Contemporary Perceptions of Effective and Ineffective Managerial Behavior: A 21st century case from the U.S.A.

Carlos E. Ruiz
Georgia Gwinnett College

Robert G. Hamlin
University of Wolverhampton

Eric B. Gresch
Georgia Gwinnett College

This qualitative study explores how contemporary US managers and non-managerial employees in the metropolitan region of Atlanta, Georgia behaviorally differentiate effective managers from ineffective ones. We collected from 81 research participants 381 critical incidents (CIs) of observed effective and ineffective managerial behavior. These CIs were subjected to open, axial and selective coding which resulted in the emergence of 10 effective and 13 ineffective behavioral indicators of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness. The findings could be valuable to managers seeking to make better decisions about how best to behaviorally manage and lead US employees in the 21st century.

INTRODUCTION

The role of leadership on the effectiveness and competitiveness of organizations has been extensively discussed in the literature. Rausch (1999) claims effective leadership at all levels of management can help organizations to better face the challenges and opportunities derived from globalization, whilst Addis (2003) suggests that by being able to influence the performance of individuals through effective leadership, managers have the ability to have a positive impact on organizational competitiveness. And Ireland and Hitt (2005) suggest that effective strategic leadership practices can increase the competitiveness of the organization. Other researchers have argued that effective managers have a positive impact on employee job satisfaction, performance, and productivity (Bass 1985; Bass & Avolio 1993; Burns 1978), and that corporations seek individuals who possess effective leadership [and management] skills because they are deemed imperative for the survival of the company (Luthans & Doh, 2014; Northouse, 2004). Despite the established critical relevance of 'managerial effectiveness' and 'leadership effectiveness,' these have been relatively under-explored and substantially neglected areas of study in the field of management (Cammock, Nilakant, & Dakin 1995; Noordegraaf & Stewart, 2000; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber 2002), with very few manager/leader behavior studies having been carried out in the US since the late 1980s, or in any other country.

Of the 'leadership effectiveness' related studies conducted to date, most have been focused on behavioral theories of leadership involving the use of quantitative survey-based methods. However, lack

of consensus on the definition or theorization of leadership (Bass, 1981; Stogdill, 1974), and lack of agreement about which behavior categories are relevant and meaningful for leaders (Yukl et al., 2002), have made it very difficult to compare and integrate the results from studies that have used different sets of behavioral categories. Indeed, as Glynn and Raffaelli (2010) claim, "there is a general lack of commensuration or standards by which [leadership] theories can be compared or synthesized" (p.359). These writers suggest three possible alternative strategies for future leadership research: i) *Theoretical Compartmentalization*- whereby different theoretical perspectives are neither compared nor combined in meaningful ways; ii) *Theoretical Integration*- through which attempts are made to shape a common vision or perspective in the conduct of leadership research so as to generate hybrid theories that draw upon different leadership theories in combinations where the strengths of one counterbalance the weaknesses of others. However, a strategy of integration can be a disadvantage or even useless if it results in a set of abstract or vague behavioral categories, loosely coupled, and without a unifying conceptual framework; and iii) *Theoretical Novelty*- through which researchers pursue theoretical creativity or radical breakthrough thinking by being less bound to existing theoretical strictures and the privileging of dominant research paradigms. Through this strategy there are clear methodological opportunities for qualitative research that can serve as a catalyst for theory development.

Based on their observation that commensuration seems wanting at the field level in leadership research, Glynn and Raffaelli (2010) claim 'the very concept of leadership and its composition' needs to be reconsidered if 'theoretical comparability' is to be achieved; and to this end suggest "a fairly unexplored territory in leadership is that of international or cross-cultural theorization and methods" and that "there are considerable possibilities for leveraging cultural dimensions to induce theories" (p.394). Of the few 'theoretical novelty' forays into leadership research the most notable is the GLOBE worldwide study of culture, leadership and organizations (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). However, one of us (Author 2) has also adopted (in hindsight) this type of research strategy for studying managerial and leadership effectiveness. Based on several emic single organization replication studies of effective and ineffective managerial behavior carried out jointly with various co-researchers within public and/or private sector organizations in three EU countries, namely Germany, Romania and the United Kingdom (UK), he has deduced through multiple cross-case/cross-nation comparative analysis a novel taxonomic 'concept and composition' of perceived *managerial and leadership effectiveness* that is relevant and transferable across three European nations (see Patel & Hamlin, 2012). Prior to and since conducting this comparative study, Author 2 has completed with various other co-researchers, including Author 1, a cumulative series of equivalent indigenous emic replication studies within the UK (Hamlin et al., 1998; Hamlin et al., 2011) and in multiple non-Anglo countries including among others Egypt (Hamlin et al., 2010), Mexico (Ruiz et al., 2013), and Colombia (Torres et al., 2015). The ultimate aim is to develop (if possible by empirical generalization) a 'general taxonomy' of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* through replication logic and comparative analysis.

This study is in part a response to the concerns about leadership research outlined above, but also builds upon and extends into the USA our previous leadership-related replication research. Its primary aim is to explore the issue of *managerial and leadership effectiveness* as perceived by people in a diverse range of organizations in the metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia in the US to identify what behaviorally differentiates effective managers from ineffective managers. In common with our previous studies we follow Tsui's (2007) definition of indigenous research which she refers to as any study conducted in a single country that takes the national context for granted. And our use of the word "leadership" refers to the type of leadership performed on a daily basis by most managers, which House and Aditya (1997) describe as 'supervisory leadership' and House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) describe as 'general leadership.' By *"managerial and leadership effectiveness"* we refer to "the behavioral effectiveness of managers in performing their everyday tasks of managing and leading people" (Ruiz et al., 2013, p. 131); and our use of the term 'managerial behavior' refers to all observable 'managing-related' and 'leading-related' behaviors exhibited by managers at all levels of management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the topic of leadership effectiveness in the United States is extensive with significant numbers of empirical studies having been focused on identifying those leadership behaviors that improve employees' performance (Yukl, 2012). Thus, in this section we discuss the 'hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior' developed by Yukl (2012) which integrates 50 years of leadership research. In addition, we address the implications of Hofstede's (1980) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's (1998) cross cultural studies with respect to the US, as well as the implications of the GLOBE study of culture, leadership and organizations in 62 societies that relate specifically to the US.

