

Patel, T., Salih, A. & Hamlin R. G. (2017) Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in UAE and Egypt: A comparison through the combined lenses of Islamic work ethics and Islamic leadership. *European Management Review*.

Manuscript Accepted by Publisher

26th November, 2017

**PERCEIVED MANAGERIAL AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN UAE AND
EGYPT:**

**A COMPARISON THROUGH THE COMBINED LENSES OF ISLAMIC WORK
ETHICS AND ISLAMIC LEADERSHIP**

Taran Patel,

Grenoble Ecole de Management

Ahmad Salih,

Grenoble Ecole de Management

Robert G Hamlin

University of Wolverhampton

PERCEIVED MANAGERIAL AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN UAE AND EGYPT:

A COMPARISON THROUGH THE COMBINED LENSES OF ISLAMIC WORK ETHICS AND ISLAMIC LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

Despite the increasing awareness that societal, sectorial, and organizational variables have a significant impact on manager and employee behavior, most studies in Asian and Middle Eastern (ME) countries, whether conducted by Western or indigenous scholars, continue to be informed by frameworks derived from the United States (US), Canada, or Western European countries (Leung, 2007; Li, 2012; Tsui, 2006)¹. This approach is problematic because the insights gleaned from such studies may fall only within Western theoretical constructs (Tsui, 2007; see also Shahin & Wright, 2004), thereby compromising insights regarding novel country-specific phenomena and the development of indigenous management/leadership knowledge. Consequently, many scholars (Rosenzweig, 1994; Rousseau & Fried, 2001) have called for the generation of indigenous management theories based on local conditions and socio-cultural factors, and for indigenous management and leadership research within non-Western countries (see Holtbrugge, 2013; Wolfgramm, Spiller & Voyageur, 2014; Shahin & Wright, 2004). This call is also pertinent for ME countries, where there is generally a paucity of indigenous management/leadership research and more specifically, of inductive emic (*context-specific*)

¹ The only notable non-US studies are those of: (i) Cammock, Nilakant and Dakin (1995) who used 'repertory grid' and factor analytic techniques to explore from a social constructionist perspective effective and ineffective managerial behaviors and characteristics within a New Zealand public sector organization, and thereby developed a *lay model of managerial effectiveness*; (ii) Alimo Metcalfe and Alban Metcalfe (2001) who also used 'repertory grid' and factor analytic techniques to derive an effectiveness related *new model of transformational leadership* within local government departments and public sector hospitals in the UK; and (iii) inductive emic replication studies of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* conducted by two of us (Author 1 & Author 3) in various Western and non-Western countries through the use of the Critical Incident Technique (CIT).

managerial behavior studies. We suggest that areas of management research that require particular attention in both Western and non-Western countries, including ME countries, are 'managerial effectiveness' and 'leadership effectiveness'. As various writers have claimed (Noordegraaf & Stewart, 2000; Yukl, 2012), such managerial behavior-related topics have been substantially neglected since the mid 1980s. Our study addresses this research gap within the context of two ME countries: United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Egypt.

Although it is commonly accepted that members of Islamic countries widely adhere to Islamic Work Ethics (IWE) (Ali, 1992 in Whiteoak, Crawford, and Mapstone, 2006), and that this influence is also observed in the workplace with Muslim managers and employees showing a high commitment to IWE (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008), there is a paucity of management and leadership theories grounded in Islamic principles (Elkaleh & Samier, 2013). For centuries, the Islamic world has accumulated a wealth of knowledge and experience regarding work and economic enterprises, and has developed views of work that are a reflection of their own cultural realities (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). Yet Western scholars continue to neglect IWE and to ground their reflections selectively in Max Weber's concept of Protestant Work Ethics (PWE) (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). The few references that have been made to IWE in Western management literature have a negative connotation. For instance, Weber (1982) believed that Islam, and more specifically Sufism, encourages a fatalistic way of life and is an obstacle in the development of a capitalistic spirit. He also argued that the 'the spirit of conquest' that characterized Islam is an antithesis of the productive capitalist spirit. Similarly, Ball and McCulloch (1985; also Terpstra, 1978) attribute economic and social problems in Islamic countries to IWE. Such criticisms have led past scholars to undermine the importance that Islamic principles might play in the way businesses are conducted in Islamic countries. In the present paper, we adopt a different stance. We examine our findings of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness through the lenses

of two key Islamic concepts - Islamic Work Ethics (IWE) and Islamic Leadership (IL). As such, we address the dearth in extant literature of research that demonstrates empirically the embeddedness of managerial behaviors in ME countries within Islamic principles.

Past literature also ignores the fact that every Muslim country has its own understanding of Islam (and consequently, of IWE) (Uygur, 2009). Further, Islam may exercise different degrees of influence on its adherents, with some followers being more devout than others (Uygur, 2009). A particular interpretation of Islam is created by its believers via producing and reproducing social practices across space and time, and therefore, there could well be different interpretations of Islamic principles between different peoples. Since the diversity in the interpretation and application of Islamic principles across Islamic countries is often neglected in extant literature, we deem it important to explore the same. With this objective in mind, in the present paper, we compare findings between two Islamic ME nations - UAE and Egypt - to assess the extent to which the perceived effectiveness or ineffectiveness of managerial behavior is influenced by the Islamic principles of IWE and IL across these countries.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND CORE QUESTIONS

In the present study, we replicate in a multinational company based in UAE the study of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* that Author 3 has conducted with other co-researchers in various private, public, and third sector organizations in the United Kingdom (UK), Egypt, Germany, Mexico, and Romania (see Anon 3 et al, 2012), and more recently in Argentina (Anon 3 et al, 2015), France (Anon 3 et al, 2015), and South Korea (Anon 3 et al, 2015). Barring the one study conducted by Author 3 with indigenous co-researchers in Egypt (Anon 3 et al., 2010), we know of no other 'managerial effectiveness' or 'leadership effectiveness' studies conducted by other researchers in ME countries. Therefore, the first objective of this

study is to build upon Author 3's previous research by conducting an equivalent inquiry within the UAE. As a second objective we compare the findings from our emic UAE replication study with those resulting from the afore-mentioned Egyptian replication study conducted within a public sector hospital in Cairo. We have used this latter study as a 'template' for our present replication study in the UAE. A comparison of the results from the Egyptian and UAE studies will reveal the degree of consistency and/or differences between the perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of managerial behavior between the selected organizations in these two countries. The third objective of our study is to examine both sets of findings through the combined lenses of IWE and IL so as to assess the extent to which these Islamic principles influence the perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of managerial behavior in UAE and Egypt. Thus the core question that has guided the study is: "How do people within UAE and Egyptian organizations perceive 'good' (*effective*) and 'bad' (*ineffective*) managers, and in what ways are their perceptions influenced by the principles of IWE and IL?"

Before we outline the knowledge gaps that our present paper addresses, we clarify two key points.

(1) First, within the context of our study we make no distinction between 'manager behavior' and 'leader behavior', and instead use the term 'managerial behavior' to refer to both. Our choice is influenced by the fact that various researchers argue that the terms 'management' and 'leadership' are not distinct constructs (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003; Kotterman, 2006). Leading is in fact an integral part of the everyday task of managing (Mintzberg, 2004; Tett, Gutterman, Bleier, & Murphy, 2000). Many if not most people within organizations and within the academic world tend to use the terms

interchangeably (Bolden, 2004; Raelin, 2004). Additionally, our use of the term 'leadership' refers to the 'supervisory leadership' (House & Aditya, 1997) performed by managers at all levels within an organization, and not to the 'strategic leadership' as performed by top managers/organizational leaders (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004).

(2) Second, in the present paper we compare findings from a private UAE multinational company with those from an Egyptian public sector hospital. Various writers claim that lists of core managerial competencies cannot be transferred and applied with equal success across organizations and organizational sectors (see, Garavan & McGuire, 2001; Raelin & Cooledge, 1995). Such claims lend support to the argument that managers in public sector organizations need to adopt different behaviors to those in private sector companies because of inherent differences between the two sectors (de Graaf & van der Wal, 2008; Hansen & Villadsen, 2010; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001). However, although differences between public and private sector organizations have been studied in terms of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, motivation, and efficiency and effectiveness, few researchers have examined differences in leadership behavior and effectiveness across public and private sectors (Hooijberg & Choi, 2001: p.404). Whereas in Greece Bourantis and Papalexandris (1993) found public managers using less 'initiating structure' in their leadership than private managers, in Sweden Anderson (2010) found 'task' (*initiating structure*) styles of leadership are more often used in public sector organizations whilst 'relationship' (*consideration*) styles of leadership are most frequently applied by private managers. Yet in the UK, Dulewicz and Higgs (2005) found that managerial job contexts seemed to influence leadership style the same way in the two organizational sectors. Thus, extant literature is inconclusive on the issue of

differences between public and private sectors regarding leadership behaviors and styles. Further, replication studies of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* carried out by Author 3 of the present study in UK public, private and third sector organizations have revealed little difference between the sectors, with over 90% of the *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviors observed in nine different organizations from across the three sectors being perceived in much the same way (Anon 3 et al., 2013). Similarly, Patel and Hamlin (2012) found almost 80% of the behavioral indicators of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* identified in public and private organizations in Germany, Romania and the UK to be generalized across the two sectors and three countries. Thus there is a strong precedence for comparing results of managerial behavior research conducted in public and private sector organizations, and across culturally diverse countries. Our study builds on this body of literature by comparing results from a private multinational UAE company against those from a public sector hospital in Egypt regarding *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness/ineffectiveness*.

