TOWARD A UNIFIED FRAMEWORK OF PERCEIVED NEGATIVE LEADER BEHAVIORS

INSIGHTS FROM FRENCH AND BRITISH EDUCATIONAL SECTORS

INTRODUCTION

In recent times there have been increasing concerns about unethical practices in the business world. Recent scams, scandals, and frauds in business entities all over the world (see Patel [2012] for examples) have put into question people's faith in the ethicality of businesses (Orlitzky, Siegel, and Waldman, 2011). This increasing concern about dropping ethical standards has been accompanied with increased criticism of educational establishments and increased calls for inclusion of more ethical reflections within the academic curriculum. This means that stakeholders now rely more on educational establishments for guiding the future generation toward ethical practices. Since teachers and other people holding leadership positions in educational establishments have an important role in shaping future leaders and their choices, exploring their behaviors, especially the negative side of such behaviors, is important.

Focusing on the education sector is also important for another reason. Public opinion towards the education sector, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world, is fairly positive (Ipsos MORI, 2014; Pew Research Center, 2009; Small & Mallon, 2007). A recent UK survey of public attitudes found that academics or scientists (irrespective of whether they are leaders or followers) are largely seen as ethical and honest[1] (Ipsos MORI, 2014). Perhaps this finding reflects a more widely held assumption that academics (both leaders and followers) are ethical people. Only such an assumption would explain why so little attention has been focused in the past on negative leader behaviors in the education sector, although other sectors have not been spared from this scrutiny (e.g. see Goldman's 2006 study of the fashion industry). In the present paper, we address this void by focusing on the negative side of leadership in British and French educational establishments.

The term 'leadership' itself has been a source of much confusion to scholars. For more than half a century, scholars have struggled to understand its impact on organizations and performance (Fernandez, 2004). As Burns (1978: 3) explained over three decades ago, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (see also Klenke, 1993). This observation holds even today. Many contemporary scholars are content with focusing on the positive aspects of leadership (see Bryman, 2007). If they do focus on negative aspects of leadership, they prefer to limit their efforts to categorizing leader behaviors into positive or negative categories, and to labelling negative behaviors as 'least effective' or 'ineffective' (see Patel and Hamlin, 2012; Hamlin and Patel, 2012; Wang, 2011). In our present work, we challenge this past trend and argue that labelling every negative leader behavior as ineffective leads to compromising the possibility of generating more in-depth understanding of such behaviors. Instead, grounding our work in varied literature streams, we argue that some negative behaviors may emanate from leaders' inability to meet functional

---

[1] The percentage of people who believed scientists were ethical *minus* the percentage who disagree produced a net score of over +50

demands, and these should be labelled as 'ineffective leader behaviors'. Other negative behaviors stem from leaders' insouciance regarding harming the organization or its members. We call such behaviors 'dysfunctional leader behaviors' (following Johnson and Huwe, 2002; Harvey, Martinko and Douglas, 2006). Finally, some negative behaviors emanate from leaders' tendency to manipulate or exploit organizational members – behaviors we label as 'unauthentic leader behaviors' (following Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, et al. 2008; Lloyd-Walker and Walker, 2011). While dysfunctional and unauthentic leader behaviors are logically more relevant to our present paper, we discuss ineffective leader behaviors in equal detail because the latter also form part of negative leader behaviors. Besides, understanding ineffective leader behaviors is required in order to distinguish them from dysfunctional and unauthentic leader behaviors. We also argue that since the underlying motives driving different types of negative leader behaviors are different, the corrective measures designed for them should also be different.

Our present study has two features, which we elucidate upfront. First, we focus on managerial or supervisory leadership as opposed to organizational leadership[2]. In the context of our study, the term 'leader' represents the 'managerial leader'. This conceptualization is grounded in the argument that managers at different levels in the organizational hierarchy engage in 'leading' people on an ongoing basis (following Hamlin 2004, 2009; Hamlin and Barnett, 2011). Also, it is possible for managers to be leaders and leaders to be managers in different contexts (House and Aditya, 1997). This explains why the terms 'management' and 'leadership' have so often been used interchangeably (Barker, 2000; Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawler, 2001). Conceptualized in this manner, leadership is part of everyday "grassroots" behavior of managers at different levels in an organization (Russ-Eft, Berrey, Hurson, and Brennan, 1996; Bergmann, Hurson, and Russ-Eft, 1999). More specifically, in the education sector leadership involves supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues on a daily and ongoing basis, and "should be [exercised] by everyone from the Vice Chancellor to the casual car parking attendant" (Ramsden, 1998, p. 4). The second characteristic of our study is that unlike some past studies that focus on leaders' roles (Mintzberg, 1973; Kurke and Aldrich, 1979) and frames (Bolman and Deal, 1991a, 1991b), or how they could or should behave at work, we focus on leaders' actual behaviors in the workplace (following Lau, Pavett and Newman, 1980). We collect real-life examples of negative leader behaviors from British and French educational establishments. As such, we focus on subordinates' perceptions of leader behaviors. Perceptions are often just as important as reality. In particular, negative perceptions can result in support, resources, or contributions being withheld from the leaders by subordinates (Tsui and Ashford, 1994). The impact of such negative perceptions should therefore not be underestimated. While our focus on managerial or supervisory leadership as opposed to organizational leadership, and on manager/leaders' actual behaviors as opposed to their frames and roles, is not new in itself, there have not been many studies focusing on these within the education sector (barring exceptions like Bryman, 2007), with even fewer focusing on negative leader behaviors.

---

[2] There are many different viewpoints on whether management and leadership is one and the same thing (Bolman and Deal, 1991a, b; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1988). While Bolman and Deal (1991a) show that for active managers and their colleagues, management and leadership are distinct, but overlapping, other scholars (Barker, 2000; Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawler, 2001; House and Aditya, 1997) argue that management and leadership are in fact one and the same thing.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, we present the context of the study. Then we offer an overview of negative leader behaviors from extant literature, while distinguishing them into ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic behaviors. At the end of the literature review section, we lay out our key research questions. Next, we justify our use of the Critical Incident Technique (CIT), followed by an overview of the methods of data collection and data analysis. We end the methodology section with a discussion of the validity, reliability, and credibility of our work. In the results section, we present our findings, and discuss them in light of extant literature. We end the paper with a discussion of our theoretical and managerial contributions, the limitations of our study, and some suggestions for future research.

THE CONTEXT OF OUR STUDY: BRITISH AND FRENCH EDUCATIONAL SECTORS

As discussed in the introductory section, the education sector is perceived as bearing, at least partially, the responsibility of guiding and molding our future generation of leaders. Therefore, it is important that leaders in educational establishments themselves demonstrate exemplary behaviors. Since few studies have focused on leader behavior in the education sector (especially on its negative side), a study such as ours is warranted. Additionally, we wish to challenge the commonly held assumption that the education sector is largely ethical and therefore does not warrant a study of negative leader behaviors. In addition to these foundational motivational drivers, we focus on the education sector for the following reasons:

(1) In recent decades, the education sector has witnessed increased managerial control, competition, and restructuring (Szekeres, 2004). We believe that these changes may have influenced the way these organizations are being led. Therefore, a current study of leadership in this sector is warranted.

(2) Knowledge-intensive sectors (such as education) are driven by notions of service, knowledge and wisdom, and rely heavily on the commitment, loyalty, goodwill and passion of their employees (Covey, 2004 as cited in Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010). Since undesirable leader behaviors negatively impact commitment and loyalty of employees, it is important to comprehend and minimize such behaviors in knowledge-intensive sectors.

(3) There seems to be a paucity of leadership studies in the education sector. Although educational institutions have long appointed managerial leaders for varied roles (Heads of Departments, Module Leaders, Research Heads, etc.), there is little research on how these leaders impact their respective units and their outcomes (Gomes and Knowles, 1999). Among the few scholars who focus on leadership in the education sector (Bolman and Deal, 1991a, b; Onorato, 2013; Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, and Ryland, 2012; Chipunza and Gwarinda, 2010), none focus on its negative side.

(4) Most articles on leadership in the education sector have been published in education-related journals (e.g. Bryman's [2007] paper in *Studies in Higher Education*). While this is an understandable choice, it has led to a void in management scholars' understanding about leadership practices in the education sector. In channeling our present paper toward mainstream management readership, we hope to address this void.

For the present paper, we rely on three emic case studies that we have previously conducted (see figure 1 below). While the first two studies were conducted by Author 2 in British secondary and high schools, the third case study was conducted by the Author 1 in a French establishment offering higher education (i.e. undergraduate to doctoral level programs). We followed Onorato's (2013) suggestion that education is an industry that comprises of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary institutions, and we designed our study accordingly to cover the full range of educational establishments.

----Insert Figure 1 about here---

NEGATIVE LEADER BEHAVIORS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

As Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser (2007) explain, modern social science has tended to emphasize the positive and constructive aspects of leadership while avoiding its darker side (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005; Kellerman, 2004; Yukl, 1999). Contradicting this trend, in the present study, we focus on the negative side of leadership. We draw inspiration from Bryman's (2007) argument that leadership may be significant for its adverse effects rather than for the positive ones. More specifically, in the context of the education sector, the issue is not so much what leaders should do, but more about what they should avoid doing (Bryman, 2007). We find broader support for our arguments in the causal asymmetry principle (Woodside, 2014), which states that antecedents indicating the negation of an outcome condition are not mirror opposites of antecedents indicating a positive response for the same outcome. Applied to the context of our study, this principle suggests that if we wish to understand negative leader behaviors then we need to conduct a study of negative leader behaviors, and not assume that negative behaviors are simply the outcome of omission of positive behaviors. This is what we aim to do in the present study. Extant literature reveals many kinds of negative leader behaviors, some of which are discussed next.

Ineffective leader behavior

Hamlin and Barnett (2011) offer a comprehensive overview of past literature on leadership effectiveness and ineffectiveness. They explain that in the 1950s, many attempts were made to link observed leader behaviors with measures of effectiveness (Flanagan, 1952; Jasinski, 1956). Although differences were found between the behaviors of effective and ineffective leaders, these studies only revealed the degree of brevity, variety, fragmentation and interpersonal interaction that characterize a leader's work. Most subsequent studies focused on time devoted to or relative frequency of particular leader activities (O'Driscoll, Humphries, and Larson, 1991; Shipper, 1991), and failed to explore what differentiates effective from ineffective leaders (Borman and Brush, 1993; Hales, 1986; Martinko and Gardner, 1990). Also comparing the findings of these different studies was problematic due to the haphazard, arbitrary and confusing mix of coding categories used (Stewart, 1989). Hamlin and Barnett (2011), therefore, call for a continued focus on effective versus ineffective leader behaviors, and for conducting such studies through the use of systematic and comparable tools.

One leader behavior commonly evoked in extant literature on leadership effectiveness/ineffectiveness is delegation. Delegation means assigning new responsibilities to subordinates and giving them the space, discretion and confidence to carry out tasks independently (Fernandez, 2004). With regards to the impact of

delegation, extant literature presents a mixed picture. Some scholars (Bauer and Green, 1996; Schriesheim, Neider, and Scandura, 1998) believe that there is a positive correlation between the degree of delegation and performance, that delegation helps develop subordinate skills and confidence, it enables subordinates to deal with problems more quickly (Yukl and Fu, 1999), and leads to successful implementation of programs (Majone and Wildavsky, 1979). But other scholars (Yukl, 2002; Bass, 1990) argue that the effectiveness of delegation holds only in some situations and not in others. Further, Yukl and Fu (1999) explain that delegation will be used more frequently by managers when subordinates are competent, share the leader's task objectives, have worked longer for the manager, were themselves supervisors, and have had favorable exchange relationships with the manager. Similarly, Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2000) argue that delegation might work only when tasks are easy to handle and where subordinates are expected to manage these tasks on their own. It remains to be seen how leaders' choices to delegate or not, will be perceived within the education sector.