Yukl (2012) developed his taxonomy from various sets of effective leadership-related behaviors that emerged from research conducted almost wholly in the US from the 1950s through to the late 1980s/early1990s, and it groups indicative (effective) leader behaviors into four meta-categories: *Task-oriented* behavior, *Relations-oriented* behavior, *Change-oriented* behavior, and *External leadership* behavior. The *task-oriented* behavior category includes behaviors relating to the leader's (or manager's) ability to efficiently use resources and people. Examples of these behaviors include: planning, clarifying responsibilities and performance objectives, monitoring operations and performance, and problem solving. All of these behaviors have been found to have a positive correlation with managerial effectiveness (e.g., Kim & Yukl, 1995; Shipper, 1991; Komaki 1986).

The *relations-oriented* behavior category of the taxonomy includes those behaviors that encourage strong commitment to the mission and the organization, as well as the ability of the leader to foster an environment of trust and cooperation among the members of the organization. Specific relations-oriented behaviors include: supporting, developing, recognizing, and empowering (Yukl, 2012). All of these behaviors have been found to have a positive correlation with leadership effectiveness (Dorfman et al., 1992; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Shipper, 1991).

The *change-oriented* behavior category includes leadership behaviors that encourage innovation and adaptation to change. Specific change-oriented behaviors include: advocating change, envisioning change, encouraging innovation, and facilitating collective learning (Yukl, 2012). Studies provide evidence of these cited behaviors being related to effective leadership (e.g. Beer, 1988; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Edmondson, 1999).

The *external leadership* behavior category includes leadership behaviors that facilitate the access to outside information that could affect the organization as well as behaviors necessary to obtain resources, and promote the interest of the organization (Yukl, 2012). Specific external behaviors include networking, external monitoring, and representing. All of these behaviors have been found to have a positive correlation with leadership effectiveness (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Dollnger, 1984; Dorfman et al., 1992). This taxonomy proposed by Yukl (2012) integrates findings from previous studies on leadership, and it could assist in developing more inclusive theories of effective leadership.

Hofstede's (1980) cross cultural study also provides insight into managerial effectiveness in the US. The findings of his study suggest that those managerial practices that are responsive to the cultural dimensions of the US could be effective. He identified four main cultural dimensions: 'power distance,' 'uncertainty avoidance,' 'collectivism/ individualism,' and 'masculinity/femininity.' Hofstede's finding on 'power distance' indicates that the US scores low in this dimension, which suggests that US employees do not blindly follow orders. And indeed, the US is considered generally to be an egalitarian country where employees do not have a high tolerance for inequalities in the workplace. This low score on the 'power distance' dimension suggests that employees in the US are less willing to accept authoritarian managers when compared to employees from countries with high 'power distance' scores. Moreover, it suggests less hierarchical organizations where participative managers who use a more decentralized approach to decision making seem to work best for managing and leading employees.

In regards to 'uncertainty avoidance' which refers to the extent that individuals try to avoid ambiguous situations, the findings of Hofstede's study indicate that the US scores below average. The low score on this dimension suggests that employees in the US are more willing to take risks, are more

ambitious, need fewer written rules and prefer more risk taking managers. As Luthans and Doh (2014) assert, managers in US organizations should encourage personnel to act on their own initiative.

Hofstede (1980) also found the US to score high on the cultural dimension of 'individualism' which refers to the extent that individuals look after themselves and immediate family only. The high score suggests that employees in the US tend to have greater individual initiative and take responsibility for their actions. Also, they expect promotions to be based on achievement rather than seniority; and that effective managers should meet these expectations.

In regards to the cultural dimension of 'masculinity/femininity' which refers to the extent to which individuals value money, success, and physical assets, Hofstede's study found the US to be high on the 'masculinity' component. This finding suggests that in order to motivate employees in the US managers should place emphasis on physical rewards, money, advancement, and recognition.

Another study that provides guidance for effectively managing people in the US is the one conducted by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). In this study, the authors explored the culture of 23 countries based on relationship orientations, some of which mirror Hofstede's cultural dimensions. For example, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found that the US is high on universalism which indicates that US people believe that practices should be applied the same, regardless of particular situations. This finding suggests that employees in US organizations expect their managers to be fair and not show favoritism towards certain employees. The authors also found in the US that relationships between managers and subordinates are very specific, meaning that managers should not expect to invade the private lives of their subordinates and should focus exclusively on work related issues. In addition, and similarly to Hofstede's study, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found that employees in the US are achievement oriented which suggests that managers should promote them based on achievement rather than relationships or seniority (Luthans & Doh, 2014).

The GLOBE study (House et al., 2004) also provides insight into managerial practices that could be most effective in the US cultural context. Its findings suggest that effective general managers of private companies in the US should exhibit behaviors such as charisma, participative leadership, and team orientation. In addition, they should avoid self-protective behaviors (conflict inducer, face saver, self-centered, status-conscious) and autonomous behaviors (independent, individualistic, and self-centric) because such behaviors can potentially inhibit effective leadership (Center for Creative Leadership, 2013). It is important to note that the GLOBE study focused on the "strategic leadership" of general (top) managers, and not on the "supervisory leadership" or "general leadership" as performed on a day-to-day basis by most managers at all different levels of management in the organization (House et al., 2004).

While the aforementioned studies provide insight into practices that could lead to 'managerial effectiveness' and 'leadership effectiveness' in the US, they do not directly address the question: 'What behaviorally differentiates effective managers from ineffective ones?,' nor do they provide conclusive results about the specific behavioral practices that lead to effective leadership. As Yukl et al., (2002, p. 15) assert "a major problem in research and theory on effective leadership has been the lack of agreement about which behavior categories are relevant and meaningful for leaders." And as Glynn and Rafaelli (2010, p. 394) claim, there is a need, perhaps, "to reconsider the concept of leadership and its behavioral composition across persons, roles, and situations" within and across various organizations, organizational sectors and nations, not least, we suggest, within the US. In a small way our study in the US cultural context attempts to address these concerns regarding the lack of 'agreement' and 'commensuration' by identifying a contemporary 'lay theory' (Cammock, Nilakant, & Dakin, 1995) of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* that is commensurate with equivalent 'lay theories' identified in the cultural contexts of other countries, and which, therefore, can potentially be compared and synthesized to generate a 'universalistic' mid-range theory.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Our study is grounded in the *Implicit Leadership Theory*. According to this theory, employees have their own expectations about what constitutes effective and ineffective leadership (Eden & Leviathan,

1975). Individuals make use of their theories of effective and ineffective leadership to process their experiences at work (Shaw, 1990). Subordinates evaluate the effectiveness of the behavior of the manager based on how well the behavior exhibited by the manager fits with the implicit leadership theory that the subordinate holds about the manager (Cantor & Mischel, 1979). The better the fit between the implicit leadership theory held by the subordinate (perceiver) about how the manager should behave and the behavior of the manager, the more likely that the manager will be perceived as effective or ineffective.