With regards to knowledge gap, our present emic study addresses the paucity of indigenous research on management/leadership, and more specifically on ‘managerial effectiveness’ and ‘leadership effectiveness’, in ME countries. It contributes to understanding better the issue of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* in UAE by describing 13 broad categories of positive managerial behaviors and 27 broad categories of negative managerial behaviors. This could be thought of as a two-dimensional behavioral ‘lay model’ of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* in the UAE private sector. Secondly, our study reveals that although there is a

considerable overlap in substance and meaning between the compared positive and negative BSs resulting from the UAE and Egyptian studies, there are also some significant differences. Although Egypt and UAE are both Islamic countries (implying that people in these countries subscribe to the principles of IWE and IL), there are still certain differences between how managerial behaviors are perceived in these two countries. This finding suggests that while IWE exercises a considerable influence on members of the Muslim society, the degree of influence it exercises on people varies from one group of people to another. It may therefore be unwise to assume that IWE principles have the same degree of impact on all Muslims (Uygur, 2009), and that there is homogeneity among ME countries simply because they subscribe to Islam as the dominant religion. Finally and most importantly, our study reveals that despite the apparent gap between Islamic principles inherent within the notions of IWE and IL and actual practices observed in certain ME countries, more than half of the positive and negative BSs from the UAE data set are informed by principles of IWE and IL. This shows that IWE and IL exercise significant influence on the personal Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) subconsciously held by followers, and consequently their perceptions of managerial behaviors in ME countries. Therefore, ignoring the principles of IWE and IL, as past scholars have tended to do, might be short-sighted, and might curtail our understanding of how to function effectively in ME countries.

LITERATURE REVIEW

We begin this section by briefly explaining the notion of Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) before moving on to a critical review of extant literature on IWE and IL, which we believe may influence the ILTs that employees in ME countries develop of their leaders and/or managers.

Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs)

Over three decades ago, Tsui (1984) argued that managers operate within a social structure consisting of multiple constituencies or stakeholders (e.g., superiors, peers, subordinates), each of whom has his/her own expectations of managerial behaviors. Further, how managers' behaviors are perceived by their respective constituencies, can be important for managerial success because it determines their 'reputational effectiveness' (Tsui, 1984), which can have reputational consequences (Tsui & Ashford, 1994). For example, a manager's perceived behavior can cause peers and superiors to give or withhold important resources such as information and co-operation, or can lead to subordinates either following or not following their leadership. The criteria used by individual stakeholders to perceive the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of managers are influenced by their personally held 'mental models' or what is known as their Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs).

All individual employees have their own sets of beliefs, convictions, and assumptions concerning the attributes and behaviors that distinguish 'good' from 'bad' managers (Eden & Leviathan, 1975), and they use these Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) to encode, process, and recall specific events and behavior (Shaw, 1990). Within the context of our study, ILTs can best be understood in terms of cognitive categorization processes that result in employees holding implicit cognitive prototypes of what they perceive as a behaviorally effective or ineffective manager (Phillips & Lord, 1981). Employees evaluate managers against these cognitive prototypes (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; Foti & Luch, 1992). The better the fit the more likely it is

they will perceive the observed manager as being effective, or conversely ineffective. Additionally, a variety of contextual factors may also influence the kind of ILTs that followers develop about managerial leaders (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher, 1999). In the present paper, we argue that the Islamic principles inherent in IWE and IL considerably influence the ILTs that employees in ME countries hold regarding their managers, and therefore have an impact on the perceived effectiveness or ineffectiveness of managerial behaviors. In subsequent sub-sections, we provide a critical review of extant literature on IWE and IL.

Islamic Work Ethics (IWE): Ideals versus reality

In this sub-section, we outline some of the basic tenets of IWE and also point out identified gaps between these ideals and the current reality in ME countries. First, Islam gives considerable importance to work (including business activities) (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008; Possumah, Ismail, & Shahimi, 2013). Work is believed to offer many benefits: alleviation of poverty, motivating other people, creatively engaging in an appropriate profession, complementing the human soul with knowledge, cultivating good manners, useful ideas and responsible deeds, and ultimately achieving salvation (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). In Islam, no work is considered superior or inferior, and both physical and manual work is equally appreciated (Possumah et al., 2013). Much importance is given to pursuing perfection in one's work. Islam also encourages helping one another within the work context, as long as this is for righteous reasons (Possumah et al., 2013). Although conventional Islamic teachings give utmost importance to work, recent experiences in many Islamic countries show that work and productivity may not hold the same priority among the populations today as dictated within traditional Islamic teachings. Some experts (see Ali, 1992) believe that the historical domination of Western power over Arab countries and the discovery of oil have led to the erosion of the value of hard work and commitment in these countries, thereby negatively impacting their

economic growth and development. More recently, Sidani and Thornberry (2009) conclude that the economic condition of a majority of Arab states is evidence that the current work value system is not working well (see Metle, 2002 for similar findings in the Kuwaiti public sector). Successive UNDP reports (2002 through 2005) have also reported significant drops in productivity in these countries.

Second, Islam encourages transparency and honesty in business transactions, and it is believed that those who cheat, conceal facts, and tell lies shall lose the blessings of their transactions (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). Wealth must be earned through hard work, and not by usurping what belongs to others. Islam encourages open and unrestricted competition, but one that is conducted transparently and morally. Through free competition, Islam supports the interest of both the individual and the larger community, and condemns corrupt practices such as bribery (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). Notwithstanding these ideals, many Islamic countries, including those in the ME have often been criticized for corrupt practices, both in the public and private sectors (Sidani & Thornberry, 2009). According to the 2007 annual corruption report, Arab countries scored an average of 3.18 over 10, where 10 represents no corruption (Transparency International, 2007). Corruption is further supported by the presence of red-tape, bureaucracy, mismanagement and waste, inefficiencies, nepotism and ineffective due process (Sidani & Thornberry, 2009).

Third, Islam discourages from being greedy and monopolizing resources, because such practices produce suffering and unlawful profits, and propagate inequality. While those who enable supply of resources are considered blessed, those who monopolize or withhold supplies are considered as sinners (Ali & Al-Owaidan, 2008). Islam gives considerable importance to generosity (Yousef, 2000a) and explains that those who contribute toward eliminating the distress of others are close to God. Islam also encourages people to strike the right balance between being

extravagant and being miserly, and advises strong punishments for those who hoard wealth (Ali & Al-Owaihian, 2008).

Fourth, Islamic teachings give considerable importance to human dignity (Ali, 1992; Khan, Abbas, Gul, & Raja, 2013). Muslims are advised to respect their employees, and treat them as family members (Possumah et al., 2013). They should not expect their employees to work beyond their capacity, and help them if tasks become too much for them to handle by themselves (Possumah et al., 2013). They should be fair to their employees, and to pay their wages in a timely, fair, and adequate fashion. There is also emphasis on maintaining trust in interpersonal dealings and treating fellow-beings in a just and fair way (Possumah et al., 2013). Islam categorically rejects the exploitation of human resources, with a special focus on protecting weaker members of society such as women and children (Tabakoglu, 1983 as cited in Possumah et al., 2013). Despite Islam's inherent emphasis on maintaining human dignity, in recent decades accusations have been leveled against many Islamic countries, including those in the ME, regarding their ill-treatment of employees, especially foreign workers (Khan, 1991 as cited in Sarwar & Abugre, 2013).

Fifth, decision-making from the Islamic viewpoint incorporates the principles of consultation (*Shura*), honesty (*Al-Sidq*), trust (*Al-Amanah*), justice and fairness (*Al-Adl*), teamwork and cooperation (*Al-Ta'waan*), and excellence (*Al-Ikhlās*) (Mellahi & Budhwar, 2010; Khan et al., 2013). However, some scholars have described Muslim managers as 'pseudo-participative' (Ali, 1993), implying that these managers make an appearance of consulting employees, while rarely taking their views into consideration. Further, according to Mutahhari (1985) Islam supports the idea of justice, and divides it into divine (i.e. creative and legislative) and human (i.e. individual and social) justice. Islam also supports the idea of distributive justice in the larger society such that every individual is guaranteed a standard of living consistent with

human dignity (Shah-Kazemi & Lewisohn, 2006). Nevertheless, many Muslims nations presently experience a gross inequality in wealth distribution, which threatens their welfare by pitting a small class of privileged individuals against the vast majority of Muslims living under the poverty line (Böwering, 2012).

In conclusion, our review of extant literature reveals that while the principles inherent in IWE are very noble, there is, in fact, a gap between these principles and their actual implementation in different Islamic countries. In light of this gap, a logical question arises: do the principles inherent in IWE still exercise an influence on employees in ME countries? More specifically, do employees in the UAE multinational firm and the Egyptian public sector hospital continue to embed their perceptions of managers' and leaders' effectiveness/ineffectiveness (i.e. their ILTs) within the principles of IWE?

Islamic Leadership (IL): Ideals versus reality

Broadly speaking, Islamic leadership involves working for the collective wellbeing of society through the propagation of all that is good (Mir, 2010). Leaders are expected to contribute to creating a society that is just, welfare-oriented, egalitarian, and free from discrimination, exploitation, and oppression (Mir, 2010). Leadership involves trust and responsibility rather than privilege (Elkaleh & Samier, 2013), and a psychological contract by which leaders dedicate themselves to protecting, guiding, and serving followers (Metcalf & Murfin, 2011).

When examined closely, the concept of IL reveals similarities with the contemporary theory of servant leadership (Elkaleh & Samier, 2013). A servant leader is first and foremost a servant of the followers (Greenleaf, 2002). Servant leaders listen to others' problems, prioritize followers' needs, and help them grow and achieve their potential. Drawing parallels between the concept of servant leadership and their understanding of IL, Beekun and Badawi (2009) explain that Islamic leaders must work with dedication to ensure the welfare and growth of their

followers. Islamic leaders are expected to live lives of self-denial, while serving and helping others. Beekun (2012) identified the following attributes of servant leadership in Prophet Mohammed's behavior: focusing on serving others rather than on acquiring status, wealth or power, listening to others with genuine concern, speaking the truth and behaving in a way that reflects integrity thereby inspiring trust, attempting to achieve what is feasible rather than achieving everything, and always willing to help others. While these scholars (see Beekun & Badawi, 2009; Beekun, 2012) draw parallels between the principles inherent in IL and the notion of servant leadership, other scholars (see Sarayrah, 2004) note that the concept of servant leadership might be losing its influence in Islamic countries due to external influences and the absorption of foreign practices and customs.