Another leader behavior that is commonly cited in extant literature is consultation. Like delegation, consultation also represents a form of empowerment because it provides subordinates influence over important decisions and an opportunity to voice concerns about any negative consequences of a proposed change (Yukl and Fu, 1999). Past literature (see Bandura, 1998) supports that leaders, who are autocratic and do not engage in participative decision making, are negatively perceived by their subordinates. Such leaders weaken the organization's ability to respond to change, undermine employee confidence and motivation, and reduce work life quality (Detert and Burris, 2007; Whetten and Cameron, 2007). Other scholars (Yukl and Fu, 1999) suggest that while consulting with subordinates encourages buy-in and involvement, whether or not leaders will actually use consultation is influenced by the degree of goal congruence between leaders and followers, the subordinates' job level, and the quality of the leader-member exchange relationship. In the present paper, we hope to uncover how leaders who engage (or not) in consulting with their employees are perceived by the latter within the education sector.

Other behaviors cited in leadership effectiveness/ineffectiveness literature include being open to new ideas and supporting change. Leaders are called upon to play various roles in the process of organizational change, beginning with spelling out the vision and need for change, and ending with the actual implementation of the change process (Armenakis and Bedeian 1999; Armenakis, Harris, and Field, 2001). Leaders may therefore be required to behave as change agents. Blass and Ferris (2007) emphasize that in the current times, leaders need to demonstrate considerable flexibility and openness to change in order to enjoy long term career effectiveness. Some scholars (Hall, 2002) define this openness to change as adaptability or avoidance of obsolescence. Others (Calarco and Gurvis, 2006) go so far as to say that in current times, adapting to change is no longer just a coping mechanism, but is in fact a leadership imperative. Therefore, in the present study, we also hope to uncover how leaders' change-related behaviors are perceived within the education sector.

Mentoring and/or supporting subordinates is another leader behavior commonly evoked in literature on leadership effectiveness/ineffectiveness. Mentoring has been considered as an effective way of developing contextual knowledge and political skills among employees (Blass and Ferris, 2007). Morgan (2005) explains that supportive coaching by leaders is positively associated with members' perceptions of their leaders.

In contrast, other scholars (see Yukl, 2012; Yukl, Gordon, and Taber, 2002) explain that although leaders who focus on developing employees are positively perceived by followers, the empirical correlation between such efforts and followers' performance is weak. In the present study, our focus is on how leaders' mentoring/coaching behaviors are perceived by subordinates in the education sector, as opposed to the impact of such behaviors on objective measures of followers' performance.

To complement the preceding discussion of effective/ineffective leader behaviors, we refer to Yukl's (2012) recent hierarchical taxonomy of leadership efficacy, in which he identifies four categories of effective leader behaviors: (1) Task-oriented: clarifying, planning, monitoring, problem-solving (2) Relations-oriented: supporting, developing, empowering, recognizing (3) Change-oriented: advocating change, envisioning change, encouraging innovation, facilitating collective learning, and (4) External: networking, external monitoring, representing. In contrast with our present focus on subordinates' perceptions of leader behaviors, Yukl (2012) focused on effects of specific observable leader behaviors on work unit performance. Further, Yukl (2012) clarified that not all of the 15 behaviors of his taxonomy are relevant for all types of situations or leaders, and even some of the 4 broad categories may be irrelevant in some situations. Further, he suggested that behavioral categories such as ethical leadership may also need to be included in his taxonomy in the future to make it more comprehensive (see also Yukl, Mahsud, Hassan, and Prussia, 2012). In subsequent work, Yukl and his colleagues (Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl, and Prussia, 2012) show that ethical and empowering leader behaviors influence subordinates' perception of leader effectiveness. We find that Yukl's (2012) taxonomy not only includes most effective leader behaviors (e.g. delegation, mentorship, ability to support change) cited in extant literature, but it also pays due attention to the contingency and complexity of the context within which leader behaviors unravel.

Our discussions in this sub-section reveal that many scholars focus on studying leader behaviors that meet (or not) the functional demands of the leader's job. The inability to meet one or more of these demands could result in the leader being perceived as ineffective in certain situations. Consider task-oriented leader behaviors as an example. Leaders who cannot set clear objectives, who are incapable of planning tasks and allocating resources, who are unable to monitor progress on said tasks, and/or who cannot solve intermittent problems in a timely fashion, may be perceived by followers as ineffective. Nevertheless, following the viewpoint of other experts, we argue that leadership entails much more than simply meeting functional demands. Leadership is also a moral responsibility (Pava, 2003), and it entails ensuring the creation of long-term wealth for the benefit of all stakeholders (Caldwell and Karri, 2005; Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010).

It is therefore not surprising that over past decades, there has been gradually increased focus on the need for leaders to act in an ethical fashion. Block (1993: 25-26) talked about the need for leaders to treat employees as 'owners and partners', Kouzes and Posner (2007) referred to the need for leaders to nurture a spirit of community by engaging the employees, and Lennick and Kiel (2008) explained that leaders should be morally committed to doing no harm and to adding value to their organizations. In the last decade, ethical leadership has come to be conceptualized as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way

communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (Brown Trevino, and Harrison, 2005: 120). Ethical leaders are characterized as altruistic, honest, trustworthy and principled decision-makers who care about the well-being of their followers and broader society (Trevino et al., 2000, 2003). Such leaders proactively try to transform followers by communicating ethical standards, modeling ethical behavior, and holding followers accountable for ethical actions (Trevino et al., 2003). They listen to their employees, establish trust, employ fair decision making processes, communicate decisions in a sensitive manner, and take action against unethical employees (Brown et al., 2005). Their honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness are important predictors of their effectiveness (Hassan et al., 2012). Parallel to this increasing interest in ethical leadership, there has also been gradually increasing interest in dysfunctional and unauthentic leadership, which we discuss next.

Dysfunctional leader behavior

We begin this section by first defining dysfunctional behaviors in the workplace.

"Dysfunctional behavior falls within the broader category of antisocial behavior, which is described as "any behavior that brings harm, or is intended to bring harm, to an organization, its employees, or stakeholders" (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997, p. vii). Dysfunctional/antisocial behavior, then, may range from low levels of inappropriateness (e.g. inappropriate attire, alcohol use, smoking, inappropriate behaviors, loud talking or radio playing, and tardiness) all the way to sabotage or violent behavior directed toward one or more individuals or the organization as a whole" (Van Fleet and Griffin, 2006, p. 698-699).

Dysfunctional individuals use gossip, political tactics, harassment, intimidation, and threats to create a climate of fear in order to advance personal goals (Kinney, 1995, p. 96 as cited in Van Fleet and Van Fleet, 2006). Their aim is personal gain, and their tactic is to generate fear in a relatively low-key, non-violent way, and without surpassing legal limits (Kinney, 1995, p. 96 as cited in Van Fleet and Van Fleet, 2006). Interestingly, such individuals are capable of presenting a positive image and may also have supporters within organizations.

We now shift our focus from dysfunctional behaviors to dysfunctional leadership – a topic that demands attention for a variety of reasons. First, if employees are treated with dignity and respect then they are more committed to organizations and its leaders (Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie, 2005). Conversely, when employees feel that their psychological contract with the organization has been broken due to the way the leader behaves, they are prone to neglecting their institutional commitment and discretionary contributions (Turnley and Feldman, 1999; Burris, Detert, and Chiaburu, 2008). In extreme situations, abuse or unfair treatment could also lead to employees' departure from organizations. Very often, people who quit organizations as a consequence of poor leadership are also among its best employees (Pfeffer, 1998 as cited in Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010). Dysfunctional leadership thus has a significant negative impact on organizations, and deserves to be minimized.

Dysfunctional leader behaviors are those counterproductive behaviors that undermine trust and effectiveness in a leader-member relationship (Johnson and Huwe, 2002; Harvey, Martinko and Douglas, 2006). Although dysfunctional leadership may

include illegal activities, it could also include actions, which while being legal, are counterproductive for the organization and its members (Hall, Blass, Ferris, and Massengale, 2004). Dysfunctional leaders display one or more of the following characteristics:

1. They are abusive, and demonstrate 'pervasive contempt' (Sutton, 2007: 6-7), disregard (Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010: 159), and bullying behaviors (Wayne, Hoobler, Marinova, and Johnson, 2008) towards employees.

2. Their actions are inspired by self-interest (Williamson, 1996: 49 as cited in Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010). They often create and employ self-serving rules (Wayne et al., 2008).

3. They act autocratically (Bandura, 1998). They deny organizational members their right to participate in organizational decisions, and treat them as a means for achieving their own goals (Warner, 2001).

4. Dysfunctional individuals actively seek out leadership positions (Brunell, Gentry, Campbell et al., 2008). Their behaviors have many negative consequences: reduced productivity, eroding morale, undermining initiative, and creating an environment of distrust (Covey, 2004; Sutton, 2007). Dysfunctional leaders undermine organizational effectiveness, destroy relations, and negatively impact organizational wealth creation, employee satisfaction, and the overall quality of work life (Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010).

5. Dysfunctional leaders support the generation of dysfunctional organizational cultures (Van Fleet and Griffin, 2006; Kets de Vries, 2004). Such cultures constraint individual and group capabilities, reward mediocrity, and eventually lead to the creation of dysfunctional organizations (e.g. see Frost, 2003; Goldman, 2006).

Padilla et al.'s (2007) conceptualization of destructive leadership as being characterized by leaders' selective focus on personal outcomes (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, et al., 1995, p. 529), their narcissistic abuse of power (Sankowsky, 1995, p. 57), and their actions resulting in disastrous outcomes (Conger, 1990, p. 44) comes very close to our afore-cited conceptualization of dysfunctional leadership.

We now present two knowledge gaps in extant dysfunctional leadership literature, which we hope to address through our present paper:

(1) Extant literature mostly focuses on extreme cases of dysfunctional leader behavior, often termed as 'organizational terrorism' or 'high toxicity' (Goldman, 2006: 733)[3]. Such extreme behaviors may involve the intent to evoke fear or extreme stress for the purpose of implementing the perpetrator's wishes (Van Fleet and Van Fleet, 2006)[4]. We do not find many studies of 'less extreme' dysfunctional leader behaviors in extant literature. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to assume that the low intensity of such behaviors implies less negative outcomes for employees. Some scholars (see Lazarus and Folkman, 1984) even argue that low-level daily nuisances could have a greater impact on individual outcome than less frequent but major stressors. It is for this reason that in our present study we record all examples of dysfunctional leader behaviors offered by respondents, without focusing specifically on extreme cases.

---

[3] Describing such extreme cases, Kets de Vries (1995: 217) explains, "some leaders go far beyond the abnormal ways of functioning…they go off the deep end".

[4] Individuals engaging in such behaviors may be referred to as internal terrorists, psycho-terrorists, or organizational terrorists (see McCurley and Vineyard, 1998).

(2)   Extant literature mostly focuses on dysfunctional behaviors of high level organizational leaders (e.g. Summers, Munyon, Perryman, and Ferris, 2010). We do not find extant studies focusing on dysfunctional behaviors of mid-level supervisory leaders[5]. Yet, it is with these leaders that employees interact most frequently. Although top organizational leaders have a significant impact on employees, most decisions directly impacting employees (e.g. attribution of rewards, allocation of resources, etc.) are handled by their supervisory leaders. Further, for 60-70% employees, the most stressful part of their jobs emanates from their immediate supervisors (Van Vugt, Hogan, and Kaiser, 2008). Therefore, we choose to study dysfunctional behaviors of leaders transversally across different levels in an organization's hierarchy, as opposed to focusing solely on top level organizational leaders.