Moreover, the subordinate's perception of the manager's behavior is influenced by the culture of the organization (Gerstner & Day, 1994) and the national culture (Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher, 1999). Hence, subordinates from different cultural backgrounds may perceive the effectiveness of the same manager/leader in different ways (Chong & Thomas, 1997). Inconsistencies between the manager's and the subordinate's implicit theory of leadership may lead to workplace dissatisfaction, and therefore, have an adverse impact on the organization (Engle & Lord, 1997).

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

As previously indicated, our indigenous managerial behavior study in the US is a replication of earlier studies conducted by Author 1 and Author 2 with various indigenous co-researchers in a range of culturally diverse countries. Consistent with our prior research the purpose of the present study was to identify how US employees, in the 21st century, perceive and judge the behavioral performance/effectiveness of managers who they personally observe on a daily or regular basis. Following Hamlin (1988) who followed Latham and Wexley (1981), and consistent with our previous replication studies, we adopted the following definitions of *effective* and *ineffective* managerial performance: Effective Managerial Performance is "*behavior which you wish all managers would adopt if and when faced with a similar circumstance;*" Ineffective Managerial Performance is "*behavior which, if it occurred repeatedly, or was seen once in certain circumstances, might cause you to begin to question or doubt the ability of that particular manager in that instance*" (Ruiz et al., 2013, p.135).

The specific research questions addressed by the study were:
1. What managerial behaviors are perceived as effective by managers and non-managerial employees in a selected part of the US?
2. What managerial behaviors are perceived as least effective or ineffective by managers and non-managerial employees in a selected part of the US?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

In conducting the present study we adopted the "managerial behavior approach" (Noordegraaf & Stewart, 2000). This approach to manager/leader behavior research attempts to address the general question 'What do managers do?', and is characterized by (i) "an empirical focus on managers" and (ii) "analyzing the day-to-day behavior of individual managers" with the aim of developing "categories, concepts and theories on the basis of empirical evidence" (p. 429). Specifically, our study focused on collecting empirical data based on the observations of research participants (managers and non-managerial employees) who had personally observed managerial behavior manifested by managers in organizations where they worked in the US.

We used the critical incident technique (CIT) (Flanagan, 1954) to gather concrete examples (critical incidents-CIs) of effective and ineffective managerial behaviors. This technique was used in Hamlin's (1988) original study of managerial effectiveness and in his subsequent replication studies of perceived *managerial and leadership effectiveness*. CIT is considered to be one of the best research techniques to obtain data related to the performance aspects of managerial behavior (Borman & Brush, 1993), and also for subsequent comparative analyses across cases in order to demonstrate the external validity and transferability of findings (Chell, 2004). In addition, CIT offers the advantage of gathering more reliable data compared to other approaches in which participants are forced into a given framework. When using CIT, participants are free to express their perspectives using their own words.

Sampling

The study took place within that part of the U.S.A where two of us (Author 1 and Author 3) live and work. A convenience sampling strategy was adopted to obtain an adequate number of volunteers to act as research participants. A sample of 81 participants was secured which included 19 managers and 62 non-managers drawn from 30 private, 46 public, and 5 non-profit organizations located in the metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia. In terms of their ethnicity, 35 were white and 46 non-white, and of these 31 were male and 50 female aged between 20-29 years (n=65), 30-39 years (n=9), 40-49 years (n=6), and 50-59 (n=1).

Data Collection

To collect our empirical data we used a Web online survey that offered respondents anonymity, decreased the risk of research bias, and which could be completed by the participants at their convenience. As claimed by Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, (2007, p. 343) "the relative anonymity of online interrogations facilitates more open and honest responses, in particular with regards to sensitive issues." Online surveys offer the advantage of getting access to a diverse and large population in different business sectors, and were used by Author 2 in a previous replication study on managerial and leadership effectiveness conducted in Germany (Patel et al., 2009). The researchers of this German study found that collecting CIs through online surveys can be as efficient as face-to-face interviews when respondents are given clear instructions.

Following Hamlin's (1988) original study on managerial effectiveness and later replication studies of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness, prior to participation in the study, participants were instructed on the aim of the research and what was expected to be accomplished. They were asked to describe in an online survey five incidents of specific effective managerial behavior and five incidents of specific ineffective managerial behavior which they have personally observed within the past six to twelve months. The CIs could relate either to behavior exhibited by managers above them, at the same level, or below them, in the organizational hierarchy. Those participants who were themselves managers were instructed not to describe behaviors based on their own managerial practice, but only those of other managers in the company where they worked. All were required to answer three questions relating to each CI offered, as follows: *i) What was the background situation, circumstance or context that led up to the managerial practice you have in mind? ii) What _exactly_ did the subject manager do or not do that was either effective or ineffective? iii) How was the managerial practice that you have described an example of 'effective' or 'ineffective' management performance?* Participants were advised that the time required to complete the survey would be approximately 1 hour, and for illustration they were given an example of a CIT data strip (background-critical incident-consequence/outcome) for a typically described 'effective' and 'ineffective' managerial behavior.

Data Analysis

In accordance with Hamlin's (1988) original study and further replication studies on managerial and leadership effectiveness, the analysis of the critical incidents obtained from the CIT respondents consisted of a four-stage procedure. In Step 1 (*Usable incident identification*) each collected CIT data strip was examined to check that a specific observed managerial behavior had been described and that it conformed to the definition of a critical incident. If it did not, that CI was not used for any further analysis. In Step 2 (*Concept identification*) each usable CI was subjected to a variant of inductive content analysis involving *open coding* conducted at the semantic level of analysis to identify its unit(s) of meaning and salient concept(s) (Flick, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Where a CI contained two (or more) units of meaning, these were disentangled and separated to form two (or more) discrete coded critical incidents (CCIs). In Step 3 (*Category identification*) the CCIs were subjected to second level content analysis involving *axial coding*, also conducted at the semantic level of analysis. Using a form of card-sorting technique the CCIs were examined for evidence of *sameness*, *similarity*, or an *element of congruent meaning*; and then grouped accordingly into the maximum number of discrete behavioral categories. *Sameness* was deemed to exist when the sentences or phrases used to describe two or more CCIs were identical or near identical.

Similarity was deemed to exist when the CCI sentences and/or phrases were different but the basic meaning was the same. *Congruence* existed where there was an element of sameness or similarity in the meaning of certain phrases and/or key words. Each deduced behavioral category was analyzed, interpreted, and labeled with a behavioral statement (BS) describing, in essence, the meaning held in common with all of the constituent CCIs. The BSs were derived either by selecting one representative verbatim CCI or creating a compound statement from the group of constituent CCIs. In Step 4 (*Core category identification*) the derived BSs were subjected to third level content analysis involving *selective coding* in search of sameness, similarity or congruence of meaning at a higher level of abstraction (Flick, 2002). The aim was to identify and elaborate broader 'core' behavioral categories around which the BSs could be grouped and integrated using the same procedure as used for the axial coding.