Similarly, there are strong overlaps between Burns' (1978) transformational theory of leadership and IL's notion of guardianship (Elkaleh & Samier, 2013). In transformational leadership, leaders and followers support one another to surpass their initial limits. Transformational leaders inspire followers to reach their full potential (Northouse, 2004). Drawing parallels between transformational leadership and IL, Beekun and Badawi (2009) explain that in Islam the guardian leader must work toward protecting followers from oppression and tyranny, and promote justice and consciousness among them. The guardian leader is like a shepherd who guards, protects, cares for, develops and guides followers. Considering Prophet Mohammed's behavior as the standard, Beekun (2012) explained that guardian leadership involves raising followers' awareness, helping people look beyond their self-interest, encouraging followers to acquire more knowledge, inspiring followers through charisma, treating them fairly while respecting their differences, and supporting them during difficulties.

Finally, the principle of '*shura*' or consultation is very important for Islamic leaders (Ather & Sobhani, 2007). Islamic leaders must consult the followers, and be kind to and

supportive of them. Conversely, followers must actively collaborate with leaders, and support them provided their choices are consistent with Islamic principles. However, followers may withdraw support if leaders deviate from the path of Islam. Thus, Islam encourages active rather than blind followership (Ather & Sobhani, 2007). Islam does not support an authoritarian style of leadership where little or no voice is given to subordinates (Ather & Sobhani, 2007). Thus, in Islamic teaching, leadership is “a social exchange” (Beekun & Badawi, 2009: 7) and “a shared influence” (Ali, 2009: 163) process whereby leaders seek advice from followers (Elkaleh & Samier, 2013). Unfortunately, as Sidani and Thornberry (2009) explain, despite the emphasis in Islam on independent thinking and active (rather than blind) followership, such practices may have been discouraged in Islamic countries in recent decades. This may be the case because the Islamic culture demands obedience from a very young age, and the education system in these countries prioritizes rote learning as opposed to critical thinking and questioning authority figures (parents, teachers, supervisors, etc.) (see also [Shahin & Wright, 2004](#)). Challenging authority figures including managers may also be rendered difficult due to high power distance that characterizes these countries (Hofstede, 2001 cited in Sidani & Thornberry, 2009).

As a closing remark to this sub-section, although extant literature on IL supports many noble principles, we also find some evidence indicating that these principles are not always respected in practice. For instance, in some Islamic countries, where knowledge serves as source of power, leaders (managers) tend to hoard knowledge (Sidani & Thornberry, 2010). Their leadership style is autocratic and they rely on fear and coercion to achieve organizational objectives. They may also engage in playing one group of employees against another to secure their position. They try to make themselves indispensable by ensuring that their subordinates never learn enough to replace them. Decision-making is such that it preserves the fiefdom of the leader. This kind of leadership style is consistent with what Khadra (1990) refers to as the

Caliphal model of leadership (as opposed to the Prophetic model). Some scholars have described Muslim managers as ‘pseudo-participative’ (Ali, 1993), implying that these managers make an appearance of consulting employees, while rarely taking their views into consideration. Considering the potential gap between the ideals of IL and the actual practice of leadership and followership in certain Islamic countries, it is valid to question whether, in the present times, these ideals still exercise an influence, and if so, to what extent, on the perceptions that followers have of their managers’ and leaders’ effectiveness/ineffectiveness (i.e. on their ILTs).

Research Questions

Based on the reflections presented up to this point in the present paper, we raise the following three research questions:

RQ1: Which managerial behaviors are perceived as effective/ineffective in the context of our UAE-based private sector multinational company?

RQ2. How do the UAE private sector findings from RQ1 compare with the findings of an equivalent study conducted in the Egyptian public sector?

RQ3. To what extent are the effective and ineffective managerial behaviors identified by the UAE and Egyptian studies embedded (or not) in IWE and IL principles?

METHODOLOGY

Our three research questions were addressed separately in three component parts (stages) as discussed below. For the overall study we adopted a philosophical stance informed by pragmatism and the ‘pragmatic approach’ (Morgan, 2007) which allows researchers to adopt pluralistically those paradigmatic assumptions that best fit the research purpose and questions, and not to be constrained by what is privileged by a particular research paradigm (Cunliffe, 2011, Hamlin, 2015). Because our study seeks to identify not only what behaviorally distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers in our collaborating UAE company, but also to

reach for mutual validation and generalization of the findings with those resulting from the earlier Egyptian study, we assumed a post-positivist (empirical realist) ontology and constructivist-interpretivist epistemology (Guba and Lincoln 1994; Ponterotto 2005), and adopted Tsang and Kwan's (1999) notion of 'empirical generalization replication'.

Stage 1 Component (*Addressing RQ1*)

This component consisted of an 'emic' replication of Anon 3 et al.'s (2010) Egyptian study of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* within a UAE-based multinational company - M&R (pseudonym). Both these studies respond to calls from past scholars for researchers to: (i) carry out indigenous non-Western country-specific management and leadership research; (ii) attempt generating indigenous theories, and (iii) conduct these studies with the help of local scholars using local language (Tsui, 2007). For this stage of our study the local scholar was Author 2 who is a bi-lingual resident of UAE, and a follower of Islam.

Sampling

M&R designs, supervises, and manages infrastructural, architectural, and engineering projects, and offers consulting services for urban planning. It has offices in Dubai, Sharjah, Abu Dhabi, Al Ain, and Fujairah. Through a process of purposeful convenience sampling the research participants secured for this study were mid-level managers (heads of departments, heads of sections, construction managers, and project managers), and non-managerial employees including senior architects, architects, senior engineers, engineers, secretaries and team members. The sample comprised of 43 participants from Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Syria, Oman, Palestine, Lebanon, Philippines, Pakistan, India, Canada, Ukraine, and UAE; and as such reflected the diversity found in the larger UAE society. Of the 43 participants 34 were male and 9 were female, 15 were managers and 28 were non-managerial staff.

Data Collection

Replicating as closely as possible Anon 3 et al.'s (2010) research design and methodology, we used Flanagan's (1954) Critical Incident Technique (CIT) to collect examples (critical incidents-CIs) of effective and ineffective managerial behavior. CIT has long been claimed as one of the best techniques for focusing on the more important aspects of managerial behavior (Latham & Wexley, 1981), and is regarded by many researchers as among the best technique for sampling important performance-related managerial behavior (Borman & Brush, 1993). Furthermore, CIT permits a degree of replication because "*the method enables the development of case based theory grounded in actual critical events which shape future actions*" and when used across multiple sites it means "*the researcher can look for evidence of commonalities in themes, that is, 'incidents' which increase generalizability*" (Chell, 1999:71).

The CIT data was collected by Author 2 after having gained permission from the General Manager of M&R. Initially all employees were invited by the HR Department to a meeting wherein they were informed about the objectives of the study, how the data would be collected, and how it would be subsequently used. The meaning of key terms such as 'incident', '*critical incident*' and *effective and ineffective managerial behavior* were also explained. *Effective behavior* was defined as 'behavior one would wish all managers to adopt if and when faced with similar circumstances', and *ineffective behavior* was defined as 'behavior which, if it occurred repeatedly or even once in certain circumstances, might cause one to doubt the ability of that particular manager'. Potential participants were informed that the data collected would be anonymous, neither their names nor the name of the company would appear in the final report, and that the company would only be offered an executive summary of the study.

During the interviews, participants were asked to provide 10 CIs that they had personally observed during the previous six months, which, at the time of observation, they considered to be effective or ineffective. For each CI they were asked to (i) explain the background/context in

which the incident had taken place; (ii) describe the incident itself; (iii) describe the consequential outcome of the specific managerial behavior and to elucidate why they had categorized it as effective or ineffective. The examples given could include behaviors exhibited by any project managers, direct line managers, design managers, or even members of the senior management. Respondents were asked to offer only examples of actual manifested behaviors of managers, and not their managerial styles, values, preferences, personality traits, or other characteristics. Leading questions were avoided at all times, but probing questions were used as necessary to elicit the critical aspect of observed managerial behaviors.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted by Author 1, for which the CIs served as the unit of analysis. Each CI was subjected to *open coding* to identify its respective unit of meaning. Where doubts occurred regarding the meaning behind some of the CIs these were resolved through critical examination and discussions between Authors 1 and 2. For most CIs, the clarification provided by Author 2 sufficed, but in some cases a more in-depth back-and-forth iterative process was required until the two researchers finally agreed on the meaning of the coded CI. These open coded CIs were then subjected to inductive *axial coding* applied at the semantic level (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Flick, 2002) in search of evidence of *sameness*, *similarity*, or *congruence* of meaning. *Sameness* existed when the sentences or phrases used to describe two or more behavioral descriptors were nearly identical. *Similarity* existed when the behavioral descriptors were different, but the kind of meaning was the same. *Congruence* existed where there was an element of sameness or similarity in the meaning of certain phrases. When such commonality of meaning was found the CIs were grouped accordingly into clusters (behavioral categories). In accordance with the research procedure used by Anon 3 et al. (2010), each cluster was comprised of a minimum of three and a maximum of ten CIs. After analyzing and interpreting each cluster a

label was devised in the form of a behavioral statement (BS), which reflected in essence the meaning held in common by its constituent CIs. Since a presentation of each emergent BS with its underpinning CIs is not possible due to the word limit imposed on this paper, we provide one example each of a positive and a negative BS in Table 1 below.

---Insert Table 1 about here---

Stage 2 Component (*Addressing RQ2*)

The Stage 2 component involved comparing the BS data set resulting from Stage 1 against the equivalent BS data set from Author 3's earlier Egyptian study (Anon 3 et al., 2010)². The earlier Egyptian study was conducted in a public sector hospital since this offered a unique context for exploration. As Hassan and Sarker (2012) report, the performance of the public health care sector in Egypt remains poor as compared with other countries with similar economic conditions. Nevertheless, significant reforms have been attempted in recent years (Hassan, 2010), one of which pertains to the introduction of the pay for performance system in 2001. In accordance with this system, employees receive financial incentives when they achieve pre-determined targets. This change has led to increasing the satisfaction level of both healthcare service providers as well as patients (El-Saharty, Elhayatmy, Prose, et al., 2010), thereby bridging the performance gap between public and private hospitals in Egypt.

