Career Orientations of Self-Leaders

Öz-Liderlerin Kariyer Yönelimleri

Sevgin Batuk[*]

Abstract: One of the biggest challenges for organizations that is brought about by current business conditions and change is the requirement of being adaptive and lateral. Organizations that cannot cope with change cannot survive. In this respect, employees have become one of the most cruical and key elements for organizations. With today's prominent concepts such as delegation, empowerment, participation in decision making, it is possible to utilize every employee and become more lateral. Self-leadership is a concept that has emerged in line with this trend and has deepened this notion. Self-leadership claims that it is possible for employees to manage themselves without requiring external supervision when provided with the necessary means and to reach personal and organizational goals. Nowadays, for an effective and fast operation, organizations need this kind of individuals. Employees who have high self-leadership skills play a crucial role for organizations to reach high performance without verticalization. In this study, it is aimed to reveal the career orientations of employees who are high on self-leadership levels. In this respect, via data from 126 employees working in services sector, the protean and boundaryless career attitudes and preferences of individuals who are high on self-leadership have been investigated. Within the protean career, self-directed career orientations and values-driven career orientations, and under the boundaryless career, boundaryless mindsets and organizational mobility preferences of employees are investigated. As a result, it is observed that both protean and boundaryless career attitudes of individuals high on self-leadership are more compared to other individuals. As a striking result, it is seen that the organizational mobility preferences of these individuals are low and even though they have boundaryless mindsets, their attitudes towards interorganizational mobility is negative.

Structured Abstract: In this paper, it is aimed to explore the differences between career orientation levels of employees who are high on self-leadership (SL) and who are low in self-leadership. As career orientation, protean and boundaryless career orientations are taken into account. Additionally, self-directed, values-driven career orientations of the employees, their boundaryless mindset levels and organizational mobility preferences are investigated. In this respect the following research questions are asked:

Q1: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their protean career attitudes?

[*] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Türk-Alman Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü
Asst. Prof. Dr., Turkish-German University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business
ORCİD 0000-0001-7917-713X
sevginbatuk@gmail.com

Q2: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their boundaryless career orientations?

Q3: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their self-directed career orientations?

Q4: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their values-driven career orientations?

Q5: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their boundaryless mindset?

Q6: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their organizational mobility preferences?

Self-leadership has become a prominent topic in business world, and, due to the need for lateralization, organizations need to depend on employees by providing them larger spheres and spans for actions. Organizations strive for self-managing teams and individuals; therefore understanding the tendencies and preferences of self-leading individuals has become vital for organizational survival. This paper aims to fill this gap by examining the career orientations of self-leaders.

In this respect, data from 126 participant working in banking and insurance sectors have been collected via online-survey method. Self-leadership is measured by the Abbreviated Self-Leadership Questionnaire (ASLQ) by Houghton, Dawley and DiLiello (2012). In order to measure career orientations of the participants Protean and Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scales by Briscoe and Hall (2005) are used. Protean Career Scale consists of two subscales- namely "Self-Directed Career" and "Values-Driven Career". Boundaryless Career Scale also includes two sub-scales namely "Boundaryless Mindset" and "Organizational Mobility Preferences".

The participants are classified as the "high self-leadership group" and "low self-leadership group" with respect to the mean self-leadership score of the whole group. Independent samples t-tests are conducted to see if there are significant differences between these two groups with respect to both career orientations and their four sub-dimensions. The difference tests show that there are significant differences between two groups in terms of all variables. Self-leaders (implying the higher scoring group) are found to have higher boundaryless career attitudes and protean career attitudes as a whole. In terms of sub-dimensions, self-leaders are found to have more self-directed, values-driven attitudes and boundaryless mindsets. Although there is a significant difference in terms of organizational mobility preferences, they tend to exert less physical mobility compared to low self-leadership performers.

The results imply that employees high on self-leadership have higher protean and boundaryless career attitudes compared to those low on self-leadership. Employees with a higher self-leadership score tend to depend on their own decisions rather than the organization's and prefer drawing their career path according to their own norms and values.