RESULTS

As a result of the Web online survey interviewing a total of 392 critical incidents (CIs) were collected from the 81 research participants. Of these CIs, 11 had to be discarded at the Step 1 stage because of lack of clarity or absence of a discernible specific managerial behavior in the respective CIT data strip. Of the 381 usable CIs, 190 were concrete examples of positive (*effective*) managerial behavior, and 191 of negative (*ineffective*) managerial behavior. The Step 2 *open coding* process led to the identification of 195 and 193 positive and negative CCIs of which respectively 193 and 187 were convergent in meaning to a greater or lesser extent with one or more other CCIs. The Step 3 *axial coding* process led to the emergence of 36 positive and 38 negative behavioral categories/statements (BSs) comprised of a minimum of 2 to a maximum of 10 CCIs (mean=5.14). And the Step 4 *selective coding* of these BSs resulted in the emergence of 10 positive (*effective*) and 13 negative *(ineffective)* core behavioral categories (CBC's) which we refer to as behavioral indicators of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* (see Table 1).

TABLE 1
CORE BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES (CBCS) AND UNDERPINNING
BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS (BSS)

Positive (*effective*) CBCs and BSs
1) Sets clear standards, schedules work effectively, and monitors/controls staff performance and behavior
P1) Manager schedules work in a way that ensures everyone is occupied and/or is flexible with the work schedule and staff time keeping provided all work is done (2 CCIs)
P2) Manager sets clear standards for staff performance and behavior, communicates them clearly, and actively ensures that staff perform to those standards (7 CCIs)
P4) Manager addresses problems with employees whose behavior or performance is below standard by taking action to help them improve their performance in a supportive way (6 CCIs)
P5) Manager confronts staff whenever they are unexpectedly late for work and/or have not turned up to fulfill a commitment (8 CCIs)
P9) When a member of staff uses foul or abusive language, and/or says bad things of other people, the manager immediately addresses the situation and confronts the person in a private setting (3 CCIs)
P10) Manager actively monitors and controls staff who are idle, who underperform, and/or who exhibit behavior that is below standard, and gives disciplinary warnings if required (6 CCIs)
P11) Manager confronts staff who violate/abuse company policies/rules/procedures and takes corrective action, including reminders to them and their colleagues about the proper protocols to be followed (9 CCIs)
2) Quickly addresses and resolves problems, and/or takes action to prevent problems arising
P6) Manager reacts/steps in quickly to solve problems experienced by customers caused by mistakes

made by staff or by other factors, and arranges for them to be fixed (9 CCIs)

P8) Manager addresses a customer's complaint by listening, apologizing, satisfying and then thanking the customer (6 CCIs)

P 12) Manager handles effectively situations where shoppers are caught stealing items or money (2 CCIs)

P14) When addressing conflict and problematic interpersonal issues that arise among employees (verbal or physical), the manager listens to both sides of the story before taking action to resolve and/or settle the situation. (5 CCIs)

P15) Manager listens to the complaints of staff about other staff members and then addresses the issues accordingly (3 CCIs)

P16) Manager anticipates and proactively takes action to prevent potential problems arising (5 CCIs)

3) Helping, supporting and guiding staff
P7) Manager helps/supports employees deal with problem issues arising with their customers or clients (5 CCIs)

P17) Manager gives practical help to staff in addressing/solving problems, handling difficulties, and/or correcting their mistakes or errors (9 CCIs)

P20) When manager learns directly from members of staff or indirectly via a third party that they are having difficulty in performing their tasks/roles correctly, or that they want feedback on their performance, he/she takes action to provide guidance and/or instruction as appropriate (6 CCIs)

P21) When members of staff make a mistake, the manager jumps in to minimize any damage and then helps them learn from their mistakes (10 CCIs)

P22) When unexpectedly members of staff become overloaded/over extended the manager gives support by personally 'lending a hand' to get all the work done (5 CCIs)

P25) Manager listens with understanding when an employee reports a mistake and quickly provides support or guidance to help resolve or minimize any potential damage (8 CCIs*)*

P26) Manager is very open to listening and responding to staff *[work or personal] concerns and/or* requests for help (4 CCIs)

4) Recognizing and rewarding staff for good performance
P18) Managers rewards staff who exceed what is expected of them (3 CCIs)

P19) Manager recognizes the good work of his/her employees, shows his/her appreciation, and thanks them (7 CCIs)

5) Reprimands staff in private
P9) When a member of staff uses foul or abusive language, and/or says bad things of other people, the manager immediately addresses the situation and confronts the person in a private setting (3 CCIs)

P13) When correcting or reprimanding staff s/he does so in private (3 CCIs)

6) Shows care and concern for staff well being
P26) Manager is very open to listening and responding to staff [work or personal] concerns and/*or requests for help* (4 CCIs)

P27) Manager shows understanding, kindness and forbearance when employees report they have made a mistake (10 CCIs)

P28) When an employee is off work for reasons of ill health, manager takes an interest and wishes them well (2CCIs)

P29) Manager is empathetic when staff need some flexibility and/or time off from work for medical or exceptional domestic reasons (e.g. an injury or death in family) (3 CCIs)

P30) Manager ensures employees are made aware of safe ways of working and/or ensures they are always in a safe area at work (5 CCIs)

7) Comes to the defense of staff under threat from outsiders
P23) When his employees are complained about by outsiders (customers or other managers), the manager consults with/listens to their side of the story to find out all of the facts (2 CCIs)
P24) When employees are subjected to rude/abusive/disrespectful behavior and/or racial slurs from customers, or are in some other confrontation with them, the manager takes over the conversation and handles the customer in their defense (7 CCIs)

8) Actively facilitates the training and development of staff
P31) Manager proactively identifies the learning needs of employees in their present job and arranges for more training as necessary (4 CCIs)
P32) Manager personally trains/guides his/her staff and shows them how best to perform tasks (5CCIs)
P33) Manager shows an interest in the personal growth/education and career development needs of staff, and if necessary allows some flexibility in their working arrangements (6 CCIs)

9) Actively listens to and seeks the ideas/suggestions of staff in decision making/problem solving
P34) Manager is open and listens to the ideas/suggestions of employees, and acts on them (6 CCIs)
P35) Manager actively seeks the views, ideas and suggestions of staff to inform the making of a decision and/or solving a problem (3 CCIs)