The Egyptian study (Anon 3 et al, 2010) was based on emic replication research conducted by Anon 4, and Egyptian national, as part of an MBA study programme under the general supervision of her Director of Studies and specific guidance and mentoring from Author 3. The collaborating organization she chose for her 'case study' research was a public hospital

² The word limit prevents us from enlisting here the BSs from the Egyptian study. We are willing to provide these upon request.

where she was an administrator, and where one of her close relatives worked as a doctor. Hence, she was well acquainted with both the broader Egyptian cultural, religious, and political context, as well as the internal structure and functioning of the hospital, served as the local expert in this case study. The chosen hospital was located in down town Cairo, which has a mix of Muslim and Christian populations. Nevertheless, in light of the fact that 90% of Egyptians are Muslim³, it is reasonable to assume that a large majority of doctors, nurses and other healthcare staff plus administrators in the chosen hospital were followers of Islam, and therefore adhering to the tenets of IWE and IL.

We chose the Egyptian study with which to compare our findings because, to our knowledge, this was the only managerial behavior study of its kind conducted in either a private or public sector organization in ME countries, and it was the ‘template’ study used to guide our UAE emic replication research. Hence for comparability purposes there is a high degree of ‘functional equivalence’ across the two BS data sets because both groups of researchers adopted the same research focus, and adhered as closely as possible to the established ‘common CIT protocols’ for collecting and analyzing the data. Furthermore, as called for by Kim and Yukl (1995) for replication studies, there was a degree of central control exercised by Author 3 in both studies in order to ensure consistency in the way the protocols were applied. Put together, these studies offer two contrasting perceptions of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* from two ME countries which share considerable similarity in terms of religious affiliations, but are very different from each other on economic and demographic characteristics.

³ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/eg.html>

In order to compare the findings emerging from the UAE data with those from the study conducted previously in Egypt, initially Authors 2 and 3 worked independently in search of commonalities and relative empirical generalizations as reflected by evidence of ‘sameness’, ‘similarities’ and/or ‘congruence’ of meaning across the two BS data sets. The definitions of ‘sameness’, ‘similarities’ and ‘congruence’ were the same as elaborated in the previous subsection. The method used was ‘realist qualitative analysis’ (Madill, Jordon, & Shirley, 2000) that involved a variant of open coding applied inductively and deductively within a grounded theory mind set (Flick, 2002). Once the degree of similarity/dissimilarity between the two BS data sets was established by Authors 2 and 3 independently, they then shared their findings with one another (Gibbs, 2007).

Stage 3 Component (*Addressing RQ3*)

This component of our study involved Author 1 and Author 2 re-interrogating the BSs emerging from the UAE and Egyptian data sets through the conceptual lenses of IWE and IL. They applied open coding (Flick, 2002) in search of Islamic concepts in the emergent BSs, and they allowed the richness of the data to emerge through a process of on-going discovery (Van Maanen, 1983). First, Author 1 independently examined the two sets of BSs at the semantic level to identify Islamic principles of IWE and IL embedded in the textual data. These findings were then shared with Author 2, who, being a follower of Islam and a resident of UAE, was treated as the local expert on the topic.

Credibility, dependability, and trustworthiness of our study

During stage 1 of our study, consistency was ensured in Author 2’s application of the CIT protocols by the fact that Author 1 trained him before he commenced interviews in M&R. Author 1 continued to provide further guidance and support during the process of data collection and

analysis. To ensure the validity of research findings in terms of their plausibility, trustworthiness and credibility, a form of ‘investigator triangulation’ was applied for the data analysis (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe, 1991). This involved Authors 1 and 2 first analyzing the set of collected CIs and deduced BSs independently. Then they compared and contrasted their individual analyses and interpretations in order to arrive at a mutual confirmation of where there was convergence and divergence (Knafl & Breitmayer, 1991). Overall there was general agreement regarding their respective judgments of the commonalities existing between the respective data sets. Minor discrepancies and inconsistencies that arose were resolved through critical examination and discussion to reach a consensus.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the Stage 2 research findings in terms of their credibility and dependability a form of ‘investigator triangulation’ was applied for the comparative analysis (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe, 1991). This involved Authors 2 and 3 first analyzing independently the UAE and Egyptian BS data sets. They then compared and contrasted their analyses in order to arrive at a mutual confirmation of where there was convergence and divergence (Knafl & Breitmayer, 1991). Overall there was general agreement regarding their respective interpretations. Minor discrepancies and inconsistencies were resolved through critical examination and discussion to reach a consensus. The results of the Stage 2 comparative analysis were then sent to Author 1 who acted as a confirmatory auditor.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the Stage 3 research, Author 1 first independently examined the BSs from the UAE and Egyptian data sets to identify their embeddedness within the tenets of IWE and IL. Subsequently, Author 2 reverted back to Author 1 with his assessment of the degree of embeddedness of the BSs within the tenets of IWE and IL. Since there was almost total agreement between them, the iterative process of discussion and subsequent refinement of the findings was fairly short at this stage.

RESULTS

This section is divided into three parts: one for each of the three stages of the study.

Stage 1 Component (*Addressing RQ1*)

In this section we present the positive (effective) and negative (ineffective) BSs that emerged from the UAE replication research. A total of 401 CIs were collected from 43 research participants. During the initial familiarization with the CIT data, Author 1 discovered that some of the CIs referred to managerial behaviors observed by participants in their previous organizations. Consequently these non-M&R related CIs were discarded, resulting in 346 usable CIs of which 132 were examples of effective and 214 of ineffective managerial behavior. The *open* and *axial coding* process revealed that 5 of the effective and 16 of the ineffective coded CIs had nothing in common with at least two other CIs, and consequently they could not be included under any behavioral cluster. The reason could have been an insufficiency of collected CIs, or alternatively they might have been examples of idiosyncratic managerial behavior. A total of 40 discrete behavioral statements (BSs) emerged from this coding and categorizing process of which 13 were indicative of effective and 27 of ineffective managerial behavior (see Table 2 below).

---Insert Table 2 about here---

These BSs reveal two dimensions of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness*: (i) An *Effective Manager* is one who supports subordinates (especially when faced with criticisms or demands from third parties) and builds personal relations with them; encourages them to learn and grow; treats them politely and respectfully; ensures fair performance appraisals; allocates tacit and explicit rewards; demonstrates knowledge of how to handle mistakes and to resolve conflicts; organizes resources and workload efficiently; cares about standards, quality and the well-being of the company; and takes swift decisions after due consultation with subordinates; and (ii) An *Ineffective Manager* is one who does not manage workload and resources well;

overloads subordinates with excessive workload; procrastinates on important matters; withholds necessary resources, tools and/or guidance; takes credit for the work of others; exhibits an inability to manage conflicts and errors; discriminates between employees and treats them unfairly; conducts unfair performance appraisals, shows a lack of care for employees or interest in building personal bonds with them (thereby compromising trust); expresses negative emotions; reacts negatively without checking the facts; compromises the team spirit of the department; is closed to new or different ideas; does not support subordinates in front of a third party; excludes subordinates from contributing to decisions affecting them; is overly critical, biased, dishonest and disrespectful; engages in humiliating behavior; is unreliable, manipulative and exploitative; does not respect rules; does not communicate effectively; and does not delegate authority or give freedom to subordinates.

Although some of the negative BSs are mirror opposites of the positive BSs, this is not always the case. For example, while the negative BS ‘the manager is disrespectful to subordinates’ is a mirror opposite of the positive BS ‘the manager treats subordinates politely and respectfully’, negative BSs ‘the manager does not handle conflicts well’ and ‘the manager displays dishonest, manipulative and exploitative behavior’ have no parallels in the list of positive BSs. This implies that negative managerial behaviors are not simply acts of omission of positive behaviors. They are discrete behaviors, which lead to perceived ineffectiveness among subordinates (see the *causal asymmetry* principle, Woodside, 2014).

Stage 2 Component (*Addressing RQ2*)

In this sub-section we present the results of the Stage 2 comparison of the positive and negative BSs obtained from our UAE study and the previously conducted Egyptian study. Numeric details of the BS data sets resulting from these two studies are given in Table 3 below.

---Insert Table 3 about here---

The findings of the comparative analysis demonstrate empirically that perceptions of what behaviorally distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers within a UAE-based multinational company and an Egyptian public sector hospital are highly congruent. The vast majority of the behavioral indicators of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* identified in both countries are substantially the same and are described in similar terms. We found that 76.00 % (n=19) of the Egyptian positive BSs were convergent in meaning with 100.00% (n=13) of the equivalent UAE BSs. Similarly 69.57% (n=16) of the Egyptian negative BSs were found to be convergent in meaning with 81.48% (n=22) of the equivalent UAE BSs.

Stage 3 Component (*Addressing RQ 3*)

In this sub-section we present the results of examining the BSs from the UAE and Egyptian studies through the combined lenses of IWE and IL. We begin with the positive BSs emerging from the UAE data. P1 (the manager supports the subordinates), P6 (the manager builds personal relations with the employees and shows caring), and P8 (the manager supports team members when faced with criticism/demands from a third party) coincide well with the IWE principle that people (including managers) work not just for monetary gains, but also to build social bonds with one another. This is also supported by our earlier discussion of IL wherein the leader plays the role of a guardian. Such a guardian would help subordinates learn and develop, as is supported by P3 (the managers encourages subordinates to learn and to develop their skills and competencies). To a certain extent, this also overlaps with P8 (the manager supports team members when faced with criticism/demands from a third party) because a guardian leader would attempt to protect those under his guardianship. P9 (the manager treats his subordinates politely and respectfully) is also supported by the IWE principle that leaders should treat their employees/subordinates as their brothers. This Islamic principle of brotherhood

is further supported in the UAE data by respondents' frequent use of terms like 'a family', 'like a son', 'not an outsider, but a family member' to describe the personal bonds that managers cultivate with subordinates. P7 (my manager knows how to handle mistakes - his own and those of subordinates) coincides with IWE principles of humility and compassion. P11 (the manager ensures a fair performance appraisal/evaluation) echoes the concept of justice as espoused in IWE. P13 (the manager makes decisions swiftly, *while simultaneously sharing the decision making with subordinates*) is well-supported by the principle of *shura* in IWE. To conclude, we find that many of the positive BSs from the UAE data (8 out of 13 or 61.5%) are informed by principles of IWE and IL. Nonetheless, we could not find direct parallels in IWE or IL for 38.5% (n= 5) of the positive BSs (P2, P4, P5, P10 and P12).