In terms of the sub-dimensions, it is seen that employees scoring high on self-leadership execute more self-directed, values-driven attitudes in comparion to those low on self-leadership levels. They also navigate through work-related decisions with a more boundaryless mindset. Surprisingly, their tendency for physical mobility across organizations is found to be lower compared to the other group. It means that when self-leaders work in an organization that matches with their capabilities and values, they do not tend to leave the organization. Briscoe and Hall (2006) define this kind of individuals who are high on the three career profiles but low on organizational mobility preference as "solid citizens". For these solid citizens, person-organization fit is a must, they perceive mobility as a threat and they tend to see the organization as their "home"; therefore organizations should be aware that they need a workplace which matches with their own values and norms, provides autonomy for them and also enhances them with learning opportunities (Briscoe and Hall, 2006). Therefore, it is easier for organizations to retain self-leaders if autonomy and flexibility are given to them.

Employees who tend to exert self-leadership skills should be provided with the necessary opportunities which may help them to develop their skills and apply self-management. If they feel secure and free, a mutually beneficial relationship both for the individual and the organization can be established and sustained.

Öz: Günümüz iş koşullarının ve değişimin organizasyonlar için yarattığı en büyük zorluklardan birisi uyarlanabilir ve yatay bir yapıya sahip olma gerekliliğidir. Değişime ayak uyduramayan organizasyonların varlığını sürdürmesi mümkün değildir. Bu bağlamda, çalışanlar, organizasyonların en önemli ve kilit unsurlarından birine dönüşmüştür. Günümüzde öne çıkan yetki devri, güçlendirme, kararlara katılım gibi kavramlarla, her çalışandan maksimum faydayı sağlamak ve daha yatay bir yapı almak mümkün hale gelmiştir. Öz-liderlik kavramı da bu akımla beraber ortaya çıkmış ve bu düşünceyi daha derinleştirmiş bir olgudur. Öz-liderlik, çalışanlara gerekli imkânları sağlandığında kendi kendilerini yönetmelerinin ve dışsal bir gözetime gerek duymadan bireysel ve organizasyonel amaçlara ulaşılmasının mümkün olduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Günümüzde daha etkin ve hızlı bir işleyiş için, organizasyonlar, bu gibi bireylere ihtiyaç duymaktadır. Öz-liderlik yetenekleri yüksek çalışanlar, organizasyonların dikeyleşmeden yüksek performansa ulaşmasında kilit rol oynamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, öz-liderlik seviyeleri yüksek çalışanların kariyer yönelimlerini ortaya koymak amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda, hizmet sektöründe yer alan 126 çalışandan toplanan verilerle öz-liderliği yüksek olan bireylerin çok yönlü ve sınırsız kariyer tutumları ve tercihleri incelenmiştir. Çok yönlü kariyer tutumları içerisinde kendi kendine yönlendirilen kariyer ve değerlere göre yönlendirilen kariyer tutumları; sınırsız kariyer tutumlarının altında ise çalışanların sınırsız düşünce yapıları ve örgütsel hareket tercihleri araştırılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, öz-liderliği yüksek olan bireylerin hem çok yönlü hem de sınırsız kariyer tutumlarının diğer bireylere göre daha fazla olduğu gözlenmiştir. Çarpıcı bir sonuç olarak ise, bu bireylerin örgütsel hareketlilik tercihlerinin düşük olduğu ve sınırsız düşünce yapısına sahip olsalar dahi organizasyonlar arası mobilite konusunda tutumlarının olumsuz olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öz-liderlik, Kariyer tutumu, Çok yönlü kariyer, Sınırsız kariyer

Introduction

Business world has changed rapidly and intensively with the effect of globalization, ease of knowledge dissemination and new economy. These changes have brought about challenges for both employers and employees. Employers are in quest of sustainability and survival as do employees in their own terms. For employees, sustainability and survival means effective career management. The requirements of the turbulent business environment have led to the birth of new approaches for careers and careers have emerged as one the most important factors that should be managed carefully both by employers and employees. In addition to that, concepts such as delegation, empowerment and involvement in decision making have become vital for organizational survival. To become more lateral and adaptive, organizations should utilize every single individual by giving them the opportunity to take initiative. In this respect, self-management and self-leadership have emerged as new ways of managing career and change.