Another literature stream relevant for our study is on authentic/unauthentic leadership.

Unauthentic leader behaviors

Authentic leadership is defined "as a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, et al. 2008, p. 92)."

Many scholars have related authentic leadership to ethical behaviors on the part of leaders. For instance, Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004) state that leaders' personality traits such as self-awareness, transparency and ethics are critical components of authentic leaders (Tonkin, 2013). Lloyd-Walker and Walker (2011) claim that authentic leadership adds ethics to the concept of transformational leadership (Tonkin, 2013). Luthans and Avolio (2009) also identify 'ethics and morals' as one of the four dimensions for authentic leadership. Ethics and morals, as conceptualized in their definition, are about an internalized system of self-regulation guided by internal moral standards uninfluenced by group, organizational or societal pressures. The other three dimensions of authentic leadership according to Luthans and Avolio (2009) are self-awareness, transparency, and balanced processing. Self-awareness is about how leaders makes sense of their world in light of their own strengths and weaknesses, and how they can improve themselves to better serve those around them. Transparency involves presenting one's true self to others and engaging in full disclosure so as to promote trust. Balanced processing implies that the leader objectively analyses contradictory information before making decisions.

Based on the afore-cited discussion of the characteristics of authentic leaders, one could argue that leaders who lack in self-awareness, integrity, ethics and morals, and those who engage in non-transparent, manipulative and/or imbalanced interactions may be perceived as being unauthentic by their followers. Nevertheless, this conceptualization of unauthentic leadership remains speculative at best, and therefore, in the present study we attempt to qualify unauthentic leader behaviors in the context of

---

[5] Although Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco (2010) discuss dysfunctional behaviors at the level of top organizational leaders, they also acknowledge that such behaviors may be observed at other levels in an organization.

the British and French education sectors, with the aim of adding qualitative richness to our understanding of the topic.

Research questions

Our preceding discussions reveal that there is growing literature on ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leader behaviors. Yet, there has been no attempt to combine these in a unified framework of negative leader behaviors, nor has there been an attempt to address negative leadership in the education sector. With the aim of addressing these knowledge gaps, we raise the following research questions:

RQ1: *What kind of ineffective behaviors do leaders in French and British educational establishments manifest?*

RQ2: *What kind of dysfunctional behaviors do leaders in French and British educational establishments manifest?*

RQ3: *What kind of unauthentic behaviors do leaders in French and British educational establishments manifest?*

METHODOLOGY

Our objective in the present study is to develop a richer theoretical understanding of negative leadership in the context of French and British educational establishments. We do this by identifying emerging patterns of ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leader behaviors from our data, and comparing these with existing literature on the topic. Following Marshall and Rossman (1989), we use an inductive approach because extant literature does not offer a sufficiently rich conceptualization of negative leadership. We begin by explaining our reasons for using the Critical Incident Technique (CIT).

Choice of methodology

Past leadership studies have been criticized for their over-reliance on quantitative survey-based methodology (Hamlin, 2004). Many critics find such studies to be unnecessarily narrow, and complain that these studies do not offer the required understanding of leader behaviors (see Alvesson, 2002; Yukl, 1994, 2012). It is for this reason that scholars such as Gordon and Yukl (2004) call for leadership studies conducted through methodologies other than those relying on survey instruments. Following this advice, we choose to use the qualitative Critical Incident Technique (CIT), which was first developed by Flanagan (1954) and further refined by Latham and Wexley (1981). CIT is particularly well suited for in-depth exploration and for collecting concrete illustrations of behavior (Mintzberg, 1973) such as those required for this study. Some scholars believe that the CIT is one of the best methods for focusing on important aspects of leader behavior (Latham and Wexley, 1981; Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick, 1970), and for sampling important performance-related behaviors (Borman and Brush, 1993). Furthermore, Chell (1998) claims that CIT is particularly useful for multiple cross-case comparative research in search of discernable patterns of behavior which may inform theory, policy and practice. Nevertheless, like any other methodology, the CIT also suffers from some drawbacks, one of which is that respondents' values and implicit leadership theories may bias expectations and evaluation of leader behavior. But as Chell (1998) observes, whether "partial or not,

biased or not, such accounts constitute *their* [i.e. the respondents'] reality, and arguably it is the way they view the world which shapes their future actions" (p.70).

Sample

The present study relies on data collected from three past independent emic case studies conducted by the authors of this study. The first case study was conducted from 1985 to 1987, the second case study was conducted from 2011 to 2012, and the third case study was conducted from 2012 to 2013. Each of these case studies followed the CIT to collect concrete and spontaneous examples of positive and negative leader behaviors from educational establishments in UK and France[6]. There were three reasons for choosing to combine these previously conducted studies for our present endeavor. First, all three studies conform to what Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) refer to as '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 2. Not only was Author 2 the lead researcher for case studies 1 and 2, he also guided Author 1 for data collection and analysis for case study 3. Second, the three studies were very similar in terms of focus and methodology. Finally, put together, these three case studies covered a full range of educational establishments from secondary to doctoral levels.

The first case study covered four secondary schools in the UK, and focused specifically on heads of department (HoDs). In this study Critical Incidents (CIs) relating to the managerial and supervisory leadership components of HoDs' role were collected from teachers, head-teachers, deputy head teachers, and HoDs. The second case study focused on leaders in academic and pastoral managerial roles within three independent private girls' high schools. Respondents included Heads of School, Deputy Heads, HoDs and House Masters/Mistresses. The third case study covered one French educational institution large enough to offer undergraduate to doctoral level programs. In this study, respondents included administrative staff, teaching faculty, research active faculty, mid-level managers, program directors, and other directors. In all three case studies, the authors adopted a realist (post-positivist) paradigmatic stance (Madill, Jordon and Shirley, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005), and used Tsang and Kwan's (1999) notion of 'empirical generalization replication'. For the present study, we allowed the richness of the data to emerge through a process of on-going discovery (Van Maanen, 1983; Miles and Huberman, 1995), as we compared and contrasted the findings from the previously conducted studies.

Data collection

The same protocol was followed for data collection in each of the three previously conducted case studies. Prior to the CIT interviews, each interviewee was briefed on the purpose of the research and the anticipated benefit to their institution; what was expected from the CIT interview; what was meant by key terms such as '*critical incident*' and *positive/negative managerial leader behavior*; what the interviewee would be asked during the interview; how to prepare for it; and the academic code of ethics that would be followed. *Effective behavior* was defined as

---

[6] Although data were collected on both negative and positive leader behaviors in the three case studies, our present work draws only on the data on negative leader behaviors. Also, although the three studies use different terms (managers, managerial leaders, leaders), they all refer to behaviors that supervisory leaders exercise as part of their day-to-day functions.

'behavior one would wish all managerial leaders 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 managerial leader'[7]. Typically each CIT interview lasted for 75-90 minutes. Prior to offering each CI, interviewees were required to respond to three standard questions: (1) What was the background situation, circumstance or context that led up to the CI that you have in mind? (2) What did the observed manager/leader do or say, or not do or say, that was particularly positive/negative? (3) What was the specific outcome/consequence of this CI, and why did you perceive and judge the specific managerial/leader behavior to be an example of positive/negative behavior? Interviewees were asked to offer concrete examples of positive and negative managerial leader behaviors that they had personally observed within the past 6 to 9 months. The concrete example offered by a respondent was only accepted as a CI if the critical causal relationship between the specific context (i.e. the described situational background), the observed behavior and the negative outcome was clearly made evident by the respondent. In so doing, we paid due attention to the context in which the leader behavior unraveled, and also minimized respondent bias. Those interviewees who themselves held leadership positions were not allowed to offer CIs relating to their own practices. When capturing a CI the researcher recorded it as far as possible in the language of the respondent. On each occasion the recorded data was reflected back to check the accuracy of its interpretation. Because of the strict code of anonymity applied the interviewees were required not to reveal the identity of the leader whose behaviors they had described. For the present study we use only the negative CIs generated from each case study. In the first study, 168 negative CIs were collected from 35 respondents. In the second study, 124 negative CIs were collected from 33 respondents, and finally in the third case study 104 negative CIs were collected from 37 respondents.

Data Analysis

This section is divided into two parts. In part I, we explain how the data analysis was conducted in the three prior case studies. In part II, we explain how the data analysis was conducted for the present study.

Part 1: Data analysis in the three prior case studies

The unit of analysis for each prior case study was the critical incident (CI). Through a process of open and axial coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) and a form of '*summarizing*', '*inductive category formation*' and '*explicative*' content analysis (Flick, 2002) applied at the semantic level (Braun and Clarke, 2006), the CIs were initially scrutinized for evidence of 'sameness', 'similarity' or 'congruence' of meaning and clustered accordingly. *Sameness* existed when the sentences or phrases used to describe two or more CIs were identical or near identical. *Similarity* existed when the CI sentences and/or phrases 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 and/or key words. These behavioral clusters of CIs were subjected to a form of realist qualitative analysis (Madill, Jordon and Shirley, 2000) using a variant of '*selective*' content analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1995; Flick, 2002) to identify and develop a smaller number of behavioral categories. Behavioral

---

[7] In line with the general trend at the time, in our earlier studies, we also used of the terms 'negative leader behaviors' and 'ineffective leader behaviors' interchangeably. It is only in the present study that we draw a distinction between different kinds of negative leader behaviors.

statements (BSs) were then devised to reflect the meaning held in common to the respective constituent CIs of each category. A total of 61, 31 and 21 negative BSs were derived from cases 1, 2 and 3 respectively[8] (see Table 1 below).

---Insert Table 1 about here---

Part 2: Data analysis for the present study

We now explain how we categorized the 113 negative BSs from the three prior case studies into ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic behaviors. We categorized as ineffective those leader behaviors that indicated inability to meet functional demands. These included instances of poor communication and decision-making, poor organization, planning and/or resource allocation, inability to accept change or new ideas, poor allocation of rewards, or inability to delegate, guide or empower subordinates. In contrast, we categorized as dysfunctional, those leader behaviors that caused harm to the organization or its employees. Key words that signaled dysfunctional leader behaviors were: autocratic, insensitive, self-serving, humiliating, and distrustful. Finally, we categorized behaviors implying dishonesty, manipulation, and lack of ethics, integrity and/or transparency on leaders' part as unauthentic behaviors.

Next, we familiarized ourselves with the emergent ineffective, unauthentic and dysfunctional BSs by reading them over and over again. Then, using somewhat the same method as described in Part 1 of this section, we worked towards identifying the 'sameness' between BSs to generate clusters. As we proceeded with this exercise, we attempted to triangulate emergent data across the three data sets (following Miles and Huberman, 1995). For instance, every time we came across a BS from one of the three case studies that indicated an example of rude, aggressive, or threatening behavior on the part of the leader, we put it in a common cluster. Thus, clusters of BSs with common themes emerged. Then using a variant of selective content analysis (as described in part 1 of this section) we came up with short but meaningful descriptors for each of these BSs clusters. We used a minimum of three BSs to generate a behavioral descriptor, although most behavioral descriptors are grounded in 10-12 BSs. Some BSs contribute to the emergence of more than one behavioral descriptor[9]. In figure 2 below, we offer one example each of ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic behavioral descriptors, and their underpinning BSs:

---Insert Figure 2 about here---

Ensuring internal consistency and external validity:

Consistency and validity were ensured in this research project at two stages: first when the original three case studies were conducted, and second when the BSs emerging from the three prior case studies were analyzed for our present paper.

To ensure consistency in the application of the CIT data collection and analysis protocols in the three original case studies, Author 2 trained the other collaborators before they began the replication studies. Author 2 continued to provide further

---

[8] The full list of negative behavioral statements can be made available to readers upon request.