Similarly, we explored the negative BSs emerging from the UAE data through the conceptual lenses of IWE and IL. We find parallels between N2 (the manager overloads subordinates with excess workload) and the IWE principle that an employer should treat his employees or subordinates as his brothers and when said employee is over-burdened the employer should pitch in and help. N4 (the manager does not provide necessary resources, tools, information or guidance for the task) contradicts the Islamic notion of guardian leadership. N7 (the manager shouts and publicly humiliates the subordinate) and N8 (the manager is disrespectful to subordinates) negate the principle in IWE of treating one's employees with respect and dignity (see also N14 'the manager often displays negative affect' and N15 'the manager often reacts negatively without fully checking the facts'). Participants use terms like 'in a prison', 'in the military', and 'in a muppet show' to describe those situations in which managers exercise excessive control and treat them disrespectfully. N9 (the manager discriminates between employees and treats them unequally/unfairly) and N10 (the manager does not/cannot ensure a fair performance appraisal/reward allocation) contradict the concept of justice engrained in IWE.

N5 (the manager does not recognize the contribution of other team members and takes credit himself), N12 (the manager does not keep his word), and N24 (the manager displays dishonest, exploitative, and manipulative behavior) reflect a disrespect of the basic principle of honesty and integrity as engrained in the IWE, while N13 (the manager does not care about his employees) and N23 (the manager does not build human bonds or trusting relationships with the employees) demonstrate a disrespect of the Islamic principle of treating one's employees as one's family. N17 (the manager is not open to ideas different from his own) and N19 (the manager is not open to new ideas from subordinates or to involving subordinates in decisions affecting them) contradict the IWE concept of *shura*. N18 (the manager does not support the subordinate in front of a third party) reflects the manager's inability to act as a guardian of his subordinate. In conclusion, 59.3% (n=16) of the negative BSs involve behaviors that appear to contradict the basic principles of IWE and IL; and 40.7% (n=11) of the negative BSs (i.e. N1, N3, N6, N11, N16, N20, N21, N22, N25, N26 and N27) are not directly related to principles of IWE and/or IL.

Following the same method, we examined positive BSs from the Egyptian data set, and found that 17 out of 25 (68.0%) positive BSs were informed by principles of IWE and IL, while the other 8 positive BSs had no overlaps with IWE and IL. Regarding the negative BSs from the Egyptian data, while 69.6% (n=16) were influenced by principles of IWE and IL, the other 7 BSs had no overlaps with IWE and IL. These findings are summarized in Table 4 below:

---Insert Table 4 about here---

Table 4 reveals that a significant percentage of perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of manager behaviors identified by our UAE study and the previously conducted Egyptian study is informed by the concepts of IWE and IL. In other words, many of the managerial behaviors that subordinates find effective can be explained from the basic guidelines of IWE and IL. Conversely, many of the managerial behaviors, which are perceived as ineffective are also those

that undermine the basic tenets of IWE and IL. Therefore, it would be fair to argue that the concepts of IWE and IL exercise considerable influence on the ILTs held by subordinates in the selected organizations in these countries. Further, the degree of overlap is higher in the Egyptian data than in the UAE data. Perhaps this is indicative of the fact that IWE and IL are more influential in Egypt than they are in the multinational and cosmopolitan environment of UAE.

DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the three main findings of our study in light of extant literature.

Perceived Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness in UAE

In our introduction to this article, we had discussed the paucity of indigenous studies of management/leadership, and more specifically of ‘managerial effectiveness’ and ‘leadership effectiveness’, in ME countries. Our present emic replication study partially addresses these gaps, and makes a contribution to understanding better the issue of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* in UAE by describing 13 broad categories of positive managerial behaviors and 27 broad categories of negative managerial behaviors. Following Cammock et al. (1997), this could be thought of as a two-dimensional behavioral ‘lay model’ of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* in the UAE private sector.

Our finding that managers who build personal relations with their subordinates are positively perceived in UAE, and those who fail to do so are not trusted by subordinates, supports Sidani and Thornberry’s (2010) observation that within the ‘Arab world’⁴, the family is the basic allegiance group (see also Shahin & Wright, 2004), and that employees in these countries hesitate to give trust to others outside their social circle. An unexpected finding is that UAE managers who consult with their employees on important decisions are positively perceived. This finding

⁴ While we borrow this term from extant literature for the present discussion, we do not ourselves subscribe to such grouping or labeling of ME countries.

contradicts those of scholars such as Hofstede (2001) and Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010), who have suggested that due to the high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance which characterizes certain ME countries there is a strong presumption among followers about the leader's competence in handling problem situations, and that leaders seeking followers' inputs in solving said problems may fail to make a positive impression. Indeed, our finding offers support to Sidani and Thornberry (2010) who also found that in ME countries subordinates appreciate managers who consult with them, and more generally to other scholars like Bandura (1998) who have shown that leaders who are autocratic (non-participative) are negatively perceived.

The evidence that UAE managers who discriminate between employees, treat them unfairly, and fail to ensure fair performance appraisals are negatively perceived by followers (see N9 and N10 in Table 2) lends support for past literature on organizational justice which states that individuals are not only concerned about the fairness in decision outcomes (distributive justice), but also about the fairness of the procedures used to make those decisions (procedural justice) (Bies & Moag, 1986; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). That UAE managers are negatively perceived if they express negative emotions, react negatively without checking facts, are overly critical, biased, disrespectful of subordinates, and engage in humiliating them is consistent with much literature on 'incivility in the workplace'⁵. Leaders' expression of anger or aggressiveness with subordinates is generally perceived as dysfunctional (Bennett, 1998), and is likely to be harmful, especially if subordinates are not actually at fault (Harvey, Martinko & Gardner, 2006). Additionally, our findings show that managers who take credit for the work of others, who engage in behaviors considered biased, dishonest, discriminatory or unfair, and who

⁵ Workplace incivility is defined as "low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999: 457).

treat subordinates in an exploitative, unreliable and manipulative manner are negatively perceived by their subordinates. This supports well Reave's (2005) observation that personal traits such as honesty, integrity and associated values are crucial elements to a leader's success. As other experts (see Tonkin, 2013) explain, traits such as self-awareness, transparency and ethics are critical components of the personality of a manager who exhibits authentic leadership (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May, 2004).

Comparing Perceived Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness between UAE and Egypt

As explained in the previous section, there is a considerable overlap in substance and meaning between the compared positive and negative BSs resulting from the UAE and Egyptian studies. For example, both the UAE and Egyptian BS data sets reveal that managers who are polite and respectful to their employees, or who establish personal relations with their subordinates, are positively perceived. However, there are also some significant differences. For example, while Egyptian subordinates perceive a manager to be effective if (s)he prepares for meetings effectively, or if (s)he sets SMART goals and metrics for subordinates, no such patterns emerged from the UAE data set. The fact that although Egypt and UAE are both Islamic countries (implying that people in these countries subscribe to the principles of IWE and IL), there are still certain differences between how managerial behaviors are perceived in these two countries, is consistent with extant literature on the topic. As Ali (1992) notes, while IWE exercises a considerable influence on members of the Muslim society, the degree of influence it exercises on people varies from one group of people to another. Similarly, Uygur (2009) observes that the degree of influence that Islamic values exercise in Turkey vary between people who are more secular and those who are more devout. Religion is therefore a complex construct and influences people in a variety of ways. It may therefore be unwise to assume that IWE exercise

the same degree of impact on all Muslims (Uygur, 2009), and that there is homogeneity among ME countries simply because they subscribe to Islam as the dominant religion.

Examining Our Findings from the Perspective of IWE and IL

Our Stage 3 findings compliment those of Ali and Al-Owaihah (2008) and show that the same IWE principles that influence managerial behaviors also influence followers' perceptions of these behaviors. We find that more than half of positive and negative BSs from the UAE data set are informed by principles of IWE and IL. This shows that IWE and IL exercise significant influence on followers' ILTs, and consequently their perceptions of managerial behaviors. Our findings offer some support to Ali and Amirshahi's (2002) study in Iran, which reveals that Islamic teachings have a considerable influence on people in different social spheres, including their managerial roles. Our findings also lend support to Whiteoak et al.'s (2006) study in the UAE, which shows that IWE continue to exercise an influence on members of the UAE society. Additionally, our findings also lend support for the continued preference of the guardian and servant leadership styles in UAE and Egypt. As such, our finding contradicts Sarayrah's (2004) conclusion that the concept of servant leadership is losing its importance in Islamic countries.

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Our study offers three theoretical contributions. Our first and most significant contribution is to the literature on IWE and IL. We also offer two ancillary contributions to the general literature on managerial and leadership effectiveness, and to the specific literature on managerial and leadership effectiveness in ME countries.

With regards to our first theoretical contribution, in prior research IWE has been related to individualism (Ali, 1992), job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Yousef, 2001), role

ambiguity and locus of control (Yousef, 2000b), loyalty (Ali and Al-Kazemi, 2007) and other variables. However, to the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to relate IWE to perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of managerial behavior in ME countries. We show that the concepts of IWE and IL considerably influence the ILTs that employees in UAE and Egypt carry of their leaders. As such, we address the dearth in extant literature of research that demonstrates empirically the embeddedness of Islamic principles in managerial behaviors in ME countries. Our finding is particularly interesting in light of the fact that the gap between the principles inherent in IWE and IL and actual practices observed in many ME countries would lead one to assume that these principles have lost some of their influence on these populations. Our study challenges this assumption, and reveals that even today, IWE and IL principles continue to considerably influence employees' ILTs in ME countries. Therefore, scholars need to pay more attention to the concepts of IWE and IL if they aim to better understand managerial behaviors and subordinates' perception of the same in ME countries.