In traditional terms, career has been defined as "a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered (more-or-less predictable) sequence" (Wilensky, 1961:523). With the effect of the shift in business world, career orientations of employees have also started to change. Recently, in literature, career attitudes of invidiuals are considered under two main headings: protean careers and boundaryless careers (Pak, 2008). Developed by Hall, protean career concept is defined as an orientation on career development in which the main control related to career decisions lies with the individual, not the organization. Hall defines the protean career as a career "in which the person, not the organization, is in charge, the core values are freedom and growth" (Hall, 2004:4). The second one, boundaryless career is based on the idea that an individual can pursue her/ his development steps in different organizations. Protean career concept has started to shift the responsibility of career management to the individual and boundaryless careers have taken it a step further; pursuing a career in different organizations. These concepts have shifted the responsibility from employer to employee.

In a similar fashion, self-leadership has transferred the role of the leader to the employee. It has been put forward as a substitute for traditional leadership approaches. It is defined as "a process through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies" (Neck & Houghton, 2006:270). It is regarded as a process in which employees do not need exterior supervision and regulate themselves to achieve predetermined goals or tasks (Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 2004).

Organizations need self-leaders in order to quickly and effectively resolve problems, adapt to change and become lateral. Therefore, understanding the career orientations of self-leaders is vital for organizations to retain them and utilize their skills. In this study, it is aimed to understand the career attitudes of self-leaders and, especially, their approach towards mobility within and across organizations. In this respect, first, by using survey method, participants are categorized according to their self-leadership levels. Afterwards, the career attitudes of employees high on self-leadership are investigated to see their tendencies and understand their expectations from organizations.

New Career Approaches

Classical definitions of career include a hierarchical path that evolves along a vertical line. Today, the impact of flatter organizational structures and turbulent business environment have opened up new dimensions for career development. "Being able to change with change" has become the major requirement both for organizations and employees.

As one of the mostly referred definitions, Hall has described career as "…the sequence of individually perceived work-related experiences and attitudes that occur over the span of a person's work life." (Hall, 2002:12). Arthur et al. (1989:8) considered career to be "an evolving sequence of a person's work experience over time." while Greenhaus et al. (2000:9) defined it as "a pattern of work related experiences that span the course of a person's life". The underlying theme in all these definitions is that a career represents an individual's work experiences throughout his/ her life without reference to his or her occupation or position in an organization. This view considers career as a less value-laden, more neutral concept that expresses the idea that people who are into work-related activities are considered to have a career (Colakoglu, 2005).

Within this mentality, two new approaches have been put forward in order to define careers and career orientations of employees: protean careers and boundaryless careers (Pak, 2008).

Coined by Hall (1976), protean career concept put emphasis on the subjective stance of the employee (Hall, 1996). It means that the main control related to career decisions lies with the individual, not the organization (Briscoe et al., 2006). Hall defines the protean career as a career "in which the person, not the organization, is in charge, the core values are freedom and growth, and the main success criteria are subjective (psychological success) vs. objective (position, salary)" (Hall 2004, p.4). A career with greater mobility and development orientation characterize the protean career concept (Hall, 1996).

According to Briscoe and colleagues (2006), protean career orientation has two typical attitudes- values-driven attitude and self-directed attitude. If the individual guides her/ his career according to her/ his own values rather than the organizational values or norms, then this individual is called "values-driven". If the individual is in charge of her/ his career path and manages her/ his own career, then this individual is referred as "self-directed". Therefore, individuals who display protean attitudes are more likely to adopt internally developed standards rather than exterior ones and to proactively and independently guide their own careers (Briscoe et al, 2006).

The second recently developed career concept is boundaryless career. Boundaryless career is "…one of independence from, rather than dependence on, traditional organizational career arrangements" involving "opportunities that go beyond any single employer (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996:6). According to Arthur and Rousseau, boundaryless careers are not attached to a single

organization and do not follow an established sequence, and in this rescpect, they can be considered as the opposite of "organizational careers" which are mainly identified with a single employer (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996:5). The outstanding feature of boundaryless career concept is that careers transcend organizational boundaries (Briscoe et al, 2006).