10) Communicates well with staff and keeps them informed on planned organizational changes that will affect them
P3) Manager explains to and educates staff on new policies, processes and procedures (5 CCIs)
P36) Manager communicates well with staff and keeps them informed on matters that affect them (4 CCIs)

Negative (*ineffective*) CBCs and BSs

1) Poor work scheduling, direction, judgment, and control
N1) Manager develops work schedules without a good feel [understanding] of the employees' individual strengths/preferences, and/or does not develop the schedules on time or at all (2 CCIs)
N4) Manager fails to give to employees clear, precise, timely (or even any) orders, instructions or directions on what is required of them (4 CCIs)
N5) Manager runs meetings in such a way that time is wasted and/or issues are never resolved (2 CCIs)
N7) In attempting to save money manager exhibits poor judgment and makes bad decisions that have damaging consequences (e.g. hiring unqualified people; installing cheapest outlets)(3 CCIs)
N9) Manager tolerates the laziness, under performance, bad behavior, and/or misdemeanors of various employees, and takes no action to get them to perform to standard or to discipline them (8 CCIs)

2) Overloads staff with work
N2) Manager sets unrealistic goals that are too high for staff to achieve (7 CCIs)
N3) Manager loads staff with more work than can be achieved within the scheduled time, or within the normal working hours (9 CCIs)

3) Shows lack of concern for staff safety, health, personal well-being and home life
N12) Managers shows a lack of interest in ensuring the safety and health of employees, and takes no preventative action even when alerted to the potential risks (3 CCIs)
N13) Manager shows lack of sensitivity or empathy for employees who exhibit signs of undue stress or burn out, and/or are experiencing an unavoidable crisis at home (e.g. a sick child) and who seek time off or some understanding for being late for work (3 CCIs)
N16) Manager expects/requires staff to attend to work matters in their own private time and regardless of their personal lives (e.g. arrive at work 1 hour early; respond to emails/calls at weekends or on vacation, work 6 days/week) (3 CCIs)

N20) Manager shows intolerance of staff who are not feeling well, and/or when they fall sick and are off-work at home (e.g. threatening to cut their hours of work; highlighting the risk of losing their job) (4 CCIs)

4) Manages staff in an inappropriate autocratic and/or dictatorial non listening/consultative way
N14) Manager autocratically makes decisions, implements changes, and/or commandeers the staff of subordinate managers without prior consultation or agreement (3 CCIs)
N37) Manager shows an unwillingness to listen to employee explanations of problematic situations and/or to listen to their ideas, before challenging/rebutting them (6 CCIs)
N38) Manager attempts to secure staff compliance to his orders (or point of view), and/or to force staff to achieve their goals through the threat of penalties and/or of the possibility of being fired from their jobs (6 CCIs)

5) Is unfair, inconsiderate and/or inconsistent in the way staff are treated
N8) Without properly investigating or questioning the validity of accusations and/or complaints received from third parties about his employees, the manager immediately reprimands them and/or unfairly punishes them (6 CCIs)
N15) Manager treats employees unfairly and unequally in terms of work allocation, pay, and overtime requirement (4 CCIs)
N16) Manager expects/requires staff to attend to work matters in their own private time and regardless of their personal lives (e.g. arrive at work 1 hour early; respond to emails/calls at weekends or on vacation, work 6 days/week) (3 CCIs)
N17) Having previously agreed something with staff the manager will arbitrarily change his/her mind (3 CCIs)
N21) Manager sets bad example by expecting/enforcing staff to follow company rules, but then not following them himself (7 CCIs)

6) Exhibits selfish/ self-serving behavior
N18)Manager exhibits favoritism by treating certain members of staff either better or more leniently than others (9 CCIs)
N19) Manager blames staff for problems caused by his/her own action or inaction (2 CCIs)

7) Gets angry and yells at staff
N10) When employees fail to achieve the output or to do so within the time requirements of their job, or they make a mistake/error, the manager gets angry and yells at them (10 CCIs)
N11) Manager exhibits a lack of emotional control by showing anger and yelling at people when s/he has had a stressful day, or is experiencing personal life problems, or when accidents occur at work whether caused or suffered by employees or customers (10 CCs)

8) Belittles and demeans staff in front of others
N22) When employees have made a mistake or error (or are just confused) the manager reprimands and/or belittles them in front of other people (i.e. fellow employees or customers) (5 CCIs)
N23) Manager makes inappropriate, distasteful, offensive, or discriminating jokes or remarks at the expense of certain staff, and/or behaves in other ways that demean or makes them feel degraded (6 CCIs)

9) Exhibits slackness and procrastination
N6) Manager can be forgetful or too focused and thus lose track of what is going on (2 CCIs)
N24) Manager exhibits a lack of key knowledge, skills, competence, and/or experience that subordinates expect their manager to possess. (4 CCIs)
N25) Either through forgetfulness or procrastination, the manager fails to do, or puts off doing what they said they would do (3 CCIs)

10) Ignores and avoids addressing poor performance, interpersonal conflict or bad staff behavior
N26) Manager turns a blind eye to and/or does nothing about employee harassment/bullying perpetrated by other employees (4 CCIs)
N27) Manager ignores concerns or complaints from staff regarding potentially serious work based issues (e.g. detected bad workmanship, faulty product; errors in documents; potential fraud), and either does nothing or suggests they close their eyes (6 CCIs)
N28) Manager takes no action to intervene/resolve interpersonal conflict taking place between employees, and/or avoids situations where confrontational argument might ensue (e.g. confronting poor performance/bad behavior of employees; presenting bad news to higher management) (6 CCIs)

11) Omits to provide staff with clear expectations and guidance, and/or provide feedback on their performance
N29) Manager omits to communicate to their staff the expectations they have of them (3 CCIs)
N31) Manager deprives staff of feedback on their work, and/or to review their performance (3 CCIs)
N32) When manager allocates new tasks to, or sets goals for employees, or requires them to change their way of working, s/he does so without giving any guidance or guidelines on how to complete the tasks or achieve the goals, and/or any opportunity to ask questions to find out (7 CCIs)

12) Withholds information on changes affecting staff
N30) Manager makes changes that will affect staff without giving prior notice or only giving short notice (3 CCIs)
N35) Manager deprives or withholds employees of explanations and/or information that they need in order to understand and/or implement changes that affect them (7 CCIs)

13) Deprives staff of recognition/ reward for good performance and/or of needed help/support
N34) Manager offers no help to support employees struggling to fix a problem and/or to achieve their goals (3 CCIs)
N33) Manager shows no appreciation or recognition of employee abilities and successes, and/or exhibits unwillingness to reward employees for their extra effort or great performances (7 CCIs)
N36) Manager does nothing to support employees in situations where they are being given a hard time by or are in contention with third parties (e.g. with customers; other managers) (4 CCIs)

Note: The underlining indicate those BSs that underpin more than one CBC

Some or all of the behavioral elements of 6 of our 13 deduced negative CBC's describe acts of omission that are polar opposite in meaning to certain behavioral elements of 5 of the 10 deduced positive CBC's, as indicated by the underlined phrases constituting the juxtaposed CBCs in Table 2 which could be regarded as 'bi-polar' behavioral constructs. Thus, the result is an emergent 'lay model' of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* relevant to one part of the USA, and comprised of 10 positive (*effective*) and 7 negative (*ineffective)* discrete behavioral indicators.