Our second and ancillary contribution is to the general literature on managerial and leadership effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Our emergent *behavioral lay model* is distinctive having been deduced from lay definitions of *perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness* offered by people directly working with UAE managers. We have found no equivalent study in mainstream business journals of managerial behaviors conducted in the UAE private sector. Our *behavioral lay model* provides a distinctive, insightful, and richly described summative view of what behaviorally differentiates effective managers from ineffective ones in the UAE private sector. Another distinctive feature of our UAE study is the emphasis given to both *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviors. This contrasts sharply with most other 'managerial effectiveness' and 'leadership effectiveness' studies, which have focused predominantly on the

effective behaviors of managers and leaders (see Borman & Brush, 1993; Tett et al., 2000; Yukl, 2012; Yukl et al., 2002).

As a third and final contribution, we find considerable similarities between our findings in the UAE and those of Anon 3 et al (2010) in Egypt, but also significant differences. Our findings suggest that grouping UAE and Egypt within the ‘Arab world’ cluster (see Hofstede, 1984) may have inadvertently contributed to an excessive emphasis on similarities within this cluster, unintentionally undermining its rich diversity. In light of our findings, we join past scholars (Tsui et al., 2007; McSweeney, 2009; Patel & Rayner, 2012) in their call to focus on both similarities and diversity within a geo-ethnic entity (for example, a nation, or a cluster or nations).

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Our study offers several recommendations for managers of domestic and international companies planning to engage in business in Islamic countries, more precisely in UAE and Egypt. First, our findings provide some insight into the critical role of IWE in understanding subordinates’ perceptions of managerial behaviors. To a large extent, those managerial behaviors that are observed as being consistent with the guidelines of the IWE are positively perceived by employees in UAE and Egypt. As such our research supports past studies (Sarwar & Abugre, 2013) that suggest there is a strong influence of IWE on employees’ attitudes in the UAE. However, we also find that employees have other expectations from their managers, which are not directly informed by IWE. For instance, employees expect their managers to be good at organizing resources and workloads, and to follow the rules and regulations of the organization. Thus, to be perceived effective, managers need to be well aware of the IWE and how it is manifested in the workplace; but they also need to pay attention to their task-oriented behaviors (see Yukl, 2012). Furthermore, managers need to realize that although IWE strongly influence employees in Islamic countries, the actual impact of IWE may vary from one country to another

(see Rice, 1999; Khan et al., 2013). Therefore, generalizing the impact of IWE on people's expectations and behaviors across Islamic countries would be erroneous.

Second, we also suggest that since Islam provides guidelines for practical day-to-day life (Rice, 1999), it should be possible to train managers working in Islamic countries in order to enhance their levels of awareness regarding IWE (Khan et al., 2013). Expatriate managers working in Islamic countries would benefit much from a basic knowledge of IWE. For example, the knowledge that IWE support the concepts of hard work and excellence, can be used by expatriate managers to encourage such behaviors among their subordinates (Sidani & Thornberry, 2010). Similarly, our finding that people employed in UAE organizations appreciate being treated like family members (see also Sidani & Thornberry, 2010; Shahin & Wright, 2004), may encourage managers to behave accordingly, thereby resulting in happier and more productive employees. In an increasingly diverse and mobile world, an understanding of IWE and how this influences perceived managerial and leadership (in)effectiveness, can also be useful to non-Muslim managers working in other countries with significant Muslim populations.

Finally, our study outlines not only the managerial behaviors that would be perceived as effective in the context of UAE and Egyptian companies, but also those that would be perceived as ineffective. This is important because, as Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta and Kramer (2004) claim, ineffective behaviors might be more important than effective behaviors in influencing subordinate performance and perceptions of managerial support, and the possible affective reactions to negative behaviors may be stronger than those to positive behaviors. Hence, managers could use these two-sided insights to engage in those behaviors, which are positively perceived, while avoiding those behaviors, which are negatively perceived. HR managers could also use these insights to identify criteria for measuring managerial and leadership effectiveness or ineffectiveness within such companies, and to assess managers' performance.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There are four methodological and three conceptual limitations in our present work. As the first methodological limitation, circumstances beyond the control of Author 2 prevented a larger number of informants being interviewed. This implies that we might not have been able to reach a 'saturation point' in the data collection process. We have nonetheless respected the general practice of collecting a minimum of 400 CIs from one data set, as observed in past replication studies. A related limitation is that our findings are specific to the collaborating company (M&R), and cannot be generalized to other UAE companies. Therefore, more replication studies need to be conducted across public, private and third sector organizations in UAE so as to be able to generalize findings at the country level. Similarly, replication studies should also be conducted in other ME countries so that a more complete understanding of similarities and differences between perceived managerial effectiveness within the backdrop of IWE and IL can be achieved. Another potential methodological limitation of our study is that we compare our findings from a private multinational company based in UAE with results from a public sector hospital in Egypt. Critics may argue that there might well have been significant differences between these two sectors of activity. We have explained our rationale behind comparing these two sectors of activity in considerable detail in the section entitled 'Purpose of the study and core questions'. Additionally, although we are sensitive to sector-based specificities, we consider this to be a valid comparison because both studies conform to Kim and Yukl's (1995) conceptualization of 'replica studies'. A pre-requisite for such comparative studies is that there is some form of 'central control', which in the present case was offered by Author 3. A related limitation could be that the original Egyptian study does not distinguish between

Christian and Muslim staff in the chosen hospital, which could well have explained some differences in findings. Therefore, we recommend future studies in Egyptian contexts that are more closely similar to the multinational and cosmopolitan context of the UAE. A third methodological criticism of our paper is that although we explore the impact of IWE on perceived effectiveness/ineffectiveness of managerial behaviors, we refrain from directly measuring respondents' adherence to IWE through self-report instruments (see Ali, 1988). Our decision was grounded in the understanding that the 'culture of face' is very significant in ME countries (Whiteoak et al., 2006). Therefore, understandably, respondents from these countries would feel compelled to give responses that show conformity with principles of IWE. To avoid such instances of social desirability bias, we decided to collect data on perceived effectiveness/ineffectiveness of managerial behaviors through CIT interviews, and subsequently infer whether and to what extent these were informed by principles of IWE and IL. As a final methodological limitation, past studies have shown differences between different segments of the same population with regards to their adherence to IWE principles⁶. Unlike these studies, our present paper does not investigate such differences, for instance between local and expatriate participants, or between male and female participants. Exploring such differences could have provided a deeper understanding of how individual factors (e.g. nationality and gender) influence one's adherence to the principles of IWE and IL, and would have provided more richness and variance to our study. Future studies could be designed to address this knowledge gap.

⁶ See Ali & Al-Kazemi's (2007) Kuwaiti study showing differences between expatriates and locals and also between men and women; see also Uygur's (2009) study showing differences between practicing and non-practicing Muslims in Turkey.

As a first conceptual limitation, one may argue that we take a rather simplistic view of the impact that Islam exercises on its adherents. Religion is a complex and multifaceted construct. Indeed, there is some debate in extant literature on the impact of Islam on its adherents and on the larger society. For instance, some scholars (see Sidani & Thornberry, 2010) argue that Islam has led to the development of value systems that are not conducive to growth and development in Arab countries. Some experts blame Islam for encouraging fatalism among its adherents (see Patai, 2007), a claim that is challenged by other scholars (see Barakat, 2000). Although we acknowledge that there is some disagreement among scholars on this topic, we do not feel particularly qualified to engage in this debate, nor do we find it directly relevant to the present topic of our interest. A second conceptual limitation in our work is that it focuses on the 'perceived' effectiveness and ineffectiveness of managerial behaviors, and not on actual performance measured through objective outcome measures. However, our decision to focus on perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of managerial behavior is grounded in past literature (Tsui & Ashford, 1994) which argues that perceptions are just as important as actual performance, and that, resources, contributions, and opportunities may either be withheld or offered to managers/leaders based on their perceived (i.e. reputational) effectiveness. A final conceptual limitation of our study is that we focus only on managers' behaviors as influencing manager-subordinate relations, and consequently subordinates' perceptions of managerial behaviors. One may well argue that subordinates' behaviors, attitudes, personality, working patterns, etc. also equally contribute to managers' behaviors, and the kind of manager-subordinate relationship that subsequently emerges (see Paul, Strbiak, & Landrum, 2002), and should therefore be included in future behavioral studies of managerial effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

Islam represents the second largest monotheistic religion in the world (after Christianity) (Khan et al., 2013). As of 2010, there were over 1.6 billion adherents of Islam (El Garah et al., 2012), representing 23.4% of the world's population (Pew Research Center, 2011). The Muslim population is increasing at a faster rate than the general population of the world, and Islamic countries represent some of the major customers in the world. Therefore, understanding the concepts of IWE and IL, and their implications on perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in these countries, becomes very important. Our present paper offers some insight on this very important segment of the workforce – which has often been neglected in Western management literature. Furthermore, studies such as ours can also be useful to managers in non-Islamic countries where there is a significant Muslim population, when called upon to interact with Muslim colleagues, peers or subordinates.