Sullivan and Arthur (2006) define boundaryless career as a multifaceted phenomenon that cannot be understood only by focusing on physical boundarylessness. Boundaryless career attitudes can be classified under pyhsical mobility (organizational mobility preference) and psychological mobility (boundaryless mindset). If a person has a boundaryless mindset, she/he can grasp the changing work landscape and draw a career path accordingly by enacting different levels of physical and psychological movement (Sullivan and Arthur, 2006). Psyhological mobility does not require physical mobility. If a person is physically boundaryless, then she/ he is inclined to prefer a cereer across several organizations.

These two major career conceptions mentioned above are not mutually exclusive and they are not "have or have not" options. They are independent but related constructs. Every career can be boundaryless, protean, self-directed or values-driven to an extent. Also, they do not require to be interdependent. An individual may have a boundaryless mindset but may prefer to stay with the same organization until retirement (Briscoe et al, 2006). Therefore, these orientations may differ to the degree they are preferred by every individual.

Self-leadership

New career approaches have shifted the emphasis from the employer to the employee. In a similar fashion, new leadership theories have shifted the role of the leader to the followers. First coined by Manz (1986), self-leadership is proposed as a substitute for leadership in a way that employees do not require external supervision if they are capable of navigating themselves. It is conceptualized as the process of motivating one's self in order to facilitate organizational and individual performance (Tabak, Sığrı, and Türkoz, 2013). In order to operate on a more lateral level, organizations need such individuals who can manage and control themselves. More specifically, self-leadership is conceptualized as "a process through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies" (Neck and Houghton, 2006:270).

Self-leadership consists mainly of three strategy groups: strategies are classified under three headings; behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies (Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 2001). Behavior-focused strategies aims to increase self-awareness, facilitate positive behaviors and help to complete unpleasant tasks; natural reward strategies helps the individual to concentrate on the enjoyable features of the task; and constructive thought pattern strategies aims to create and maintain thinking patterns that facilitate future performance (Houghton et al., 2004; Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 2001; Prussia, Anderson, and Manz, 1998; Neck and Houghton, 2006).

Conceptual Framework

Self-leadership is an important topic that has grasped attention in recent years. Studies show that self-leadership has a positive effect on job outcomes such as performance, career success and job satisfaction (e.g. Godwin, Neck, and Houghton, 1999; Murphy and Ensher, 2001; Neck and Manz, 1996; Batt and Applebaum, 1995). With the need for becoming adaptive and lateral, organizations need more self-leaders who can guide themselves and guide the organization. In this respect, understanding self-leaders, their career expectations and tendencies are very vital for organizations to retain these employees.

In this paper, it is aimed to see if there are any significant differences between the career orientation levels of employees who are high on self-leadership (SL) in comparison to who are lower on self-leadership. The research questions are listed below:

Q1: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their protean career attitudes?

Q2: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their boundaryless career orientations?

Q3: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their self-directed career orientations?

Q4: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their values-driven career orientations?

Q5: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their boundaryless mindset?

Q6: Is there a significant difference between two groups (high on SL-low on SL) with respect to their organizational mobility preferences?

Methodology

Sampling and Data Collection

The research was conducted in firms that basically operate in services sector including banking, financial services and insurance. 126 white-collar employees took part in the study. Data were collected via online-survey method. The sample demographics can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Men	72	57%
	Women	54	43%
Age	Younger than 25	30	23.8%
	26-35	57	45.2%
	36-45	28	22.2%
	46-55	9	7.2%
	Older than 56	2	1.6%
Educational level	High school	17	13.5%
	Undergraduate	94	74.6%
	Graduate	15	11.9%
Sector	Banking and Financial Services	51	40.5%
	Insurance	75	59.5%

Data Collection and Measurement

Self-leadership was measured by the Abbreviated Self-Leadership Questionnaire (ASLQ) by Houghton, Dawley and DiLiello (2012). The scale consisted of 9 items.