[9] For instance, the BS 'nominates self or deputy to attend external "in-service" training courses and not the staff' feeds into the emergence of the dysfunctional behavioral descriptor 'self-serving behavior' and the unauthentic behavioral descriptor 'exploitative and dishonest behavior'.

guidance and support to Author 1 during the data collection and analysis stages of case study 3. 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 analyses (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Lowe, 1991) in each of the three case studies. This involved the researchers first analyzing the respective sets of collected CIs and deduced BSs independently. They then compared and contrasted their individual analyses and interpretations in order to arrive at a mutual confirmation of where there was convergence and divergence (Knafl and 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.

The same system of 'investigator triangulation' was applied for the data analysis conducted for the present study as well. First, author 1 engaged in clustering the BSs into theme-based clusters and then in generating behavioral descriptors for each cluster. And then, author 2 independently engaged in the same exercise. Authors 1 and 2 then compared and contrasted their findings (Gibbs, 2007), and where required engaged in an iterative process of discussion to arrive at a mutual consensus regarding the clustering of BSs and emerging behavioral descriptors. Additionally, to avoid subjective bias in the way BSs were clustered, we invited an external expert to act as a confirmatory auditor and to counter-check our categorization.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

We divide this section into three sub-sections - one for each research question.

Sub-section 1: Behavioral descriptors of ineffective leader behaviors in French and British educational establishments

Our analysis and categorization of negative BSs from the three previously conducted case studies resulted in eight ineffective behavioral descriptors, which are listed in Table 2 below along with supporting illustrative quotes from the original CIs:

---Insert Table 2 about here---

Since the aim of this study is to generate a richer understanding of what negative leadership means in the context of academic establishments, we now elaborate on each ineffective behavioral descriptor listed in table 2:

1. *Not open to new or different ideas* and *unable to support or accept change*[10]: This behavioral descriptor includes examples of leaders who refuse to listen to the good ideas offered by colleagues, or who insist on sticking to traditional academic syllabi and teaching methods, or who take no interest in keeping up to date with new advances in the field of teaching techniques. Our finding that leaders resisting change are negatively perceived by subordinates has much support in extant literature. As Yukl (2012) explains, one of the key characteristics of effective leaders is that they are capable of advocating change, encouraging innovation, and facilitating collective learning (see also Blass and Ferris, 2007; Calarco and Gurvis, 2006).

---

[10] Combining behavioral descriptors 1 and 2 from Table 2

2. *Poor planning, organizing, monitoring and resource allocation*: This behavioral descriptor brings together many functions commonly attributed to mid-level supervisory leaders. Planning and monitoring are two functions that form part of the task-oriented category in Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy of leadership efficacy. We find many instances in our study when leaders failing to fulfill these functional tasks, are negatively perceived by followers. For example when leaders convene meetings without issuing an agenda of the items to be discussed, they are perceived as being poor in planning. Leaders who run departments without any clearly identified aims, objectives, policies, or plans are seen as poorly organized. Those leaders who operate internal exams without arranging for standardized marking schemes are perceived as being poor in monitoring. Finally, those leaders who fail to provide staff with sufficient resources to complete their tasks are seen as being poor in resource allocation.

3. *Poor communication*: Although communication does not explicitly appear in Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy of leadership efficacy, it is nonetheless inherent to all the four behavioral categories in his taxonomy. None of the four functions (i.e. task-oriented, relationship-oriented, change-oriented, and external) can be performed without effective communication[11]. In our study, respondents offered examples of leaders who give information hurriedly and at inappropriate times and places, leaders who fail to discuss matters of relevance with concerned groups of stakeholders, leaders who rely excessively on written forms of communication (as opposed to face-to-face communication), and more.

4. *Poor decision-making[12]:* Like communication, decision-making is also inherent to all the activities that leaders regularly undertake. The way leaders take decisions and the way these are communicated to subordinates are crucial in influencing followers' perceptions of leaders. Our study reveals that leaders are negatively perceived when they are indecisive or intentionally avoid taking difficult decisions, when they take decisions without thinking through all the resource implications and/or potential problems, when they take untimely decisions, and finally when they take decisions without considering relevant facts.

5. *Poor in cultivating and/or maintaining relations/provides no support or advice to staff*: This behavioral descriptor has two parts: '*poor in cultivating and/or maintaining relations*' and '*provides no support or advice to staff*'. These two parts correspond with the relation-oriented category of Yukl's (2012) taxonomy, which includes supporting, developing, empowering and duly recognizing subordinates. Examples of the first part of the behavioral descriptor include leaders who make no attempts to develop good working relations with co-workers, leaders who never appreciate their subordinates for a job well done, leaders who behave in impersonal ways, and leaders who refuse to recognize subordinates' viewpoints.

---

[11] Some experts (e.g. one of the anonymous reviewers of this paper) support that communication is a leadership skill rather than a leader behavior. Therefore, while these scholars accept that communication is an integral part of varied leader activities, they prefer not to explicitly list it in a taxonomy of effective leader behaviors. In contrast, other scholars (e.g. Bryman, 2007) choose to cite 'communicating well about the direction the department is going' as an explicit effective leader behavior. Following Bryman (2007), we have decided to include 'poor communication' in our list of ineffective leader behaviors. Another reason behind this choice is that 'poor communication' emerged from our data set in the same way as other BSs. Therefore, selectively excluding it from the final results seemed inappropriate.

[12] The same argument as presented above also applies to the BS 'poor decision making'.

The second part of this behavioral descriptor i.e. *'provides no support or advice to staff'* refers to a leader's role as advisor, mentor, or coach. This behavioral descriptor describes those leaders who 'leave probationers and new starters to their own devices to find things out for themselves with only a bare outline syllabus for guidance', and those leaders who give no time or support to staff who request help. Respondents also offer examples of leaders who fail to give constructive feedback on performance, and intentionally withhold opportunities of career development. Some respondents spoke of leaders who criticize their work in an overly negative manner, without providing any constructive remarks or alternative solutions. Thus, our finding show that leaders, who fail to provide support and guidance to new subordinates or those subordinates who explicitly seek or expect their help, guidance, and/or feedback, are negatively perceived. As discussed earlier, past literature has been somewhat unclear with regards to the impact of coaching and mentoring. As Yukl et al. (2002) explain, while descriptive research explains that effective managers take a more active role in the development of followers, and that followers are more satisfied with leaders who provide them with developmental opportunities, empirical research shows that leaders' focus on developing followers is correlated with follower performance in some studies but not in others. While we do not focus on measuring follower performance in our study, we do find evidence that leaders who fail to support and develop subordinates are negatively perceived by followers. This observation is supported by Morgan's (2005) and Blass and Ferris's (2007) work on coaching and mentoring.

6. *Exercise too little or too much control*: This behavioral descriptor refers to leaders' inability to exercise the right degree of control on subordinates. Some leaders applied too little control. For instance, they neither kept records of departmental resources, nor checks on their use by the staff. Other leaders failed to keep pupil records or failed to follow up after assigning tasks to subordinates. Some leaders allowed students to overstay in a certain class knowing fully well that these students could not cope with the demands of that class. In contrast, other leaders exercised too much control on subordinates. For instance, one leader kept departmental supplies under lock and key and allowed access only after a formal request to that effect had been made.

7. *Does not delegate tasks:* Past literature offers a mixed picture with regards to this behavioral descriptor. While some scholars (Bauer and Green, 1996; Schriesheim, Neider, and Scandura, 1998) believe that delegation leads to positive outcomes (see Yukl and Fu, 1999; Majone and Wildavsky, 1979), other scholars (Yukl, 2002; Bass, 1990) support the effectiveness of delegation in some situations and not in other situations (see also Hersey et al., 2000). Our study shows that in the context of French and British educational establishments, a leader who is not willing to delegate tasks is negatively perceived by subordinates. For instance, one respondent offers the example of a leader, who, while organizing extra-curricular activities, chose to carry out all the administrative tasks himself. Other respondents offer examples of leaders who delegate tasks to subordinates but who keep interfering and do not allow subordinates the autonomy to see the tasks to completion.

It should be noted that some (though not all) of the afore-cited ineffective behavioral descriptors are mirror opposites of effective leader behaviors identified by Bryman (2007) in educational establishments in UK, USA and Australia. For instance,

our behavioral descriptor 'poor in cultivating/maintaining relationships' is a mirror opposite of Bryman's (2007) effective behavior 'creating a positive/collegial work atmosphere in the department'. Also, our ineffective behavioral descriptor 'poor communication' is the mirror opposite of Bryman's (2007) effective behavior 'communicating well about the direction the department is going'. Conversely, there are many overlaps between our ineffective behavioral descriptors from the British and French educational establishments and Patel and Hamlin's (2012) identification of ineffective behavioral statements from British and German private sector enterprises, and British and Romanian public sector hospitals. This similarity suggests that perceptions of ineffective leader behavior across sectors are quite similar.

Nevertheless, there are some key differences between our present study and past studies on similar topics. For instance, since Bryman (2007) focuses only on positive leader behaviors in the education sector, all positive leader behaviors are grouped under the common label of effective leader behaviors. In contrast, our focus on negative leader behaviors allows us to distinguish between ineffective, unauthentic and dysfunctional leader behaviors. In the same way, comparing our present work with Patel and Hamlin's (2012) work, while the latter categorizes all negative leader behaviors as ineffective, we go through the additional effort of categorizing negative leader behaviors into ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic behaviors. Finally, comparing our findings of ineffective leader behavior with Yukl's (2012) taxonomy of leader efficacy, we find much support for his task-oriented, relations-oriented, and change-oriented categories, but no support for his network-oriented category. Past studies state that more network-oriented behaviors are required from leaders when the organization in question is highly dependent on outsiders, when the environment is rapidly changing, and/or when the organization faces serious competition or threats (Ginter and Duncan [1990] as cited in Yukl et al., 2002). Since most of these characteristics can be found in the context of British and French educational establishments, one would anticipate more network-oriented behaviors on the part of leaders in such establishments. The fact that our study does not provide evidence to the network-oriented category of Yukl's (2012) framework may be explained in the following two ways: (1) it is likely that network-oriented behaviors are more in line with activities of leaders holding specific kinds of positions in organizations. Unfortunately, in our study we did not focus on leaders holding specific positions. In other words, we asked respondents for examples of leader behaviors irrespective of leaders' positions or functions. Therefore, it is possible that network-oriented behaviors were not pertinent in the case of some of these leaders (2) since network-oriented behaviors, by their very nature, are geared toward external stakeholders, our respondents may not have had the opportunity to observe such behaviors among their leaders.

Sub-section 2: Behavioral descriptors of dysfunctional leader behaviors in French and British educational establishments

We begin this sub-section by listing five dysfunctional behavioral descriptors emerging from our study and corresponding illustrative quotes from original CIs (see Table 3 below).

---Insert Table 3 about here---

We now elaborate on the afore-cited dysfunctional behavioral descriptors, and compare our findings with extant literature on dysfunctional leadership, incivility in the workplace, and (un)ethical leadership.

1. *Humiliating and derogatory behavior:* This behavioral descriptor includes a variety of behaviors such as speaking rudely/impolitely with the staff, demonstrating a negative attitude toward them, criticizing them publicly, addressing staff in an abrasive, cynical, undiplomatic, threatening or dictatorial manner, passing condescending or derogatory remarks about others, resorting to verbal or physical bullying, behaving uncivilly with people, and more. We find much support in extant literature for the negative impact of such behaviors. Hall et al. (2004) explain that the functionality of the relationship between the leader and the follower largely depends on the extent to which followers trust their leaders, and positive leader behaviors are necessary to establish trust. 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 et al., 2006). Our finding also has much support in literature on 'incivility in the workplace'[13].