Although in the present paper we rely on the conceptual lens of IWE, there is considerable evidence in extant literature that Muslims may also be influenced by other kinds of work ethics. Arslan (2000) compared the work ethic values of Protestant British, Catholic Irish and Muslim Turkish managers, and found that latter showed higher PWE values than the former. In the same way, Zulfikar (2012) found that Muslim Turks in the US revealed greater scores on four of the five PWE characteristics than their Protestant counterparts. Some scholars go so far as to support that PWE has become somewhat secularized and can be considered as simply 'work ethics' without necessarily associating it with religion (Uygun, 2009; Arslan, 2000). We suggest that the same argument can also be made for IWE. For instance, we find many similarities between IWE and PWE regarding concepts of hard work, thriftiness, and honesty (see also Uygun, 2009). Also, there are similarities between the Hindu notion of *karuna* (kindness) and the IWE concept of benevolence. Therefore, IWE may also speak to people of other religious affiliations. Consequently, we suggest that more studies be conducted regarding how work ethics

impact perceived managerial (in)effectiveness in different countries, and that their findings be compared to reveal a better understanding of the relationship between the two variables, and also the degree of similarity/dissimilarity between different kinds of work ethics across countries.

References

- Anon 3 (2004) de-identified
- Anon 3 et al. (2010) de-identified
- Anon 3 et al. (2012) de-identified
- Anon 3 et al. (2013) de-identified
- Anon 3 et al. (2014) de-identified
- Anon 3 et al. (2015) de-identified
- Anon 1 & Anon 3 (2012) de-identified
- Anon 3 & Anon1 (2012) de-identified
- Anderson, J. (2010). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 70(1): 131-141.
- Ali, A., & Amirshahi, M. (2002). The Iranian manager: Work values and orientations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40(2), 133-143.
- Ali, A., & Al-Owaihian, A. (2008). Islamic work ethic: a critical review. *Cross cultural management: An international Journal*, 15(1), 5-19.
- Ali, A. (1992). The Islamic work ethic in Arabia. *The Journal of Psychology*, 126(5), 507-519.
- Ali, A. (1993). Decision-making style, individualism, and attitudes toward risk of Arab executives. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 53-73.
- Ali, A., & Al-Kazemi, A. (2007). Islamic work ethic in Kuwait. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 14(2), 93-104.
- Ali, A. (2009). Islamic perspectives on leadership: A model. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 2(2), 160-180.
- Alvesson, M. & Sveningsson, S. (2003). Good Vision, bad micro-management and ugly ambiguity: Contradictions of (non-)leadership in a knowledge-intensive organization. *Organization Studies*, 24(6), 961-988.
- Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and workenvironment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 5-32
- Arslan, M. (2000). A cross-cultural comparison of British and Turkish managers in terms of Protestant work ethic characteristics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 9(1), 13-19.
- Ather, S., & Sobhani, F. (2007) Managerial Leadership: An Islamic Perspective. *IIUC Studies*, 4, 7-24.
- Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumbwa, F., Luthans, F., & May, D. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.
- Ball, D. & McCulloch, W. (1985). *International Business*. Plano, TX: Business Publications.
- Bandura, A. (1998). Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory. *Psychology and Health*, 13(4), 623-649.

- Barakat, H. *The Arab Society in the Twentieth Century*. CAUS, Beirut, Lebanon.
- Beekun, R. I., & Badawi, J. A. (2009). *Leadership: An Islamic Perspective*. 3rd edn. Maryland: Amana Publications.
- Beekun, R. I. (2012). Character centered leadership: Muhammad (p) as an ethical role model for CEOs. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(10), 1003-1020.
- Bennett, J. W. (1998). Classic anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 100(4), 951-956.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.
- Bolden, R. (2004). *What is leadership?* Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.
- Borman, W.C., & Brush, D.H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, 6(1), 1-21.
- Bourantas, D., & Papalexandras, N. (1993). Differences in leadership behaviour and influence between public and private organizations in Greece. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(4): 859-871.
- Böwering, G. (2012). Preliminary observations on Islamic ethics in the Chinese context. *Journal of International Business Ethics*, 5(2), 3.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Perennial Political Classics.
- Butterfield, L., Borgen, W., Amundson, N., & Maglio, A. (2005). Fifty years of the critical incident technique: 1954-2004 and beyond. *Qualitative Research*, 5(4), 475-497.
- Cammock, P., Nilakant, V. and Dakin, S. (1995), Developing a lay model of managerial effectiveness, *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(4), 443-474.
- Chell, E. (1999). Critical incident technique. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in Organizational Research*, London: Sage. pp. 51-72.
- Cronshaw, S., & Lord, R. (1987). Effect of categorization, attribution, and encoding processes on leadership perceptions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 97-106.
- Cunliffe, A. (2011). Crafting qualitative research: Morgan and Smircich 30 years on. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14, 647-673.
- de Graaf, G., & van der Wal, Z. (2008). On values and differences experienced by sector switchers. *Administration & Society*, 40(1): 79-103.
- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2005). Assessing leadership styles and organizational context. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2): 105-123.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Lowe, A. (1991). *Management Research: An Introduction* Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- 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.
- El Garah, W., Beekun, R., Habisch, A., Lenssen, G., & Loza Adai, C. (2012). Practical wisdom for management from the Islamic tradition. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(10), 991-1000.
- El-Saharty, S., Elhayatmy, M., Prose, K.S., & Eichler, R. (2010). Pay for Performance in Egypt. <http://www.healthsystems2020.org/content/resource/detail/2763/>
- Flanagan, J. 1954. *The critical incident technique*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327-58.
- Flick, U. (2002). Qualitative research: State of the art. *Social Science Information*, 41(1), 5-24.

- Foti, R., & Luch, C. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 55-66.
- Garavan, T., & McGuire, D. 2001. Competencies and workplace learning: Some reflections on the rhetoric and the reality. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 13(4): 144-163.
- Gerstner, C., & Day, D. (1994). Cross cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5 (2), 121-134.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Sage.
- Greenleaf, R. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. 25th edn. New York: Paulist Press.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research, in N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage, pp. 105-117.
- Hamlin, R. (2015). Paradigms, replication and pragmatism in HRD research. In M.N.K. Saunders & P. Tosey (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods on HRD*, (pp. 13-31) Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Hansen, J., & Villadsen, A. (2010). Comparing public and private managers' leadership styles: Understanding the role of job context. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(3): 247-274.
- Harvey, P., Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2006). Promoting authentic behavior in organizations: An attributional perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(3), 1-11.
- Hassan, M. (2010). Understanding the behavioural aspects of costing systems in public organisations. *International Journal of Behavioral Accounting and Finance*, 1(3), 207–223.
- Hassan, M., & Sarker, A. (2012) Managerial Innovations in the Egyptian Public Health Sector: An Empirical Investigation, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35:11, 760-771.
- Helgstrand, K., & Stuhlmacher, A. (1999). National culture: An influence on leader evaluations? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 7(2), 153-168.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd edn, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Holtbrugge, D. (2013). Indigenous management research. *Management International Review*, 53, 1-11.
- Hooijberg, R., & Choi, J. (2001). The impact of organizational characteristics on leadership effectiveness models: An examination of leadership in a private and a public sector organization. *Administration & Society*, 33 (4): 403-431.
- House, R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-473.
- House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. London: Sage
- Khadra, B. (1990). The prophetic-caliphal model of leadership: An empirical study. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37-51.

- Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2013). Organizational justice and job outcomes: Moderating role of Islamic Work Ethic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 235-246.
- Khan, M. (1991). Migrant Workers to the Arab World: The experience of Pakistan. In G. Gunatilleke (Ed.) *Migration in the Arab World: Experience of Returning Migrants*, pp. (195-237). United Nations University Press, New York.
- Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of managerial effectiveness and advancement to self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors from the multiple-linkage model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 361-377.
- Knafl, K., & Breitmayer, B. (1991). Triangulation in qualitative research: Issues of conceptual clarity and purpose. In J. M. Morse (Ed.) *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*. Sage, London.
- Kotterman, J. (2006). Leadership versus management: What's the difference?. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 29(2), 13.
- Latham, G., & Wexley, K. (1981). *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Leung, K. (2007). The glory and tyranny of citation impact: An East Asian perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 510-513.
- Leventhal, G., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. *Justice and Social Interaction*, 3, 167-218.
- Li, P. (2012). Toward an integrative framework of indigenous research: The geocentric implications of yin-yang balance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29, 849-872.
- Madill, A., Jordan, A., & Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist, and radical constructionist epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91(1), 1-20.
- McSweeney, B., 2009, "Dynamic diversity: Variety and variation within countries". *Organization Studies*, 30: 933– 957.
- Mellahi, K., & Budhwar, P. S. (2010). Introduction: Islam and human resource management. *Personnel Review*, 39(6), 685-691.
- Metcalf, B. & Murfin, T. (2011). Leadership, Social Development and Political Economy in the Middle East: An Introduction, in B. Metcalf and F. Mimouni (eds) *Leadership Development in the Middle East*. Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Metle, M. (2002). The influence of traditional culture on attitudes towards work among Kuwaiti women employees in the public sector, *Women in Management Review*, 17(6), 245-61.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practices of managing and management development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Mir, A. (2010). Leadership in Islam. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(3), 69-72.
- Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods, *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76
- Mutahhari, M. (1985). *Fundamentals of Islamic thought: God, man and the universe* (pp. 9-20). Mizan Press.
- Nasr, S. (1984). Islamic work ethics. *Hamdard Islamicus*, 7(4), 25-35.
- Noordegraaf, M., & Stewart, R. (2000). Managerial behaviour 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*. 3rd edn. California: Sage Publications.
- Patai, R. (2007). *The Arab Mind* (Revised Edition), Hatherleigh Press, New York.
- Patel, T., & Rayner, S. (2012). Towards a transactional approach to culture: Illustrating the application of Douglasian cultural framework in a variety of management settings. *European Management Review*, 9(3), 121-138.
- Patel, T., Hamlin, R. G. (2012). Deducing a taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness: a comparative study of effective and ineffective managerial behavior across three EU countries. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5): 571-587.
- Paul, J., Strbiak, C., & Landrum, N. (2002). Psychoanalytic diagnosis of top management team dysfunction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(5), 381-393.
- Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life (2011), *The Future of the Global Muslim Population*. Projections for 2010-2030, Pew Research Center, Washington, DC.
- Phillips, J., & Lord, R. (1981). Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28, 58-83.
- Ponterotto, J. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 126.
- Possumah, B., Ismail, A., & Shahimi, S. (2013). Bringing work back in Islamic ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(2), 257-270.
- Raelin, J., & Cooleage, A. (1995). From generic to organic competencies. *Human Resource Planning*, 18(3): 24-33.
- Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 655-687.
- Rice, G. (1999). Islamic ethics and the implications for business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 18(4), 345-358.
- Rice, G. (2006). Pro-environmental behavior in Egypt: Is there a role for Islamic environmental ethics? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65(4), 373-390.
- Rosenzweig, P. (1994). When can management science research be generalized internationally? *Management Science*, 40, 28-39.
- Rousseau, D., & Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 22, 1-13.
- Sarayrah, Y. (2004). Servant leadership in the Bedouin-Arab culture. *Global Virtue Ethics Review* 5(3), 58-79.
- Sarwar, S., & Abugre, J. B. (2013). An assessment of Islamic work ethics of employees in organizations: Insights from the United Arab Emirates. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 6, 60-72.
- Shah-Kazemi, R., & Lewisohn, L. (2006). *The Sacred Foundations Of Justice In Islam: The Teachings of Ali Ibn Abi Talib*. M. A. Lakhani (Ed.). World Wisdom.
- Shahin, A. & Wright, P. (2004). Leadership in the context of culture: An Egyptian perspective. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(26), 499-511.
- Shaw, J. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management, *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435-54.
- Sidani, Y., & Thornberry, J. (2010). The current Arab work ethic: Antecedents, implications, and potential remedies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(1), 35-49.
- Tabakoglu, A. (1983). Labour and Capital Concepts in Islamic Economics. Paper presented in the