In order to measure career orientations of the participants Protean and Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scales by Briscoe and Hall (2005) were used. The scales consisted of 27 items in total. Protean Career Scale consisted of two subscales- namely "Self-Directed Career" and "Values-Driven Career". Boundaryless Career Scale also included two sub-scales namely "Boundaryless Mindset" and "Organizational Mobility Preferences". The items in all instruments were rated on a 5-point Likert scale.

Data Analyses and Findings

In order to conduct the analyses, IBM Statistics 22 was used. Independent samples t-tests were applied in order to test for differences between groups. First, reliability of the scales were tested through Cronbach Alpha scores. One item from each scale was deleted in order to increase reliability. All Cronbach Alpha statistics yielded scores higher than 0,70 indicating high internal reliability. The final reliability scores of the scales can be found in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Construct	Reliability Statistics (Cronbach's Alpha)
Self-directed career	0,842
Values-driven career	0,862
Boundaryless mindset	0,794
Organizational mobility	0,838
Self-leadership	0,792

Afterwards, descriptive statistics for all the variables were investigated and mean scores of all variables were found to be above 3,00. The relevant statistics can be seen in Table 3. The mean score for self-leadership is used as the cut-off point for further analyses. The participants who revealed self-leadership levels below 3,81 were treated as the "low self-leadership" group and the ones equal to or higher than 3,81 threshold were treated as the "high-self-leadership" group. The descriptive statistics of the groups can be found in Table 4.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics- All Variables

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Self-Leadership	126	2,11	2,89	5	3,8148	0,61776	0,382
Boundaryless	126	1,45	3	4,45	3,7172	0,47998	0,23
Protean	126	1,83	2,75	4,58	3,6667	0,60203	0,362
Self-directed career	126	1,86	2,86	4,71	3,8095	0,56971	0,325
Values-driven career	126	2	2,6	4,6	3,4667	0,74533	0,556
Boundaryless Mindset	126	1,57	3,14	4,71	4,0952	0,57768	0,334
Organizational Mobility	126	2,5	2	4,5	3,0556	0,80056	0,641

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics- Self-Leadership

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Self-Lead. Low	70	0,89	2,89	3,78	3,4	0,37853	0,143
Self-Lead High	56	1,11	3,89	5	4,3333	0,4414	0,195

Then, correlation analyses were conducted to see the correlations between the variables. It was seen that self-leadership did have significant correlations with the other constructs. The results also showed that the correlation between self-leadership and organizational mobility was negative (-0.300). The relevant statistics can be found in Table 5.

Table 5: Correlations

Construct	Self-Directed	Values-Driven	Boun. Mindset	Org. Mobility	Self-Leadership
Self-Directed	1				
Values-Driven	0.704*	1			
Boundaryless Mindset	0.035	0.557*	1		
Organizational Mobility	0.137	-0.016	0.049	1	
Self-Leadership	0.338*	0.346*	0.244*	-0.300*	1

*Correlations are significant at the 0.01 level.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to see if there are significant differences between employees high on self-leadership and low on self-leadership with respect to both career orientations and their four sub-dimensions. The difference tests showed that there were significant differences between two groups in terms of all variables. Self-leaders (implying the higher scoring group) were found to have higher boundaryless career attitudes and protean career attitudes as a whole. In terms of sub-dimensions, self-leaders were found to have more self-directed, values-driven attitudes and boundaryless mindsets. Although their organizational mobility preferences also altered significantly, they tended to exert less physical mobility compared to low self-leadership performers. The results can be found in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6: Independent Samples Test

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Boundaryless	Equal variances assumed	0,044	0,834	2,143	124	0,034
	Equal variances not assumed			2,177	123,152	0,031
Protean	Equal variances assumed	50,039	0,000	5,867	124	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			5,423	70,473	0,000
Self-Directed	Equal variances assumed	10,877	0,001	2,801	124	0,006
	Equal variances not assumed			2,662	86,799	0,009
Values-Driven	Equal variances assumed	90,667	0,000	9,339	124	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			8,489	62,25	0,000
Boundaryless Mindset	Equal variances assumed	42,44	0,000	6,746	124	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			7,109	115,933	0,000
Organizational Mobility	Equal variances assumed	8,377	0,004	-4,063	124	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4,131	123,306	0,000

