(1), 267–308.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 438–454.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *2*, 53–55.

FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1
Research model of the present study.



Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among the Study Variables (N = 350)

Variables	α	M	SD	1	2	3	Skewness	Kurtosis
1. WDQ	.86	3.92	.48				-.545	.121
2. LI	.84	3.63	.73	.52*			-.765	1.792
3. WAL	.95	3.05	1.01	.07	-.14*		-.458	-.740
4. MTL	.73	3.15	.52	.35*	.64*	-.32*	.384	1.549

Note. WDQ = work design quality, LI = leadership intention, WAL = worries about leadership, MTL = motivation to lead, α = Cronbach's alpha, M = mean, SD = standard deviation. All variables were measured on a 5-point Likert type scale.

* $p < .001$

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance in Work Design Quality, Leadership Intention, WAL and MTL

Measure	Office		Remote		Hybrid		F (2,347)	η ²
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
WDQ	3.854	.493	3.903	.449	4.039	.471	5.016*	.028
LI	3.578	.675	3.511	.840	3.780	.788	3.500*	.020
WAL	3.160	.978	3.272	.970	2.727	1.019	8.615**	.047
MTL	3.130	.461	3.085	.474	3.233	.624	2.080	.012

Note. WDQ = work design quality, LI = leadership intention, WAL = worries about leadership, MTL = motivation to lead, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, η² = eta squared.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Table 3
Regression Analysis Exploring Mediation of WAL and Moderation of MTL (N = 350)

Variable	B	se	t	p	LCL	UCL	df1	df2	F	R ²
Outcome: WAL							1	348	1.581	.004
WDQ	-.141	.112	-1.257	.209	-.361	.079				
Outcome: LI							4	345	91.315	.514
WDQ	.829	.306	2.707	.007	.227	1.432				
WAL	.029	.031	.926	.355	-.032	.090				
MTL	1.141	.387	2.951	.003	.381	1.902				
WDQ x MTL	-.094	.097	-.972	.332	-.286	.097				

Note. WAL = worries about leadership, LI = leadership intention, WDQ = work design quality, MTL = motivation to lead

Table 4
Regression Analyses Exploring Mediation and Moderation Effects of WAL and MTL Subdimensions (N = 350)

Variable	B	se	t	p	LCL	UCL	df1	df2	F	R ²
Mediation										
Outcome: WAF							1	348	.191	.0005
WDQ	-.051	.118	-.437	.662	-.280	.178				
Outcome: WAH							1	348	1.281	.004
WDQ	-.142	.126	-1.132	.258	-.390	.105				
Outcome: WAW							1	348	3.459	.099
WDQ	-.213	.115	-1.860	.063	-.440	.012				
Outcome: LI							4	345	35.416	.291
WDQ	.815	.071	11.414	.000	.674	.955				
WAF	-.078	.063	-1.245	.214	-.201	.045				
WAH	.019	.061	.323	.747	-.101	.140				
WAW	-.026	.067	-.399	.690	-.157	.104				
Moderation										
Outcome: LI							3	346	52.507	.313
WDQ	.781	.228	3.419	.000	.332	1.230				
MTL-NC	.088	.317	.278	.781	-.536	.712				
WDQ x MTL-NC	.016	.077	.209	.834	-.135	.167				
Outcome: LI							3	346	133.349	.536
WDQ	.921	.213	4.331	.000	.503	1.339				
MTL-A	.983	.268	3.669	.000	.456	1.510				
WDQ x MTL-A	-.111	.067	-1.652	.099	-.243	.021				
Outcome: LI							3	346	70.626	.380
WDQ	.539	.287	1.875	.061	-.026	1.104				
MTL-SN	.443	.311	1.425	.154	-.168	1.055				
WDQ x MTL-SN	-.006	.079	-.078	.938	-.162	.150				

Note. WAF = worries about failure, WAH = worries about harm, WAW = worries about work-life balance, LI = leadership intention, WDQ = work design quality, MTL-NC = non-calculative MTL, MTL-A = affective MTL, MTL-SN = social-normative MTL

Appendix A

A post hoc exploratory factor analysis showed that Leadership Intention items loaded to only one factor explaining a total of 55.902% of the variance, which was intended for since the aim was to measure a composite leadership intention score. None of the items were eliminated as the factor analysis indicated no redundant items.

Table A.1.

Factor Loadings and Communalities for 6 Leadership Intention Items (N = 350)

Item	Factor Loading	Communality
1. I would nominate myself for a managerial/leadership position if there were an opening for such a position at my current organization.	.828	.685
2. I would request to be considered in the pool for management/leadership positions.	.828	.685
3. I would be reluctant to apply for an open leadership/managerial position. (R)	.410	.168
4. I would participate in training programs to be prepared for managerial/leadership positions at my current organization.	.701	.491
5. I would seek endorsement for my candidacy for a managerial/leadership position at my current organization.	.783	.613
6. I would mention my interest in managerial/leadership positions when an opportunity arises.	.844	.712

Note. The extraction method was principal component analysis with no rotation. The reverse-scored item is denoted with an (R).

Table A.2.

Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance and Cumulative Percentages for 6 Leadership Intention Items (N = 350)

Factor	Eigenvalue	% Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.354	55.902	55.902
2	.882	14.807	70.710
3	.605	10.088	80.798
4	.434	7.235	88.033
5	.370	6.164	94.197
6	.348	5.803	100

To understand the divergent validity of the Leadership Intention Scale, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed by combining leadership intention items with motivation to lead items since motivation to lead seemed to be closely related to leadership intention. The results showed poor model fit ($\chi^2 = 1277.979$, $df = 135$, $p < 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.156, CFI = 0.557). A two-factor model with separate leadership intention and motivation to lead items had also poor fit ($\chi^2 = 1232.897$, $df = 134$, $p < 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.153, CFI = 0.574). However, an explanatory factor analysis with leadership intention and motivation to lead items yielded a two-factor model, explaining a total of 53.803% of the variance. The items loading showed that leadership intention and motivation to lead items were mostly grouped into two different factors (no items loaded to a third factor). Together, these results indicate partial support for divergent validity between leadership intention and motivation to lead.

Table A.3.

Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance and Cumulative Percentages for Leadership Intention and Motivation to Lead Items (N = 350)

Factor	Eigenvalue	% Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.151	36.795	36.795
2	2.381	17.007	53.803
3	1.009	7.208	61.011
4	0.831	5.937	66.948
5	0.744	5.311	72.260
6	0.686	4.900	77.159
7	0.550	3.930	81.089
8	0.480	3.425	84.514
9	0.432	3.087	87.601
10	0.398	2.840	90.441
11	0.390	2.787	93.228
12	0.349	2.496	95.723
13	0.323	2.310	98.034
14	0.275	1.966	100

Note

This paper is based on the first author's master thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Koç University.