Second International Conference on Islamic Economics, Islamabad, Pakistan.

- Terpstra, V. (1978). *The cultural environment of international business*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Company.
- Tett, R., Guterman, H., Bleier, A., & Murphy, P. (2000). Development and content validation of a "hyperdimensional" taxonomy of managerial competence. *Human Performance*, 13(3), 205-251.
- Tonkin, T. (2013). Authentic versus transformational leadership: Assessing their effectiveness on organizational citizenship behavior of followers. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration*, 10(1), 40-61.
- Transparency International: 2007, Corruption Perceptions Index, <http://www.transparency.org>. Retrieved 18 Jan 2008.
- Tsang, E., & Kwan, K. (1999). Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 759-780.
- Tsui, A. (1984). A multiple-constituency framework of managerial reputational effectiveness. In J.G. Hunt, J. Hoskings, C. Schriesheim & R. Stewart (Eds.), *Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership* (pp. 28-42). New York: Pergamon.
- Tsui, A. (2006). Contextualization in Chinese management research. *Management and Organization Review*, 2, 1-13.
- Tsui, A. (2007). From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the Academy and beyond. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1353-1364.
- Tsui, A., S. S. Nifadkar and A. Y. Ou, 2007, "Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations". *Journal of Management*, 33: 426-478.
- Tsui, A., & Ashford, S. (1994). Adaptive self-regulation: A process view of managerial effectiveness. *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 93-121.
- UNDP. (2002). *The First Arab Human Development Report, Creating Opportunities for Future Generations* (United Nations, New York).
- UNDP. (2003). *The Second Arab Human Development Report, Building a Knowledge Society* (United Nations, New York).
- UNDP. (2004). *The Third Arab Human Development Report, Towards Freedom in the Arab World* (United Nations, New York).
- UNDP. (2005). *The Fourth Arab Human Development Report, Towards the Rise of Women in The Arab World* (United Nations, New York).
- Uygur, S. (2009). The Islamic work ethic and the emergence of Turkish SME owner-managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 211-225.
- Van Maanen, J. (1983). *Qualitative Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Weber, M. 1982. *Essays in Sociology*, edited by H.H Gert and W. Mills. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Whiteoak, J., Crawford, N., & Mapstone, R. (2006). Impact of gender and generational differences in work values and attitudes in an Arab culture. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 48(1), 77-91.
- Wolfgramm, R., Spiller, C., & Voyageur, C. (2014). Special issue leadership journal: Indigenous leadership. *Leadership*, 10, 263-265.

- Yousef, D. (2000a). Organizational commitment as a mediator of the relationship between Islamic work ethic and attitudes toward organizational change. *Human Relations*, 53(4), 513–537.
- Yousef, D. (2000b). The Islamic work ethic as a mediator of the relationship between locus of control, role conflict and role ambiguity, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 283-302.
- Yousef, D. (2001). Islamic work ethic-A moderator between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in a cross-cultural context. *Personnel Review*, 30(2), 152-169.
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 15-32.
- Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.
- Zulfikar, Y. (2012). Do Muslims believe more in Protestant work ethic than Christians? Comparison of people with different religious background living in the US. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(4), 489-502.

Table 1 Emergence of Behavioral Statements from Clustered Critical Incidents

<p>Positive BS: The manager supports team members when faced with criticism/demands from a third party.</p> <p>Underpinning critical incidents My manager provides me support especially when other collaborators are unsupportive. When faced with difficult clients, my manager supports me and shows faith in my work. When I am pushed to do things by other departments while I already have time constraints, my manager supports me and tries to find someone else to do the additional task. My manager stands up for/protects his team members in the face of criticism from the top management. When faced with a difficult external party, the manager supports the employees, even to the extent of rupturing the relationship with the third party. My manager protects me against unfair judgments of external parties, even at the expense of losing the client. My manager always stands up for/supports his team in inter-departmental meetings. When questioned on a matter by another department, my manager supports me and shows faith and trust in me. When confronted with a third party, my manager stands up for me and defends me. When faced with criticism from external stakeholders, my manager takes time to look into the matter, discuss it with me before responding. He supports me in such a situation.</p>
<p>Negative BS: The manager does not manage conflicts well.</p> <p>Underpinning critical incidents When my subordinate goes to my manager with a conflict or disagreement regarding me, he takes a decision without consulting with me, thereby disrupting the hierarchy (chain of command). When there is a disagreement between colleagues, instead of attributing blame to the person who is wrong, my manager prefers to address everyone in general about what is acceptable and non-acceptable behavior. He does not ask the culprit to apologize for his mistake. When there is a conflict between colleagues, my manager makes no attempt to resolve it. Instead he passes on the matter to his assistant, and avoids dealing with it directly. When faced with a conflict, my manager attempts to solve it, but only partially. He makes no attempt to get the conflicting colleagues to converge or apologize to one another. My manager does not resolve conflicts; he prefers to avoid them by separating the conflicting individuals. My manager does not resolve a conflict between two co-workers, nor does he find solutions to problems. Instead he expects one to adapt to the situation.</p>

Table 2 Emergent Positive (Effective) and Negative (Ineffective) BSs from the UAE Study

<i>Positive (Effective) BSs (n=13)</i>
P1. The manager supports the subordinates
P2. The manager organizes the workload and resources well
P3. The manager encourages subordinates to learn, and to develop their skills and competencies
P4. The manager offers explicit rewards (salary increase, bonus) to subordinates when they do a good job
P5. The manager offers tacit rewards (appreciation, encouragement) to subordinates when they do a good job
P6. The manager builds personal relations with the employees and shows caring
P7. My manager knows how to handle mistakes (his own and those of subordinates)
P8. The manager supports team members when faced with criticism/demands from a third party
P9. The manager treats his subordinates politely and respectfully
P10. My manager manages conflict situations and contradictions well
P11. The manager ensures a fair performance appraisal/evaluation
P12. The manager cares about standards, quality, procedures, and the well-being of the company
P13. The manager makes decisions swiftly, while simultaneously sharing the decision making with subordinates
<i>Negative (Ineffective) BSs (n=27)</i>
N1. The manager does not manage workload and resources well
N2. The manager overloads subordinates with excess workload
N3. My manager procrastinates on important matters and reacts only when the situation has escalated
N4. The manager does not provide the necessary resources, tools, information or guidance for the task.
N5. The manager does not recognize the contribution of other team members and takes credit himself
N6. The manager does not manage conflicts well
N7. The manager shouts and publicly humiliates the subordinate
N8. The manager is disrespectful to the subordinates
N9. The manager discriminates between employees and treats them unequally/unfairly
N10. The manager does not/cannot ensure a fair performance appraisal/reward allocation.
N11. My manager does not appreciate the work done by his subordinates
N12. The manager does not keep his word
N13. The manager does not care about his employees
N14. The manager often displays negative affect
N15. The manager often reacts negatively without fully checking the facts
N16. The manager compromises the team spirit in the department
N17. The manager is not open to ideas different from his own
N18. The manager does not support the subordinate in front of a third party
N19. The manager is not open to new ideas from subordinates or to involving subordinates in decisions affecting them
N20. The manager is overly negative or critical about work/non-work related matters
N21. The manager does not handle mistakes (his own and those of the subordinates) well
N22. The manager allows his personal biases to supersede what is good for the company
N23. The manager does not build human bonds or trusting relationships with the employees
N24. The manager displays dishonest, exploitative, and manipulative behavior
N25. The manager himself does not respect the rules of the company
N26. The manager does not communicate effectively
N27. The manager does not delegate authority/give space or freedom to subordinates

Table 3: Empirical Source Data of the Stage 2 Component Comparative Analysis

Compared emic replication studies	Subject focus of the study*	No. of CIT informants	No. of usable CIs	No. of effective BSs	No. of ineffective BSs	Total No. of BSs
UAE Study	T, S, M & FL	43	346	13	27	40
Egyptian Study	T, S, M & FL	55	450	25	23	48
Total		98	796	38	50	88

* Subject Focus: T-Top managers, S-Senior managers. M-Middle managers. FL-First line manager

Table 4 Percentage of positive and negative BSs from UAE and Egypt informed by IWE and IL

UAE data set	% of positive BSs overlapping with IWE and IL concepts	61.5
	% of negative BSs overlapping with IWE and IL concepts	59.3
Egyptian data set	% of positive BSs overlapping with IWE and IL concepts	68
	% of negative BSs overlapping with IWE and IL concepts	69.6