Table 7: Group Statistics

	Self-Leadership	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Boundaryless	>= 3.81	56	3,8182	0,43512
	< 3.81	70	3,6364	0,50152
Protean	>= 3.81	56	3,9792	0,72670
	< 3.81	70	3,4167	0,30495
Self-Directed	>= 3.81	56	3,9643	0,68661
	< 3.81	70	3,6857	0,42098
Values-Driven	>= 3.81	56	4,0000	0,81976
	< 3.81	70	3,0400	0,23492
Boundaryless Mindset	>= 3.81	56	4,4286	0,35309
	< 3.81	70	3,8286	0,58554
Organizational Mobility	>= 3.81	56	2,7500	0,69085
	< 3.81	70	3,3000	0,80262

The results regarding the research questions are summarized in Table 8. The employees high on self-leadership are found to differ significantly from the employees who are low on self-leadership with respect to their career orientations.

Table 8: Results

No.	Question	Result
Q1:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their protean career attitudes?	Yes
Q2:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their boundaryless career orientations?	Yes
Q3:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their self-directed career orientations?	Yes
Q4:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their values-driven career orientations?	Yes
Q5:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their boundaryless mindset?	Yes
Q6:	Is there a significant difference between two groups with respect to their organizational mobility preferences?	Yes

Discussion

In this study, it is aimed to understand the career orientations and attitudes of self-leaders in order to present a guideline for practitioners. Due to the fact that self-leaders have become vital for organizational survival, organizations should know how to retain them and should realize their preferences and tendencies in terms of career management.

According to the results of the study conducted on 126 participants, employees high on self-leadership have higher protean and boundaryless career attitudes compared to those low on self-leadership. So to say "self-leaders" do not want to act according to the values of the organization but rather prefer drawing their career path according to their own norms and values. They set goals for

themselves and follow the business world in order to be proactive. The protean career attitudes of self-leaders are found to be slightly higher than their boundaryless career attitudes. As protean career attitudes are also based on the dynamics of self-management, it is not surprising that self-leaders exert more protean career attitudes such as self-direction and self-regulation.

In terms of the sub-dimensions, it is found that there are significant differences between the two groups of employees- that are high on self-leadership and that are low on self-leadership. Self-leaders execute more self-directed, values-driven attitudes in comparion to those low on self-leadership levels. They also navigate through work-related decisions with a more boundaryless mindset. Surprisingly, although there exists a significant difference, self-leaders' tendency for physical mobility across organizations is found to be lower compared to the other group. It means that when self-leaders work in an organization that matches with their capabilities and values, they do not tend to leave the organization. It can be deduced from the results that self-leaders care for their career development in a vertical path rather than a lateral one. Therefore, giving them the opportunity to evolve is the major key to retain them within the organization. Briscoe and Hall (2006) define this kind of individuals who are high on the three career profiles but low on organizational mobility preference as "solid citizens". For these solid citizens, person-organization fit is a must and they perceive mobility as a threat. This immobility desire may be due to circumstances or due to choice; therefore, first of all the organizations should understand the reasons underlying this situation. Solid citizens tend to see the organization as their "home"; therefore, expect to be appreciated for their contributions. Organizations should be aware that they need a workplace which matches with their own values and norms, provides autonomy for them and also enhances them with learning opportunities (Briscoe and Hall, 2006). Therefore, it is easier for organizations to retain self-leaders if they can provide autonomy and flexibility for these employees.

Limitations

This study is conducted in services sector with 126 participants of whom 56 are classified as self-leaders. The sample size is small and the grouping of the individuals is based on the structure of the sample and dependent on the dispersion of the group. Therefore, with a different sample, the threshold for the determination of individuals exerting high and low self-leadership may differ. Therefore, generalizability of the results is limited.

Conclusion

Self-management has become a prominent topic in today's volatile business environment. In the past, organizations used to avoid working with individuals who were oriented towards personal goal attainment and who wanted autonomy and power. Nowadays, this has changed dramatically. If an organization wants high performance, then the organization should donate the individual with the necessary means including the well-being and satisfaction of the individual. This transition has led to new responsibilities both for the employees and employers.