TABLE 2
**AN EMERGENT US BASED 'LAY MODEL' OF PERCEIVED MANAGERIAL AND
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS**

Positive (*effective*) behavioral indicators	Negative (*ineffective*) behavioral indicators
1) Sets clear standards, <u>schedules work effectively, and monitors/controls staff performance and behavior</u>	1) <u>Poor work scheduling</u>, direction, judgment, and <u>poor</u> control 11) <u>Omits to provide staff with clear expectations and guidance, and/or provide feedback on their performance</u>
2) Quickly addresses and resolves problems, and/or takes action to prevent problems arising	10) <u>Ignores and avoids addressing poor performance, interpersonal conflict, and/or bad staff behavior</u>
3) Helping, <u>supporting</u> and guiding staff	
4) <u>Recognizing and rewarding staff for good performance</u>	13) <u>Deprives staff of recognition/ reward for good performance and/or of needed help/support</u>
5) Reprimands staff in private	
6) <u>Shows care and concern for staff well being</u>	3) <u>Shows lack of concern for staff safety, health, personal well-being</u> and home life
7) Comes to the defense of staff under threat from outsiders	
8) Actively facilitates the training and development of staff	
9)Is open to and actively seeks the ideas/suggestions of staff in decision making/problem solving	
10) Communicates well with staff and <u>keeps them informed on planned organizational changes that will affect them</u>	12) <u>Withholds information on changes affecting staff</u> 2) Overloads staff with work 4) Manages staff in an inappropriate autocratic and/or dictatorial non listening/consultative way 5) Is unfair, inconsiderate and/or inconsistent in dealing with staff 6) Exhibits selfish/ self-serving behavior 7) Gets angry and yells at staff 8) Belittles and demeans staff in front of others 9)Exhibits slackness and procrastination

Note: The <u>underlining</u> indicates those parts of the juxtaposed positive and negative behavioral indicators that are 'polar opposite' in meaning

Positive (*Effective*) Behavioral Statement
P. 2) Manager sets clear expectations (work/attendance) (4 CIs)

The manager came down and let everyone know the importance of keeping the work place clean. He also set up a specific time in the day that everyone will go clean up their assigned area.

The manager gathered everyone to a meeting and informed everyone about the importance of keeping a clean warehouse. He also mandated a specific time during working hours that everyone has to go do the housekeeping and that is mandatory.

The manager informed every one of his expectations, that people are allowed some leeway in their start and stop time at work, so long as it is not abused.

Manager made a point that we were all supposed to be on time. In a serious but gentle tone of voice, the manager wanted us to be on time since he was on time.

Negative (*Least Effective/Ineffective*) Behavioral Statement
N 17). Exhibits poor planning and self-organization (5 CIs)

The manager runs ineffective meetings. We hold meetings all the time to address issues that are never resolved.

Manager did not make a work schedule on time. She would forget to make next week's schedule and we would sometimes receive calls Sunday night about our Monday schedule.

Manager had the meetings but that didn't help the productivity of the organization. Employees didn't learn anything from the meetings because they were poorly managed and a waste of time

The manager would be too busy doing other things that he would lose track of his employees and take it for granted that everything was running smoothly.

My manager would lose track of orders not very often but it would happen, or he would forget.

Two examples of the relationship between BSs and the CIs from which they were derived are illustrated in Table 3, and typical CIT 'data strips' shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
EXAMPLES OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS WITH BACKGROUND AND CONSEQUENCE

Background	Critical Incident	Consequence
Informing manager of a mistake made with a money order.	The manager calmly explained how to correct the mistake, stating that it was a minor issue. The manager was smiling throughout the process, providing comfort in the situation.	It was effective behavior due to the kindness of the manager and their willingness to help the employee figure out how to solve the problem.
One employee not doing her work and causing more work for others in the office.	Several people pointed the problem out to the office manager. The manager was afraid to say anything directly to the employee because of who her father was. She instead chose to hold an office meeting to address everyone. The person who was actually causing the problem did not think it related to her at all and didn't make any changes.	Morale and productivity continued to diminish.

These latter examples illustrate a background (situation) that prompted the manager to take action (critical incident), and also the consequence/outcome that resulted from the management's intervention, and which subsequently caused the participant to perceive and judge the action taken by the manager (critical incident) as effective or ineffective.

The findings of our empirical research suggest that 21st century managers in one part of the USA are perceived effective when, for example, they: (*i) set clear standards, schedule work effectively, and monitor/control poor staff performance/behavior, (ii) reprimand staff when necessary and in private, (iii) quickly address and resolve problems as well as taking action to prevent problems, (iv) give guidance and support to staff, (v) shows care and concern for staff well-being, (vi) come to the defense of staff who are being challenged/threatened by customers or outside managers, vii) take action in support of staff training and development, (viii) actively listens to and seeks the ideas and suggestions of staff when making decision and solving problems*, and (ix) *communicates well with staff and keeps them informed on planned organizational changes that will affect them*. Conversely, they are perceived ineffective when, for example, they: *(i) exhibit poor planning, direction, judgment and control, (ii) omit making clear their expectations and provide no feedback to staff on their performance, (iii) show a lack of concern for staff safety, health, and personal well-being, (iv) behave autocratically and dictatorially, (v) treat staff unfairly and without consideration, (vi) are inconsistent, self-serving, get angry, yell at staff, and belittle and demean them in front of others, (vii) exhibit slackness and procrastination, (viii) ignore or avoid addressing poor staff performance and behavior or conflict situations, (ix) deprive staff of key information, support, appreciation, recognition and reward,* and *(x) show unwillingness to listen to staff.*

DISCUSSION

Lu (1995) stated that "an effective manager has to consider behavior factors" (p. 45). Our empirical study explored the behavioral determinants of managerial and leadership effectiveness as manifested in one part of modern day America. The findings provide only partial support for previous behavioral research on leadership effectiveness conducted in the US. For example, they lend support for just two of the four broad behavioral meta-categories constituting Yukl's (2012) *hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior*. Of our 36 derived positive (*effective*) BSs, 16 and 9 overlap in meaning with one or more of Yukl's 'indicative leader behaviors' undergirding his *Task Oriented Behaviors* and *Relations-Oriented Behaviors* meta-categories respectively. Specifically, *task-oriented* behaviors such as solving problems, clarifying responsibilities, and monitoring performance identified in Yukl's (2012) taxonomy as effective leadership behavior, were also identified by the research participants of our US study as managerial behaviors indicative of effective managers. Moreover, leader behaviors such as being supportive, developing employees, and providing reward and recognition which were identified by Yukl as indicative of *relations-oriented* behaviors that lead to effective leadership, were also identified in our study as managerial behaviors exhibited by effective managers.