2. *Self-serving behavior:* Our respondents describe leaders as engaging in 'self-serving behavior' when they load themselves with easy tasks and allocate difficult and time-consuming tasks to their subordinates, or when they 'take all the credit for departmental achievements and omit to thank or praise the efforts of the staff'. Leaders are also seen as self-serving if they prioritize their own preference over organizational interests. One respondent offers the example of a leader who prefers not to choose the best candidate for a job simply because the candidate has a strong personality and good leadership qualities; instead the leader prefers weaker candidates who, he reckons, will be 'easier to handle'. Such practices could have a negative impact on the organization and its output on the long run. Sometimes, leaders are seen as engaging in self-serving behavior if they prioritize themselves over staff for training opportunities. When followers attribute leaders' behaviors to self-serving causes (for instance, meeting their personal objectives, or gaining visibility with powerful stakeholders, etc.), this reduces the trust that subordinates place in the leaders (Hall et al., 2004; Johnson and Huwe, 2002). As an example of leaders' self-serving behavior, one of our respondents explained that 'when things go wrong the manager is quick to apportion blame without reviewing the circumstances'. This is an example of internal attribution of blame on the part of the leader. Such situations are likely to frustrate employees, and subsequently reduce the quality of leader-follower interactions (Medina, Munduate, Dorado, et al., 2005; Martinko and Douglas, 1999). Hosner (2007) explains that leaders who prioritize self-serving behaviors over serving the interest of the larger group or community, fail to honor their moral commitment to stakeholders, and in the process, undermine their own long-term success.

3. *Is insensitive to staff constraints and needs:* Our respondents provide many examples of leader behaviors that reveal insensitivity to the constraints and needs of subordinates. For instance, one HoD repeatedly scheduled examinations and report-writing in same week without giving due consideration

---

[13] 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 and Pearson, 1999: 457).

to the fact that the staff already has a heavy workload. In the same way, another leader systematically overloaded staff with extra work creating undue stress. Yet other leaders failed to inform staff about important decisions directly affecting them, and/or failed to provide them with feedback when expected. Although this behavioral descriptor comes up fairly frequently in our study, we find little support for this in extant literature.

4. *Acts in an autocratic fashion and does not include staff in important decisions:* Past literature (see Bandura, 1998) supports that leaders, who are autocratic and do not engage in participative decision making, are negatively perceived by their subordinates. Such leaders weaken the organization's ability to respond to change, undermine employee confidence and motivation, and reduce work life quality (Detert and Burris, 2007; Whetten and Cameron, 2007). Past literature also suggests that whether or not leaders will actually consult with subordinates on important decisions depends on the degree of goal congruence between the leader and the subordinate, the subordinates' job level, and the quality of the leader-member exchange relationship (Yukl and Fu, 1999). While our study does not look at the antecedent conditions under which leaders would consult with subordinates, we do find evidence supporting that those leaders who do not consult with their subordinates are negatively perceived by the latter. Our respondents offer many instances of being excluded from important decision making. One respondent informs that his leader "runs the department as a 'one-man band' deciding everything and never consulting with the staff". Leaders who 'fail to consult or communicate with staff on wider school issues' or those that 'unilaterally or autocratically makes decisions without prior consultation or discussion with staff or without allowing any form of participation' are also categorized under the same descriptor.

5. *Tolerates poor performance*: Considering that appraising employees is one of the regular functions of mid-level supervisory leaders, this behavioral descriptor may seem more in line with ineffective leader behaviors. But we choose to categorize it under dysfunctional leader behaviors because by tolerating poor performance, leaders inadvertently create a dysfunctional organizational culture. Their tolerance of poor performance implicitly suggests that mediocre performance is acceptable (Van Fleet and Griffin, 2006). Since people take behavioral cues from their environment (see Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, et al., 2008; Tepper, 2010), observing a leader who tolerates poor performance will encourage other members to also perform sub-optimally, thereby compromising overall organizational output. By tolerating poor performance, leaders inadvertently compromise on one of their key ethical responsibilities- optimizing the organization's current and future outcomes (Caldwell and Karri, 2005).

It should be noted that although most of the afore-cited dysfunctional behavioral descriptors are unique to our study, one of these descriptors i.e. '*acts in an autocratic fashion and does not include staff in important decisions*' overlaps with Bryman's (2007) effective behavioral descriptor 'allowing the opportunity to participate in key decisions'. Notwithstanding, we classify this behavioral descriptor as dysfunctional (as opposed to ineffective) because in the context of our study, such behaviors are more about the leader's intentional exclusion of key stakeholders from decision-making rather than a simple act of negligence.

As a final remark, our study allows a richer conceptualization of dysfunctional leader behaviors than has been previously done. In past literature, dysfunctional

leadership has been characterized as involving counterproductive behaviors that undermine trust and effectiveness in a leader-member relationship (Johnson and Huwe, 2002; Harvey, Martinko and Douglas, 2006). Dysfunctional leaders have been described as: exceedingly focused on self-interest (Williamson, 1996; Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010; Wayne et al., 2008), abusive and contemptuous toward organizational members (Sutton, 2007; Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010), engaging in bullying behaviors (Wayne et al., 2008), acting autocratically (Bandura, 1998), and denying organizational members their right to participate in organizational decisions (Warner, 2001). Our present study not only confirms this conceptualization of dysfunctional leadership, but also enriches it. Based on our findings, we describe dysfunctional leaders as those who regularly and frequently engage in humiliating others, who choose to retain control by intentionally excluding other organizational members from important aspects of organizational life, who regularly engage in self-serving behavior while compromising the interest of the larger team or organization, who act in an autocratic manner while disrespecting the legitimate position that every employee has in an organization, who tolerate sub-standard performance thereby compromising the overall output for the organization and its stakeholders, and who are insensitive to the constraints and needs of subordinates, thereby causing them undue stress.

Sub-section 3: Behavioral descriptors of unauthentic leader behaviors in French and British educational establishments

Our data revealed two descriptors of unauthentic leader behaviors. These are presented in Table 4 below with supporting quotations from original CIs:

---Insert Table 4 about here---

Below we elaborate on the behaviors that each unauthentic behavioral descriptor captures, and compare our findings with extant literature on the topic.

1. *Exploitative and dishonest behavior:* In the context of our study, leaders are seen as 'exploitative and dishonest' when they show a blatant lack of honesty in their interpersonal interactions, when they are inconsistent in their decision making, when they say one thing and then arbitrarily do something else, when they give one set of instructions and change it at the last minute, or when they engage in behaviors bordering on deceit and/or manipulation.
2. *Behaviors lacking in integrity:* Leaders are seen as lacking in integrity if they allow their personal preferences and prejudices to bias the way they represent the views of their staff to higher management, if they undermine organizational processes and procedures, and when they engage in favoritism, discrimination and inequality. Leaders are also seen as lacking in integrity if they over-ride collective decisions taken by the staff, or if they use verbal and physical bullying to maintain classroom discipline.

Our findings are supported by extant literature from the trait school and more recently, from literature on authentic leadership. For instance, Reave (2005) argues that personal traits such as honesty, integrity and associated values are crucial elements to a leader's success. Similarly, other experts of authentic leadership (see Tonkin, 2013) explain that traits such as self-awareness, transparency and ethics, are critical components of the personality of an authentic leader (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May, 2004). It should also be noted that our unauthentic behavioral

20

descriptor 'behavior lacking in integrity' is the mirror opposite of Bryman's (2007) effective behavior 'being trustworthy and having personal integrity'. But since this behavioral descriptor has more to do with leaders' lack of honesty and integrity, rather than their inability to fulfil functional responsibilities, we prefer to categorize it as unauthentic behavior as opposed to ineffective behavior.

As mentioned earlier, Luthans and Avolio (2009) identify four dimensions of authentic leadership: self-awareness, transparency, ethics and balanced processing. In some ways, our study enriches this conceptualization of authentic leadership. We find that it is very important that leaders maintain coherence between their speech and their action (see also Yukl et al.'s [2012] call for a consistency between leaders' values and their actions), and between the instructions they give to subordinates and the outcomes they expect from the same if they wish to be perceived as authentic. When leaders willfully change prior decisions without any discussions with collaborators, such behaviors may be perceived as exploitative and manipulative. Also, if leaders wish to be perceived as authentic by subordinates, they must learn to discern their own viewpoints from those of the multiple stakeholder groups they are sometimes called to represent. As such leaders are spokespersons of the constituencies they represent, and allowing their own voice to supersede the multiple voices they represent will lead them to being perceived as lacking in integrity. In the same way, leaders may be perceived as unauthentic if they disrespect overarching organizational rules and processes. Extrapolating from these reflections, we propose that the existing conceptualization of unauthentic leadership be expanded to include the following elements: inconsistency between speech and actions, leaders' inability to discern their own voice from those of the multiple constituencies they represent, and their inability to respect overarching organizational rules and processes.

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Our present study offers three theoretical contributions:

(1) Theoretical contributions to the broad literature on negative leader behaviors

It has long been a tradition among many leadership scholars to focus on the positive aspects of leadership (Padilla et al., 2007). Some scholars (e.g. Patel and Hamlin, 2012; Patel and Hamlin, 2012; Wang, 2011) have been more open to negative aspects of leadership, but unfortunately they too have remained content with categorizing leader behaviors into effective or ineffective types. Yet other scholars have focused on the negative side of leadership and concentrated on unethical, unauthentic, toxic, and dysfunctional leadership. Unfortunately, there has hitherto been no attempt to put together a unified framework of negative leader behaviors. Unlike many past scholars, we choose to focus on negative aspects of leadership within the education sector, and attempt to offer a unified framework of negative leader behaviors composed of ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leader behaviors. We clarify that while ineffective leadership is about unmet functional obligations, dysfunctional leadership is about acting in ways that harm the organization and its members, and unauthentic leadership is about behaviors that indicate a lack of integrity, transparency, honesty, and ethical thinking on the part of the leader. Distinguishing between ineffective, dysfunctional and unauthentic leader behaviors allows us to provide well-tailored recommendations to those managing such leaders (see the 'Managerial

Recommendations' section). While grouping all negative leader behaviors under the 'ineffective' label has, in the past, obscured the possibility of distinguishing between different kinds of negative leader behaviors, in our present work we overcome this drawback. As such, we offer a more unified, and yet more differentiated framework of negative leader behaviors in the education sector. Although extant literature refers to other kinds of negative leader behaviors (for e.g. toxic leadership – defined as coercive and fear-inducing behaviors resulting in serious personal affront to one or more individuals, Goldman, 2006), we did not come across such behavior in our study[14], and therefore toxic behaviors do not appear in our unified framework (see figure 3 below).

---Insert Figure 3 about here---

Three points deserve to be elaborated at this stage. First, the three behavioral categories specified in our unified framework of negative leader behaviors (see figure 3 above) are distinct from one another - both in terms of how they are enacted within organizations (see the BSs that lead to the emergence of each behavioral category), and in terms of the underlying reasons inspiring such behaviors. While ineffective behaviors may be the unintended outcome of leaders' lack of skills or training, dysfunctional behaviors are the outcome of leaders' insouciance regarding harming the organization or its members, and unauthentic behaviors are the outcome of dishonesty, manipulation, lack of transparency and/or integrity on leaders' part[15]. Therefore, in distinguishing between ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leader behaviors we need to ask the 'why' question and not simply focus on outcomes as other scholars (e.g. Padilla et al., 2007) have done. Consider for instance a leader who does not delegate. Such a behavior may be inspired by varied underlying reasons. If the leader does not delegate because (s)he does not know how to delegate or does not realize its benefits, then such a behavior may be classified as ineffective. However, if the leader chooses not to delegate because of his/her desire to monopolize control, then such a behavior may be classified as dysfunctional. Asking the 'why' question helps us uncover the underlying motivation behind a leader's behavior, and thereby gain a better handle at understanding and minimizing such behaviors. Our arguments are in line with Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) and Howell and Avolio (1992), who support that categorizing leader behaviors should involve considering the underlying intent of the leader in question.