Organizations should provide employees with the necessary opportunities which may help them develop their skills and apply self-management including the responsibility for their own career management. Through that, a mutually beneficial relationship can be established and sustained. Self-leaders tend to feel free and decide according to their own mindsets. If they feel at "home", these decisions are more likely to be beneficial not only for themselves but also for the organization.

References

Arthur, M.B., Hall, D.T., and Lawrence, B.S. (1989). *Handbook of Career Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arthur, M.B. and Rousseau, D.M. (1996). "A career lexicon for the 21st Century". *Academy of Management Executive, 10:* 28-39. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1996.3145317

Batt, R., and Applebaum, E. (1995). "Worker participation in diverse settings: Does the form affect the outcome, and if so, who benefits?". *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 33:* 353-378. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.1995.tb00444.x

Briscoe, J. P., and Hall, D. T. (2005). *Protean and boundaryless career assessment collection*. Boston, MA: Unpublished, copyrighted scale collection.

Briscoe, J.P., and Hall, D.T. (2006). The Interplay of protean and boundaryless career: Combinations and Implications". *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69:* 4-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.002

Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T. and Frautschy De Muth, R. L. (2006). "Protean and Boundaryless Careers: An Empirical Exploration". *Journal Of Vocational Behavior, 69(1):* 30-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.003

Colakoglu, S.N., (2005). *The Relationship between Career Boundarylessness and Individual Well-Being: A Contingency Approach*. PhD Thesis. Drexel University.

Godwin, J.L., Neck, C.P., and Houghton, J.D. (1999). "The impact of thought self-leadership on individual goal performance: A cognitive perspective". *The Journal of Management Development, 18(2):* 153–169. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719910257738

Greenhaus, J.G., Callanan, G.A., and Godshalk, V.M. (2000). *Career management.* 3rd ed.. New York: The Dryden Press.

Hall, D.T. (1976). *Careers in Organizations*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Hall, D.T. (1996). "Protean careers of the 21st century". *Academy of Management Executive, 10(4):* 8-16.

Hall, D.T. (2002). *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, D.T. (2004). "The protean career: a quarter-century journey*". Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *65(1):*1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.006

Houghton, J.D., Bonham, T.W., Neck, C.P., and Singh, K. (2004). "The relationship between self-leadership and personality: A comparison of hierarchical factor structures". *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19:* 427-441. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410537963

Houghton, J.D., Dawley, D., and DiLiello, T.C. (2012). "The abbreviated self-leadership questionnaire (ASLQ): A more concise measure of self-leadership". *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 7:* 216–232.

Manz, C.C. (1986). "Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations". *Academy of Management Review, 11(3):* 585-600. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4306232

Manz, C.C., and Neck, C.P. (2004), *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence*, 3rd ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Manz, C.C., and Sims, H.P.Jr. (2001). *New superleadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Murphy, S.E., and Ensher, E.A. (2001). "The role of mentoring support and self-management strategies on reported career outcomes". *Journal of Career Development, 27:* 229-246. https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530102700401

Neck, C.P. and Houghton, J.D. (2006). "Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: past developments, present trends, and future possibilities". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21(4):* 270-295. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610663097

Pak, N. (2008). *The Effect of Organizational Career Management on Organizational Commitment.* Master thesis. Marmara University, Istanbul.

Prussia, G.E., Anderson, J.S., and Manz, C.C. (1998). "Self-leadership and performance outcomes: the mediating influence of self-efficacy". *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*: 523-38. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(199809)19:5<523::aid-job860>3.0.co;2-i

Sullivan, S.E. & Arthur, M.B. (2006). "Evolution of the Boundaryless Career Concept: Examining Physical and Psychological Mobility*". Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69:* 19-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.001

Tabak, A., Sığrı, Ü., and Türköz, T. (2009). "Öz liderlik (Kendi kendine liderlik) ölçeği Türkçe formunun uyarlama çalışması". *17. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi,* 303-309.

Wilensky, H.L. (1961). "Careers, lifestyles, and social integration". *International Social Science Journal, 12:* 553–538.