However, the results of our supervisory leadership-related research do not lend empirical support for the *Change-Oriented Behaviors* and *External Leadership Behaviors* meta-categories constituting Yukl's taxonomy. None of our other identified positive *(effective)* BSs (n=11) are found to be convergent in meaning with any of the indicative leader behaviors undergirding these two meta-categories. This lack of convergence might be attributable to the limitation of the size of our sample of research participants, or even to the study location that necessarily was limited to the Atlanta, Georgia region of the U.S.A. However, we suggest the absence in our findings of *change-oriented behaviors* and *external leadership behaviors* may have been due to such leader behaviors having been remotely distanced from the everyday experiences of our particular research participants. As Holtz and Harold (2013) have argued, the relevance of some leadership responsibilities (e.g. formulating an inspiring vision) varies depending on a manager's level in the management/organizational hierarchy. If so, this is significant because it suggests only two of the four meta-categories constituting Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy contain and represent fundamental behaviors that are important at all levels of management within organizations. And this brings into question the 'universal' applicability of the 'concept of leadership and its composition' for all types of managers as represented by Yukl's taxonomy.

Our research results lend some support but also bring into question the extent of the current applicability of Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions in the U.S.A. For instance, the score of Hofstede's 'power distance' dimension for the US suggests that employees have low tolerance of inequalities in the work place, and that they are not willing to tolerate authoritarian managers. This claim is supported by the empirical evidence provided by the respondents of our study who perceived authoritarian managers as ineffective. Similarly, our research results support Hofstede's finding on 'masculinity' which suggest that employees in the US are motivated by financial compensation and recognition. However, our research results give cause to question the extent to which Hofstede's finding on 'uncertainty avoidance', which suggests employees in the US feel comfortable with ambiguity, is applicable in US organizations. Based on the CIT collected for our study, effective managers set clear directions and expectations, and provide clear guidance to achieve these expectations.

Our research results also lend support to Trompenaars and Hampden Turner's (1998) findings regarding the 'relationship orientation' of employees in the US which suggest that these employees have low tolerance for favoritism. Specifically, our findings indicate that US employees perceive unfairness and favoritism as infective managerial behaviors; and they also suggest that effective managers in the metropolitan region of Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A. exhibit participative leadership and are team oriented. Interestingly, these findings are similar to the GLOBE study finding on effective strategic leadership which indicates that effective general (top) managers in US private sector organizations are participative and team oriented.

The findings of our US study are highly similar to those resulting from the aforementioned previous replication studies of *managerial and leadership effectiveness* conducted by Author 1 and Author 2 with various other co-researchers in Mexico, Egypt, Germany, Romania and the UK. This suggests the likely existence of a set of effective and ineffective managerial behaviors that are common across culturally diverse countries; it also lends support to the notion that certain effective management/leadership practices are universal and applicable across cultures (Bass, 1996).

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

By providing insight into how managerial and leadership effectiveness is perceived by US employees, our study could help domestic managers and international managers assigned to the US to have a better and more contemporary understanding of the expectations of the US workforce in regards to effective and ineffective management/leadership in the 21st century. Extant research indicates that alignment between the perception of managers and subordinates has a positive impact on the organization because it increases efficiency and employee satisfaction, and reduces costs (Anderson, Fornell, & Lehmann 1994; Crane & Crane 2000). Other studies show that developing good relationships between managers and subordinates will increase the productivity of the organization (Dodson 2006; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Therefore, it is important for managers to know how the managerial behaviors they exhibit are perceived by their subordinates and peers. By becoming more aware of how they are perceived by their constituencies (i.e. the people around them), managers will be in a better position to make the necessary adjustments to effectively manage and lead the workforce in the US. As indicated by Engle and Lord (1997), cognitive differences between what managers' and subordinates' respectively perceive as effective/ineffective managerial (leadership) behavior have the potential to result in job/employee dissatisfaction and thus have an adverse impact on organizational effectiveness and performance.

In addition, we suggest the findings of our study could be used by HR professionals of domestic and international companies to inform the design of management development programs created to enhance the managerial and leadership skills of their executives and managers. Furthermore, HR departments of multinational companies with operations in the US could use the managerial behaviors identified by our study when developing training programs to prepare expatriates to face the challenges of managing a workforce in the US. Research suggests that international managers' cultural adjustment is influenced by the degree to which they feel comfortable with the various elements of the culture of the host country (Shay & Tracey, 2009). Our findings could facilitate such expatriates with this adjustment process by providing guidance on those specific managerial (leadership) behaviors that are perceived effective by their US employees.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our study has four main limitations. The first relates to the sample size. Although we planned to gather 500 or more critical incidents we were able to collect only 392 which means we did not reach a point of data saturation. Thus, there is the possibility that there are more behavioral categories that would have emerged with a larger sample of critical incidents. The second limitation of the study relates to the methodology. Although our qualitative research has provided rich information about perceived *managerial and leadership effectiveness* in one area of the US, we cannot generalize these findings to other regions and states of the US. Therefore we recommend for future studies the use of 'mixed method research' designs. For example, the behavioral statements (BSs) identified in a qualitative research component of a future replication study in the US could be used as a departure point to develop behavioral items for a survey questionnaire to be administered as part of a quantitative research component designed to demonstrate their external validity and generalizability across organizational and state boundaries. The third limitation of the study relates to the location of the participants in only one area of the US, which was the metropolitan area of Atlanta. Therefore, these findings cannot be generalized to the entire US. Hence, it is recommended that replication studies are conducted in other

major areas of the US. Finally, although our study included managerial and non-managerial employees, the number of managers and non-managers was not balanced. Therefore, we recommend that future replication studies should strive to include more balanced numbers of managers and non-managerial employees in the respective samples of research participants.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of our study was to identify what US employees perceive as the specific managerial behaviors that differentiate effective managers from ineffective managers. We used the critical incident technique to collect concrete examples of perceived effective and ineffective managerial behavior taking place within the context of selected organizations. The analysis of the 392 CIs that were gathered from 81 participants (managers and non-managerial employees) suggests that managers in one part of the US are perceived as effective when they show behaviors such as caring, understanding, supportive, team players, democratic, problem solvers, organized, fair-minded, and communicative.