Second, despite the fact that the three behavioral categories are distinct from one another, there could be similarities in their eventual outcomes. For instance, when leaders constantly engage in behaviors such that their words are inconsistent with their actions, this eventually leads to subordinates distrusting such leaders. While this is an example of unauthentic leader behavior, its negative impact on trust will eventually lead to ineffective functional outcomes. Such similarities in the eventual outcomes of different kinds of negative leader behaviors do not imply an overlap between the three negative behavioral categories themselves. Rather they simply signal that different

---

[14] Although other forms of negative leader behaviors also include an element of fear or coercion, the difference between these forms and toxic leadership lies in the intensity or degree of fear induced.

[15] It should be noted that some examples of ineffective leader behaviors (e.g. poor reward allocation) are acts of omission – in other words, they are the outcome of failure to use the positive behavior when needed. But this is not the case with other ineffective leader behaviors that have emerged from our study, nor does this apply to dysfunctional and unauthentic leader behaviors. For instance, treating someone in a humiliating or derogatory way cannot simply be described as a mirror opposite of polite and respectful behavior. Even if a leader is generally polite and respectful, one single act of humiliating and derogatory behavior will lead to the perception of dysfunctionality between the leader and the target of said behavior.

negative leader behaviors could eventually lead to the same/similar outcomes. This is in line with the equifinality principle which states that the same outcome can result from more than one set of antecedent conditions (Woodside, 2014).

As a final remark, the perceived outcome of leader behaviors (both positive and negative) depends not on merely using certain behaviors but rather on how, how frequently, for how long and for what purpose they are used. Following this argument, simply categorizing leaders as effective because they manifest a certain behavior, for instance taking timely decisions, may be a bit short-sighted. Instead, we need to explore whether these decisions were taken after satisfactory discussions with concerned stakeholders, whether they represent the voices of the different constituencies, and whether or not different resource implications were taken into consideration before the decision was taken. Therefore, leadership scholars need to go beyond scratching the surface if they are to gain a more complete understanding of negative leader behaviors.

(2)   Theoretical contributions to specific literature streams addressing ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leadership

Our study is among the few studies that qualify ineffective leader behaviors within the education sector. We find that leaders in French and British educational institutions are perceived as ineffective if they manifest one or more of the following behaviors: inability to accept new ideas or to support change, poor planning, organizing, monitoring, and resource-allocation, poor communication and decision-making, inability to cultivate/maintain relationships, inability to support or advice staff, inability to delegate, and exercising too much or too little control. Many of these ineffective behaviors find parallels in Patel and Hamlin's (2012) study of public and private sector organizations in Germany, UK and Romania. This overlap reveals that leaders in the education sector are perceived as ineffective in quite the same way as leaders in other sectors. However, our present work also enriches Patel and Hamlin's (2012) work by categorizing negative leader behaviors into dysfunctional and unauthentic leader behaviors. Also, our findings offer partial empirical support for Yukl's (2012) taxonomy of leadership efficacy. We find that leaders, who fail to manage task-oriented, relations-oriented, and change-oriented behaviors, are perceived as ineffective. In contrast, we find no such support for the 'network-oriented' behavioral category of Yukl's (2012) framework (see reasons on p. 17).

Regarding dysfunctional leader behaviors, extant literature tends to focus on extreme behaviors observed among top level organizational leaders. In contrast, we offer many examples of mid-level supervisory leader behaviors which while not extreme in nature are still dysfunctional. We find five behaviors in the French and British education sector which can be categorized as dysfunctional: humiliating or derogatory behavior, self-serving behavior, being insensitive to staff constraints and needs, acting in an autocratic fashion and not including staff in important decisions, and tolerating poor performance. In addition to qualifying and illustrating for the first time what dysfunctional behaviors means in the context of the education sector, we also enrich the current conceptualization of dysfunctional leadership. Based on our findings, dysfunctional leaders are those leaders who frequently engage in humiliating others, who choose to retain control by excluding other organizational members from important aspects of organizational life, who regularly engage in self-serving behavior while compromising the interest of the larger team or organization, who act in an autocratic

manner while disrespecting the legitimate position that every employee has in an organization, who tolerate sub-standard performance thereby compromising the overall output for the organization, and who are insensitive to the constraints and needs of subordinates.

Finally, regarding unauthentic leader behaviors, we identify two such behaviors in the French and British education sector: exploitative and dishonest behavior, and behavior lacking in integrity. Based on our findings, we propose that the existing conceptualization of unauthentic leadership be expanded to include inconsistency between speech and actions, leaders' inability to discern their own voice from those of the multiple constituencies they represent, and their inability to respect overarching organizational rules and processes. Thus, we enrich the existing conceptualization of unauthentic leadership.

We now summarize our findings in Figure 4 below.

---Insert Figure 4 about here---

(3) Theoretical contributions regarding negative leader behaviors in the precise context of the education sector

Finally, we present our theoretical insights regarding negative leader behaviors in the education sector. First, our study shows that negative leader behaviors abound in British and French educational establishments, and that many of these negative behaviors are grounded in leaders' insouciance regarding harming the organization or its members, or in their lack of honesty, transparency, ethicality and/or integrity. This finding challenges the assumption that most academics are honest and ethical (Ipsos MORI, 2014; Pew Research Center, 2009; Small & Mallon, 2007). Our study offers a more authentic representation of leader behaviors in the education sector. We find that leaders in the education sector are as much prone to negative behaviors as leaders in other sectors, and there is therefore little justification for excluding the education sector from ethical scrutiny (as has been the case in the past). In fact, it might even be fair to argue that since academic leaders serve as role models for young adults their behavior deserves even closer scrutiny than those of leaders in other sectors.

Second, our study compels us to revisit the commonly propagated idea that educators should be conferred a major part of the responsibility of inculcating ethical values among young people. Based on our findings we argue that relying excessively on the education sector (or any other entity for that matter) to train the ethical leaders of tomorrow may be unwise. Instead, encouraging ethical behaviors among future leaders should be a shared responsibility of every responsible citizen.

Finally, since few past scholars (barring Bryman, 2007) have focused on leader behaviors in the education sector, it is difficult to compare our findings with those of prior studies. However, our study does offer partial support to Bryman's (2007) study on the topic in British, American and Australian education sectors. But, our study also goes farther than Bryman's (2007) work. While Bryman (2007) only focused on effective leader behaviors in the education sector, we focus on the negative aspects of leaders' behaviors, and distinguish them into ineffective, dysfunctional and unauthentic behaviors. Also, since the underlying motives driving different types of negative leader

behaviors are different, the corrective measures designed for them should also be different. These measures are discussed next.

MANAGERIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, we outline managerial suggestions regarding curbing ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic leader behaviors. Since ineffective behaviors result from leaders' functional inefficacies, most of these can be addressed through appropriate training. For instance, if a leader is not open to new ideas or unable to accept change, then a training program on change management might be in order. Similarly, if leaders' ineffective behavior involves instances of poor planning, organization, resource allocation, monitoring or controlling, then these can be addressed through appropriate management training program (e.g. Executive MBA programs). If leaders' ineffective behavior has to do with poor communication skills, then this can be addressed through training in public speakers, or effective written, oral and electronic communication. If a leader is poor in cultivating or maintaining relationships then self-awareness programs enabling a better understanding of their preferences, motivational drivers, communication styles, conflict resolution styles, etc. might help. When ineffective behaviors concern poor decision making, this can be addressed by making leaders accountable for their decisions and for the outcomes of their units. In so doing, leaders' tendency to procrastinate on decisions or to take hurried/delayed or misinformed decisions will be reduced. If the ineffective behavior has to do with leaders' inability to exercise the right amount of control or their inability to delegate tasks, then mentors could help them find the right balance between delegation and control. Finally, a proper system of mentorship should be created and leaders should be held responsible for the performance and growth of their subordinates (Padilla et al., 2007).

Unlike ineffective leader behaviors, dysfunctional leader behaviors are not related to lack of functional competencies, but emerge from leaders' tendency to harm the organization and its members. Therefore, training programs may not be sufficient to curb such behaviors. Since dysfunctional behaviors flourish under environments of uncertainty, the first step toward curbing them could be setting up clear organizational policies and rules. Dysfunctional leaders often behave in an autocratic fashion because they control subordinates' performance evaluation and rewards allocation, thereby exercising considerable power over them. This power imbalance (see also Padilla et al., 2007) can be reduced by creating 360° performance appraisal systems. Another solution is to set up a formal system of addressing grievances, which employees can use to raise a voice against such behaviors (Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco, 2010). Since employees are often scared about raising their voices for fear of reprimand (Hirschman, 1970), organizations need to put into place policies protecting such employees. Next, dysfunctional leaders often humiliate and demean fellow employees. Such behaviors may be curbed through training on non-violent communication and on moral harassment. Also, clear disciplinary actions need to be stipulated and implemented when leaders engage in such behaviors. Finally, leaders should be held responsible for the overall outcomes of their units, and their rewards should be linked to the performance of their units. This will minimize leaders' tendencies to engage in self-serving behaviors, make them more sensitive to the constraints and needs of their subordinates, and encourage them to take action against under-performing employees.

Finally, to curb unauthentic behaviors, it is important that organizations clearly spell out their ethical values. While the existence of ethical codes of conduct does not by itself ensure ethical practices in organizations, they at least create an ideal against which day-to-day behaviors of employees and leaders can be compared (Howell and Avolio, 1992; Padilla et al., 2007). Such ethical codes of conduct should also be supported by a clear system of reward and punishment, such that negative leader behaviors are identified and punished appropriately and swiftly. Leaders often engage in dishonest practices when they hold too much power and when there is little accountability. Therefore, setting up a transparent accountability system wherein leaders are systematically called upon to explain their decisions would help curb exploitative behaviors (see also Padilla et al., 2007). For the same reason, bringing in external auditing bodies to assess practices in educational establishments is a good way of identifying and weeding out opportunistic and self-serving behaviors.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Limitations

Our study suffers from four methodological and three conceptual limitations.

Regarding methodological limitations, first, our data is grounded in only three previously conducted case studies. Nevertheless, it should be noted that following standard requirements of the CIT, our data set includes a total 105 interviews conducted in eight academic establishments, resulting in a total 396 negative CIs and 113 negative BSs. Thus, our present study offers considerable richness and insight into negative leader behaviors in these organizations. Nevertheless, we propose that more replication studies be conducted in educational establishments in France, UK, and other countries.

Second, our present study is grounded in three extant case studies, for which data were collected at three different time periods. While the first study was conducted in 1985-1987, the second study was conducted in 2011-2012, and the third study was conducted in 2012-2013. The gap between the first and third studies is 25 years. Although this is a significant time lapse, the BSs collected from these studies are fairly comparable because they emerge from the same underlying research design and methodology. We included these three case studies in our present study because they satisfactorily meet the requirements of replica studies (Avolio et al., 1999), and offer a complete coverage from secondary to doctoral level educational establishments.

Third, there is some inconsistency in the subjects who form the focus of our three prior case studies. While in the two UK studies the subject focus were employees in designated managerial roles or in jobs where they spent 40% or more of their time doing managerial/leadership work, the third case study focused on managerial and non-managerial subjects from different levels of the organizational hierarchy. More replication studies covering transversal groups of respondents from educational establishments based in different countries might enhance/challenge the credibility of our findings.