Our findings are consistent with those of previous replication studies of *managerial and leadership effectiveness* conducted in a variety of countries including the UK, Mexico, Colombia, Egypt, Germany, and Romania, which lends support to those who theorize and attempt to demonstrate empirically the existence of the 'universally effective manager'.

REFERENCES

Addis, M. (2003). Basic skills and small business competitiveness: Some conceptual considerations. *Education &* Training*, 45*(2), 152-161.

Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(3), 53-66.

Bass, B. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1996). Is there universality in the full range model of leadership? *International Journal of Public Administration, 16*(6), 738–69.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Beer, M. (1988). The critical path for change: Keys to success and failure in six companies. In R. H. Kilmann & T. J. Govin (Eds.), *Corporate transformation: Revitalizing organizations for a competitive world* (pp. 17-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, *6*(1), 1-21.

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

Cammock, P., Nilakant, V., & Dakin, S. (1995). Developing a lay model of managerial effectiveness. *Journal of Management Studies, 32*(4), 443-447.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *12,* 3-53.

Center for Creative Leadership (2013). *Leader Effectiveness and Culture: The GLOBE Study,* Retrieved from www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/assessments/GlobeStudy.pdf

Chell, E. (2004). Critical incident technique. In C. Cassell & G Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 45-69). London, UK: Sage.

Chong, L. M., & Thomas, D. C. (1997). Leadership perceptions in cross cultural context: Pakeha and pacific islanders in New Zealand. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*(3), 275-293.

Crane, J. S., & Crane, N. K. (2000). A multi-level performance appraisal tool: Transition from the traditional to a CQI approach. *Health Care Management Review, 24*(1), 64-73.

Dodson, M. R. (2006). *Relationship of manager-subordinate MBTI similarities to subordinates' perception of management effectiveness and leader member exchange relationships* (Doctoral dissertation). Pennsylvania State University.

Dollnger, M. J. (1984). Environmental boundary spanning and information processing effects on organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*(1), 351-368.

Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Cotton, B. C. G, & Täte, U. (1992). Leadership within the "discontinuous hierarchy" structure of the military. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 399-416). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(6), 736-741.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 350-383.

Engle, E., & Lord, R. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. Academy of Management Journal, *40*(4), 988-1010.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 327-358.

Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Gerstner, C., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership Prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, *5*(2), 121-134.

Glynn, M., & Raffaelli, R. (2010). Uncovering mechanisms of theory development in an academic field: lessons from leadership research. *Academy of Management Annals, 4*(1), 359-401.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multilevel Domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219-247.

Hamlin, R. G. (1988). The criteria of managerial effectiveness in secondary schools. *CORE:*Collected and Original Resources in Education. *The International Journal of Educational Research in Microfiche, 12*(1), 1-221.

Hamlin, R. G., Reidy, M., & Stewart, J. D. (1998). Bridging the HRD research-practice gap through professional partnerships. *Human Resource Development International*, *1*(3), 273-290.

Hamlin, R. G., Nassar, M., & Wahba, K. (2010). Behavioural criteria of managerial and Leadership effectiveness within Egyptian and British public sector hospitals: An empirical study and multiple-case/cross-nation comparative analysis. *Human Resource Development International*, *13*(1), pp. 43-64.

Hamlin, R. G., Sawyer, J., & Sage, L. (2011). Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in a non-profit organization: an exploratory and cross-sector comparative study. *Human Resource Development International*, *14*(2), 217-234.

Helgstrand, K., & Stuhlmacher, A. F. (1999). National culture: An influence on leader evaluations. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 7*(2), 153-168.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Holtz, B. C. & Harold, C. M. (2013). Effects of leadership consideration and structure on employee perceptions of justice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34,* 492-519.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* London: Sage.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R.N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 409-465.

Ireland, D., & Hitt, M. (2005). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *The Academy of Management Executive, 19(*4), 66-77.

Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors to managerial effectiveness and advancement. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 361-377.

Komaki, J. L. (1986). Toward effective supervision: An operant analysis and comparison of managers at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(2), 270-279.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1981). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal.*
 Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lu, H. (1995). Managerial behaviours over MIS growth stages. *Management Decision*, *33*(7) 40-46.

Luthans, F., & Doh, J. P. (2014). *International management: Culture, strategy, and behavior,* (8th ed.).
 New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Noordegraaf, M., & Stewart, R. (2000). Managerial behavior research in private and public sectors:
 distinctiveness, disputes and directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, *37*(3), 427-443.

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Patel, T., & Hamlin, R. G. (2012). Deducing a taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership
 effectiveness: A comparative study of effective and ineffective managerial behaviour across three
 EU countries. *Human Resource Development International*, *15*(5), 571-587.

Patel, T., Hamlin, R, G., & Heidgen, S. (2009). Exploring managerial and leadership effectiveness:
 Comparing private sector companies across Germany and the UK. Working paper presented at the
 UFHRD/AHRD 10th International Conference on HRD Research and Practice across Europe.
 Northumbria University, United Kingdom.

Rausch, E. (1999). Management/leadership decision guidelines: Critical ingredients for competitiveness.
 Competitiveness Review, *9,* 19-27.

Ruiz, C., Wang, J., & Hamlin, R. (2013). What makes managers effective in Mexico? *Leadership and
 Organizational Development Journal, 34*(2), 130-146.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students (*4th ed*.)*. New
 York: Prentice Hall.

Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy
 of Management Review, 15*(4), 626-645.

Shay, J. P., & Tracey, J. B. (2009). Expatriate adjustment and effectiveness: The mediating role of
 managerial practices. *Journal of International Management, 15*(4), 401-412.

Shipper, F. (1991). Mastery and frequency of managerial behaviors relative to subunit effectiveness.
 Human Relations, 44, 371-388.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *The handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY:
 Free Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and
 techniques*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Torres, L., Ruiz, C., Hamlin, R., & Velez, A. (2015). Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness
 in Colombia. European Journal of Training and Development, *39*(3), 203-219.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in
 global business* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tsui, A. S. (2007). From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the
 Academy and beyond. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50,* 1353-1364.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a
 half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*, 15-32.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention.
 Academy of Management Perspectives, *26*(4), 66-85.