As a final methodological limitation, both the authors of this paper have themselves been academics in higher educational establishments in France and UK. While the first author has taught in different higher education establishments in France for over fourteen years and has held positions of managerial responsibilities during this

period, the second author has taught in educational establishments in UK for over 35 years and has extensive experience as a manager, HoD, and professor. Since the two authors are very much embedded within the education sector, it is likely that their own experiences may have biased the data analysis in some way. For the same reason, it can also be argued that identifying the nuances of the education sector might have been more difficult for the two authors of this paper than to an outsider. However, this limitation was overcome by the fact that the same research team has studied leadership in a wide variety of sectors (private, public, and third sector organizations) in many different countries (e.g. UAE, India, Canada, Mexico, etc.). This broad experience, we hope, has helped keep a check on any personal biases that the authors might have held regarding the education sector.

With regards to conceptual limitations, our present work focuses on how leader behaviors are 'perceived' (i.e. leaders' reputation), and not on leaders' actual performance measured through objective outcome measures. However, our decision to focus on leaders' perceived effectiveness is grounded in past literature (Tsui and Ashford, 1994) that argues that perceptions are just as important as actual performance, and that, resources, contributions, and opportunities may either be withheld or offered to leaders based on their perceived effectiveness. Another conceptual limitation of our study is that we focus only on leaders' behaviors as influencing leader-subordinate relations. One may well argue that subordinates' behaviors, attitudes, personality, working patterns, etc. also equally contribute to leaders' behaviors, and the kind of leader-subordinate relationship that subsequently emerges (see Paul, Strbiak, and Landrum, 2002; Johnson and Huwe, 2002). Similarly, the environment also influences leader behaviors (Padilla et al., 2007). Therefore, future studies of negative leader behaviors should include subordinates' behaviors as well as environmental factors as influencing variables. Finally, since our study is an inductive one, we are only able to enrich extant understanding on negative leader behaviors, rather than scientifically prove it. Future studies may therefore be required to test, challenge, and/or enhance our framework of negative leader behavior.

Suggestions for future research

We propose that more replication studies of negative leader behaviors be conducted in educational establishments in France, UK, and other countries in order to confirm/challenge our findings. Also, leader behaviors should be studied in conjunction with subordinate behaviors and environmental variables, not as a stand-alone (see also Gordon and Yukl, 2004). It might also be interesting to conduct more quantitative and longitudinal studies across organizations and countries to see how expectations regarding and perceptions of negative leadership have evolved over time. Does the concept of negative leadership vary across sectors and countries? What are the short term and long term impacts of negative leader behaviors on the recipients, witnesses, and the organization? Similar studies in sectors other than education may also contribute toward a more complete understanding of negative leader behaviors. Such replication studies would help enrich and/or modify the unified framework of negative leader behavior we have proposed in this paper. It would also be interesting to examine the relative frequency of specific types of negative leader behaviors that are clearly unethical and harmful, and the extent to which each type of behavior is associated with different types of leadership positions and situations in academic institutions. This is in line with Yukl's (2012) advice that to improve leadership theory and practice, we need

to know more about the frequency of certain leader behaviors, why they are used, how they are used, in what context they are used and by whom, how well they are used, and their joint impact on varied outcomes. Finally, we call for scholars to problematize the notions of effective and ineffective leader behaviors. Behaviors perceived as effective on the surface could well be guided by less-than-noble intent, while those perceived as ineffective may well be grounded in sound moral reasoning. Therefore, more critical studies of leader behaviors are required.

CONCLUSION

A common assumption about the education sector is that actors within this sector are mostly honest and ethical. This assumption probably explains why there have been so few studies of leadership in the education sector, and why even fewer among these have focused on negative aspects of leadership. Our study not only focuses on negative leader behaviors in the education sector, it goes one step further to propose a unified framework of negative leader behaviors composed of ineffective, dysfunctional, and unauthentic behaviors. Even if concepts like ineffective, unauthentic, and dysfunctional leadership have been the focus of research in recent years, there has been no attempt to bring these concepts together in a unified framework as we have done. Also, although literature on dysfunctional and unauthentic leadership is gradually increasing, this does not necessarily mean that we have sufficient insight into how such behaviors are manifested in the education sector. Through our present work we add qualitative richness to the understanding of negative leader behaviors in the education sector.

Nevertheless, our unified framework as presented in this paper should not be considered as a final solution for classifying negative leader behaviors. As Yukl (2012: 79) explains, every behavioral constructs is a conceptual tool and there is no objective reality for it. Therefore, we call for more efforts toward refining our framework of negative leader behaviors, and for the creation of a more comprehensive theory of negative leader behaviors. For instance, our present study does not assess whether one or more of these negative behavioral categories come to the fore in certain contexts, situation, or in specific managerial functions. Therefore, at this stage, we make no assumptions of certain negative behavioral categories (or specific behavioral descriptors included within each behavioral category) being more significant than the others. Nor do we assume that every negative behavioral category is found in every organization/context. Only future research can confirm the relative significance of these different negative leader behavior categories within specific boundary conditions, and whether or not they come to fore within specific contexts or organizations.

A tentative comparison of our findings in the French and British education sectors with those of Patel and Hamlin's (2012) findings from British and German private sector and British and Romanian public sector establishments reveals considerable similarities in negative leader behaviors across sectors. This suggests that there are considerable similarities between the negative leader behaviors observed in the education sector and those observed in other sectors. There is therefore no justification for excluding leaders in the education sector from the kind of scrutiny to which leaders in other sectors have been subjected. This finding also suggests that relying excessively on the education sector to guide future leaders may be incorrect. Producing ethical leaders of tomorrow will therefore have to be a shared responsibility of families,

educational establishments, civil society, the corporate sector, governing institutions, law and order agencies, and other stakeholder groups.

In the present paper we have exposed negative leader behaviors in French and British educational establishments. Nonetheless, our findings could be valid for other knowledge-intensive sectors as well. For instance, like educational establishments, research, training and consulting establishments are also knowledge-intensive and service-oriented. Also, like educational establishments, research, training and consulting establishments also employ qualified experts from different domains. It is, therefore, likely that these experts carry similar perceptions of positive and negative leadership as members of the education sector. Therefore, our findings from the French and British education sectors might also hold for research, training, and consulting organizations in different countries.

Reference

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. and Lawler, J.: 2001, 'Leadership development in UK companies at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Lessons for the NHS?', *Journal of Management in Medicine* 15(5), 387-404.

Alvesson, M.: 2002, *Understanding organizational culture* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA).

Andersson, L. and Pearson, C.: 1999, 'Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace', *Academy of Management Review* 24(3), 452-471.

Armenakis, A. and Bedeian, A.: 1999, 'Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s', *Journal of Management* 25, 293–315.

Armenakis, A., Harris, S. and Field, H.: 2001, 'Paradigms in organizational change: Change agent and change target perspectives' in *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, (ed.) R. T. Golembiewski, 631–58, (Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York).

Avolio, B., Bass. M., and Jung, D.: 1999, 'Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72(4), 441-463.

Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumbwa, F., Luthans, F., and 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.

Bandura, A.: 1998, Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement, in W. Reich (ed.), *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, State of Mind* (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC).

Barker. L.: 2000, 'Effective leadership within hospice and specialist palliative care units', *Journal of Management in Medicine* 14(5/6), 291-309.

Bass, B. M.: 1990, Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, 1990. *Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*.

Bass, B. and Steidlmeier, P.: 1999, 'Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior', *The Leadership Quarterly* 10, 181−217.

Bauer, T. and Green, S.: 1996, 'The development of leader–member exchange: A longitudinal test', *Academy of Management Journal* 39, 538–67.

Bennis, W. and Nanus, B.: 1985, *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge* (Harper and Row, New York).

Bergmann, H., Hurson. K., and Russ-Eft. D.: 1999, *Everyone a leader: A grassroots model for the new workplace.* (Wiley, New York).

Blass, F. and Ferris, G.: 2007, 'Leader reputation: The role of mentoring, political skill, contextual learning, and adaptation', *Human Resource Management* 46(1), 5-19.

Block, P.: 1993, *Stewardship: Choosing Service Over Self- Interest* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco).

Bolman, L. and Deal, T.: 1991a, *Reframing organizations*. (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco).

Bolman, L. and Deal, T.: 1991b, 'Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis', *Human Resource Management* 30(4), 509-534.

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

Boyatzis, R.: 1982, *The Competent Manager*, John Wiley, New York.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V.: 2006, 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3: 77–101.

Brown, M., Trevino, L., and Harrison, D.: 2005, 'Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 97(2), 117-134.

Brunell, A., Gentry, W., Campbell, W., Hoffman, B., Kuhnert, K., and DeMarree, K.: 2008, 'Leader Emergence: The Case of the Narcissistic Leader', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34, 1663-1676.

Bryman, A.: 2007, 'Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review', *Studies in Higher Education* 32(6), 693-710.

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

Burris, E., Detert, J., and Chiaburu, D.: 2008, 'Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93(4), 912–922.

Calarco, A. and Gurvis, J.: 2006, *Adaptability: Responding Effectively to Change*. (Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC).

Caldwell, C. and Canuto-Carranco, M.: 2010, 'Organizational Terrorism and Moral Choices–Exercising voice when the leader is the problem', *Journal of Business Ethics* 97(1), 159-171.

Caldwell, C. and Karri, R.: 2005, 'Organizational governance and ethical systems: A covenantal approach to building trust', *Journal of Business Ethics* 58(1), 249–259.

Campbell, J., Dunnette. M., Lawler, E. and Weick. K.: 1970, *Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness,* (McGraw-Hill, New York).

Chell, E.: 1998, *Critical Incident Technique*, in G. Symon and C. Cassell (eds.) *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in Organizational Research: A Practical Guide*, (Sage: London).

Chipunza, C. and Gwarinda, S.: 2010, 'Transformational leadership in merging higher education institutions: A case study', *SA Journal of Human Resource Management* 8(1), 1-10.

Conger, J.: 1990, 'The dark side of leadership', *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44−55.

Covey, S.: 2004, *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness* (Free Press, New York).

Detert, J. and Burris, E.: 2007, 'Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open?', *Academy of Management Journal* 50, 869–884.

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. and Lowe, A.: 1991, *Management Research: An Introduction,* (Sage: London).

Fernandez, S.: 2004, 'Developing and testing an integrative framework of public sector leadership: Evidence from the public education arena', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(2), 197-217.

Flanagan, J.: 1952, 'Principles and procedures in evaluating performance', *Personnel* 29, 373-385.

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

Flick, U.: 2002, *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 2nd ed. (Sage, London).

Frost, P.: 2003, *Toxic Emotions at Work* (Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.).

Giacalone, R. and Greenberg, J.: 1997, *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.).

Gibbs, G.: 2007, *Analyzing Qualitative Data* (Sage, London).

Ginter, P. M., and Jack Duncan, W.: 1990, 'Macroenvironmental analysis for strategic management' *Long Range Planning 23*(6), 91-100.

Goldman, A.: 2006, 'High toxicity leadership: Borderline personality disorder and the dysfunctional organization', *Journal of Managerial Psychology 21*(8), 733-746.

Gomes, R. and Knowles, P.: 1999, 'Marketing department leadership: An analysis of a team transformation', *Journal of Marketing Education 21*(3), 164-174.

Gordon, A., and Yukl, G.: 2004, 'The future of leadership research: Challenges and opportunities', *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung/German Journal of Research in Human Resource Management* 359-365.

Hales, C.: 1986, 'What do managers do? A critical review of the evidence', *Journal of Management Studies 23*(1), 88-115.

Hall, D.: 2002, *Careers In and Out of Organizations* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.).

Hall, A., Blass, F., Ferris, G. and Massengale, R.: 2004, 'Leader reputation and accountability in organizations: Implications for dysfunctional leader behavior', *Leadership Quarterly 15*, 515-536.

Hamlin, R.: 2004, 'In support of universalistic models of managerial and leadership effectiveness: Implications for HRD research and practice', *Human Resource Development Quarterly 15*(2), 189-215.

Hamlin, R.: 2009, *Universalistic Models of Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness*, (VDM Verlag Saarbrucken).

Hamlin, R. and Barnett, C.: 2011, 'In support of an emergent general taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness: An empirical study from the UK independent schools sector', in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Human Resource Development Research and Practice across Europe, 25-27 May, University of Gloucester, Cheltenham*.

Hamlin, R. and Patel, T.: 2012, 'Behavioral indicators of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness within Romanian and British public sector hospitals', *European Journal of Training and Development 36*(2/3), 234-261.

Harvey, P., Martinko, M., and Douglas, S.: 2006, 'Causal reasoning in dysfunctional leader-member interactions', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21(8), 747-762.

Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., and Prussia, G. E.: 2013, 'Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness' *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *28*(2), 133-146.

Hirschman, A.: 1970, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R.: 2005, 'What we know about leadership', *Review of General Psychology* 9, 169−180.

Hosmer, L.: 2007, *The Ethics of Management*, 6th Edition (McGraw-Hill, New York).

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

Howell, J. and Avolio, B.: 1992, 'The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation?', *Academy of Management Executive 6*, 43−54.

Ipsos MORI: 2014, *Public Attitudes to Science*. [Online] Available at: http://www.ipsos-mori.com/Assets/Docs/Polls/pas-2014-main-report.pdf [Accessed 22 July 2014].

Jasinski, F.: 1956, 'Foreman relationships outside the work group', *Personnel 33*(2), 130-136.

Johnson, W. and Huwe, J.: 2002, 'Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school', *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Training 39*, 44-55.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., and Ryland, K.: 2012, 'Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 34*(1), 67-78.

Kellerman, B.: 2004, *Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters* (Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.).

Kets de Vries, M.: 1995, *Life and Death in the Executive Fast Lane* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco).

Kets de Vries, M.: 2004, *Dysfunctional leadership. Encyclopedia of Leadership* (Berkshire/Sage, Great Barrington, MA.).

Kinney, J.: 1995, *Violence at Work*, (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.).

Klenke, K.: 1993, 'Meta-analytic studies of leadership: Added insights or added paradoxes?' *Current Psychology 12*, 326–343.

Knafl, K. and Breitmayer, B.: 1991, 'Triangulation in qualitative research: Issues of conceptual clarity and purpose', in *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*, (ed.) J. Morse (Sage, London).

Kouzes, J. and Posner, B.: 2007, *The Leadership Challenge*, 4th ed. (John Wiley, San Francisco).

Kurke, L. and Aldrich, H.: 1983, 'Mintzberg was Right! A replication and extension of the nature of managerial work', *Management Science 29*(8), 975-984.

Latham, G. and Wexley, K.: 1981, *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal,* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.).

Lampe, M.: 2012, 'Mindfulness-based business ethics education', *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 16(3): n.s.

Lau, A., Pavett, C., and Newman, A.: 1980, 'The nature of managerial work: A comparison of public and private sector jobs', in *Academy of Management Proceedings 1*, 339-343.

Lazarus, R. and Folkman, S.: 1984, *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping* (Springer, New York).

Lennick, D. and Kiel, F.: 2008, *Moral Intelligence: Enhancing Business Performance and Leadership Success* (Wharton Business School Press, Upper Saddle River, NJ).

Lloyd-Walker, B. and Walker, D.: 2011, 'Authentic leadership for 21st century project delivery', *International Journal of Project Management 29*(4), 383-395.

Luthans, F. and Avolio, B.: 2009, 'The "point" of positive organizational behavior', *Journal of Organizational Behavior 30*(2), 291-307.

MacKinnon, C.: 1994, *Only Words*, (Basic Books, New York).

Madill, A., Jordon, A. and Shirley, C.: 2000, 'Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist and radical constructionist epistemologies', *British Journal of Psychology 91*, 1–20.

Majone, G. and Wildavsky, A.: 1979, 'Implementation as evolution', 2d ed. in *Implementation*, (eds.) J. Pressman and A. Wildavsky, (University of California Press, Berkeley).

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.: 1989, *Designing Qualitative Research* (Sage, Newbury Park, CA.).

Martinko, M. and Douglas, S.: 1999, 'Culture and expatriate failure: An attributional explanation', *International Journal of Organizational Analysis 7*, 265-293.

Martinko, M. and Gardner. W.: 1990, 'Structured observation of managerial work: A replication and synthesis', *Journal of Management Studies 27*(3), 329-357.

McCurley, S. and Vineyard, S.: 1998, *Handling Problem Volunteers* (Heritage Arts Publishing/VMSystems, Downers Grove, IL.).

Medina, F., Munduate, L., Dorado, M., Martı́nez, I. and Guerra, J.: 2005, 'Types of intragroup conflict and affective reactions', *Journal of Managerial Psychology 20*, 219-230.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A.: 1995, *Qualitative Data Analysis*, (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.).

Mintzberg, H.: 1973, *The Nature of Managerial Work.* (Harper Collins, New York).

Morgan, H.: 2005, *The Art and Practice of Leadership Coaching*. (TransMedia).

O'Connor, J., Mumford, M., Clifton, T., Gessner, T., and Connelly, M.: 1995, 'Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study', *Leadership Quarterly 6*, 529−555.

O'Driscoll, M., Humphries, M. and Larson, H.: 1991, 'Managerial activities, competence and effectiveness: Managers and subordinate perceptions', *International Journal of Human Resource Management 2*(3), 313-326.

Onorato, M.: 2013, 'Transformational leadership style in the education sector: An empirical study of corporate managers and educational leaders', *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal 17*(1), 33-47.

Organ, D., Podsakoff, P. and MacKenzie, S.: 2005, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences* (Sage Publications, New York).

Orlitzky, M., Siegel, D., and Waldman, D.: 2011, 'Strategic corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability', *Business and Society 50*(1), 6-27.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., and Kaiser, R.: 2007, 'The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments', *The Leadership Quarterly 18*, 176–194

Patel, T. and Hamlin, R.: 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.

Patel, T.: 2012, 'A cultural appreciation of diversity of ethical strategies: Examples from European Businesses', in *Business Ethics: A Critical Approach*, (eds.) P. O'Sullivan, M. Smith and M. Esposito (Routledge, New York).

Patterson, K., Grenny, J., Maxfield, D., McMillan, R. and Switzler, A.: 2008, *Influencer: The Power to Change Anything* (McGraw-Hill, New York).

Paul, J., Strbiak, C. and Landrum, N.: 2002, 'Psychoanalytic diagnosis of top management team dysfunction', *Journal of Managerial Psychology 17*, 381-393.

Pava, M.: 2003, *Leading with Meaning: Using Covenantal Leadership to Build a Better Organization* (Palgrave McMillan, New York).

Pew Research Center: 2009, *Fewer Americans see solid evidence of global warming.* [Online] Available at: http://www.people-press.org/2009/10/22/fewer-americans-see-solid-evidence-of-global-warming/[Accessed 22 July 2014].

Pfeffer, J.: 1998, *The Human Equation: Building Profits by Putting People First* (Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA).

Ponterotto, J.: 2005, 'Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science', *Journal of Counseling Psychology 52*(2), 126–36.

Ramsden, P.: 1998, 'Managing the effective university', *Higher Education Research and Development 17*(3), 347-370.

Reave, L.: 2005, 'Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness', *The Leadership Quarterly 16*(5), 655-687.

Russ-Eft. D., Berrey. C., Hurson. K., and Brennan. K.: 1996, 'Updating the meaning of leadership: A grass-roots model for the new workplace', in *An essay from Zenger Miller* (Zenger Miller, San Jose, CA.).

Sankowsky, D.: 1995, 'The charismatic leader as a narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power', *Organizational Dynamics 23*, 57−71.

Schriesheim, C., Neider, L. and Scandura, T.: 1998, 'Delegation and leader–member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues', *Academy of Management Journal 41*, 298–318.

Shipper, F.: 1991, 'Mastery and frequency of managerial behaviors relative to sub-unit effectiveness', *Human Relations 44*(4), 371-388.

Szekeres, J.: 2004, 'The invisible workers', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 26*(1), 7-22.

Small, B. and Mallon, M.: 2007, 'Science, society, ethics, and trust', *International Studies of Management and Organization 37*(1), 103-124.

Stewart, R.: 1989, 'Studies of managerial jobs and behaviors-the way forward', *Journal of Management Studies 26*(1), 1-10.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J.: 1998, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Technique*, 2nd ed. (Sage, NewburyPark, London).

Summers, J., Munyon, T., Perryman, A. and Ferris, G.: 2010, 'Dysfunctional executive behavior: What can organizations do?', *Business Horizons 53*(6), 581-590.

Sutton, R.: 2007, *The No Asshole Rule: Building a Civilized Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't* (Warner Business Books, New York, Boston).

Tepper, B.: 2010, 'When managers pressure employees to behave badly: Toward a comprehensive response', *Business Horizons 53*(6), 591-598.

Tonkin, T.: 2013, 'Authentic versus transformational leadership: Assessing their effectiveness on organizational citizenship behavior of followers', *International Journal of Business and Public Administration 10*, 40-61.

Trevino, L.K., Brown, M. and Hartman, L.P. (2003), 'A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite', *Human Relations 56*, 5-33.

Trevino, L.K., Hartman, L.P. and Brown, M. (2000), 'Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership', *California Management Review 42*, 128-42.

Tsang, E. and Kwan, K-M.: 1999, 'Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective', *The Academy of Management Review 24*(4), 759–780.

Tsui, A. and Ashford, S.: 1994, 'Adaptive self-regulation: A process view of managerial effectiveness', *Journal of Management 20*(1), 93-121.

Turnley, W. and Feldman, D.: 1999, 'The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect', *Human Relations 52*(7), 895–922.

Van Fleet, D. and Van Fleet, E.: 2006, 'Internal terrorists: The terrorists inside organizations', *Journal of Managerial Psychology 21*(8), 763-774.

Van Fleet, D. and Griffin, R.: 2006, 'Dysfunctional organization culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviors', *Journal of Managerial Psychology 21*(8), 698-708.

Van Maanen, J.: 1983, *Qualitative Methodology* (Sage, Newbury Park, CA).

Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R.: 2008, 'Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past', *American Psychologist 63*(3), 182-196.

Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wemsing, T. and Peterson, S.: 2008, 'Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure', *Journal of Management 34*(1), 89-126.

Wang, J.: 2011, 'Understanding managerial effectiveness: A Chinese perspective', *Journal of European Industrial Training 35*(1), 6-23.

Warner, C.: 2001, *Bonds That Make Us Free: Healing Our Relationships, Coming to Ourselves* (Shadow Mountain Publishing, Salt Lake City, UT).

Wayne, S., Hoobler, J., Marinova, S. and Johnson, M.: 2008, 'Abusive behavior: Trickle-down effects beyond the dyad', *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1–6.

Whetten, D. and Cameron, K.: 2007, *Developing Management Skills*, 7th Ed. (Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ).

Williamson, O.: 1996, 'Economic Organization: The case for candor', *Academy of Management Review* 21(1), 48–57.

Woodside, A. G.: 2014, 'Embrace perform model: Complexity theory, contrarian case analysis, and multiple realities', *Journal of Business Research* 67(12), 2495-2503.

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

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S. and Prussia, G.: 2012, 'An improved measure of ethical leadership', *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies* 19(4), DOI: 10.1177/1548051811429352.

Yukl, G.: 2002, *Leadership in Organizations*. 5th ed. (Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ).

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., and Taber, T.: 2002, 'A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research', *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 9(1), 15-32.

Yukl, G. and Fu, P.: 1999, 'Determinants of delegation and consultation by managers', *Journal of Organizational Behavior 20*, 219–232.

Yukl, G.: 1999, 'An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories', *The Leadership Quarterly 10*, 285−305.

Yukl, G.: 1994, *Leadership in Organizations,* 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).