Title: Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness as Perceived By Managers and Non-Managerial Employees in Mexico

Carlos E. Ruiz: *School of Business, Georgia Gwinnett College, Lawrenceville, Georgia, USA*

Robert G. Hamlin: *Business School, University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, UK*

Laura Esparza Martinez: *Business School, Universidad de Monterrey, San Pedro Garcia, Mexico*

Abstract

Using the critical incident technique, concrete examples of effective and ineffective managerial behaviour (critical incidents-CIs) were collected from managers and non-managerial employees within private and public sector organizations situated in the North and South East regions of Mexico. The CIs were content analyzed using open, axial, and selective coding to identify a smaller number of thematic categories. A total of 38 'manager' and 35 'non-managerial employee' behavioural categories were identified respectively, of which 82.19% (n=60) were found to be either convergent or polar opposite in meaning. The findings suggest that what behaviourally differentiates effective managers from ineffective managers is perceived, described, and defined by Mexican managers and non-managerial employees in much the same way. The study provides new insights on the issue of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in Mexico, and is a rare example of indigenous managerial behaviour research in a non-Anglo country.

Keywords: perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness, Mexico, international HRD research

Introduction

This study explores the issue of 'managerial and leadership effectiveness' as perceived and judged by managers and non-managerial employees in a wide range of Mexican organizations. In this context the word 'leadership' refers to the everyday leadership performed by most managers at all levels of management, which House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman and Gupta (2004) described as 'general leadership' and House and Aditya (1997) as 'supervisory leadership.' The importance of effective leadership for the competitiveness of any organization has been extensively addressed in the literature. For example, Addis (2003) suggested managers who are good leaders are capable of having a positive impact on the competitiveness of the company because they are able to influence the performance of employees, and thus positively influence the performance of the company. Ireland and Hitt (2005) suggested that by using effective leadership practices, managers at all levels can make organizations more competitive in facing the challenges and opportunities of the current global business environment. This view supports Rausch (1999) who stated that "no matter what the organization's activity, or country, the better the decisions of its managers and leaders, the more likely that the organization will thrive" (1). Other research indicates that managers who lead effectively have a positive impact on employee performance, productivity, and job satisfaction (Bass 1985; Bass and Avolio 1993; Burns 1978). Nevertheless, despite the perceived importance of effective everyday leadership, and despite how effective leadership across countries is understood to help companies face the challenges associated with globalization, the issue of managerial and leadership effectiveness is still a relatively under-explored topic and a substantially neglected area of management research (Cammock, Nilakant, and Dakin 1995; Noordegraaf and Stewart 2000; Yukl, Gordon, and Taber 2002). As Hernandez-Romero (2010) observed, most internationally known management and leadership research studies have been conducted in Canada, the United

States, the United Kingdom and other Western European countries. However, as various writers have argued, the relevance and transferability of U.S. management research [and by inference Western research] to non-U.S. [Western] cultures can be problematic due to the cultural and organizational differences affecting the managerial and leadership environments of the United States [and Western nations] in relation to other countries (Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe 2001; Ayman 1993; Holt 1998; Peterson and Hunt 1997; Triandis 1993).

Hence, there are strong arguments for more indigenous studies of management and leadership, and for cross-national/cross-cultural organizational and managerial behaviour research in non-Western countries (Tsui, Nifadkar, and Ou 2007). In particular, we suggest that such studies are warranted in order to identify what behaviourally distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers within and across different countries around the globe. As various writers have claimed, the performance of any organization in any country will increase when managers are able to develop good quality relationships with their subordinates (Dodson 2006; Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995). However, to do so managers need to understand how their subordinates perceive and judge their managerial and leadership behaviour. Once aware of these perceptions, they should then be better able to adjust their managerial behaviour in order to improve performance and thereby maximize their contribution to organizational effectiveness (Graen and Uhl-Ben 1995). We suggest that such research is especially required in developing countries because foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows are increasing (World Bank Group 2012). In the particular case of Mexico, it is imperative not only for Mexican managers to understand how to manage and lead their employees in an effective manner, but it is critical also for international/expatriate managers to understand how to effectively manage and lead Mexican employees. This is especially important because Mexico has the second highest level of FDI in Latin America (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean 2011), and FDI is expected to continue to

increase as the country is part of the next 11 countries (N-11) identified by Goldman Sachs as countries (along with the BRICSs) that have the potential to become the largest economies in the world this century (Goldman Sachs 2007).

Our study builds upon and extends two previous managerial and leadership effectiveness studies that two of us have carried out in Mexico (Ruiz et al. 2011; Hamlin et al. 2013), and has two aims. The first is to replicate these past studies in a wider range of organizational settings and regions of Mexico, and further explore how managers and non-managerial employees perceive *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviour. The second aim is to compare the two sets of perceptions in order to search for similarities and differences. This latter extension of our previous replication studies has been informed and further justified by the claims of several researchers who argue that alignment of thinking and perceptions between managers and non-managerial employees has a positive impact on the organization, and that such alignment leads to reduced costs, increased efficiency, and increased employee satisfaction (Anderson, Fornell, and Lehmann 1994; Crane and Crane 2000).

Literature review

In this section we identify and discuss extant research relevant to understanding how better to manage a Mexican workforce effectively, and we then outline the theoretical context that guided our study.

Past research on managerial and leadership effectiveness in Mexico

Relevant research that provides insight into managerial leadership in Mexico was conducted in the 1980's by Hofstede (1980). As part of a large cross national study he explored national culture in terms of cultural dimensions. Based on the 'power distance' cultural dimension his findings suggest that in Mexico employees are comfortable with authoritarian managers. In addition, based on the 'uncertainty avoidance' dimension, his findings suggest that Mexican

employees want or prefer managers who provide clear directions, and this is because they are not comfortable with ambiguity and they need clear rules. According to Hofstede (1980), Mexicans are collectivist, appreciate managers who reward group efforts rather than individualistic efforts, and are willing to accept gender inequalities in the workplace. Navarro (2005) suggests that because of Hofstede's finding it is not necessary for managers to put significant effort into avoiding gender differences.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) suggested that Mexican companies have an organizational culture that is similar to a family-type environment in which the leader is regarded as a caring parent. In this type of organizational culture, employees look to managers for guidance and approval, and management plays a paternal role in the organization (Luthans and Doh 2012). According to Matinez and Dorfman (1998), Mexican managers need to be paternalistic in order to succeed. And this notion of the paternalistic role of managers in Mexican organizations is supported by Miramontes (2008) whose empirical research [unpublished] indicates that leadership is influenced by paternalistic expectations of the employees. Additionally, Miramontes has suggested that effective managers in Mexico should make use of a directive leadership style in response to the Mexican culture. Agata (2005) claimed that certain human resources practices such as internal recruitment and succession planning were influenced by national culture, and concluded that in order to be effective Mexican managers should adapt their management style to the Mexican culture. Furthermore, she argued that international managers who are looking to be effective in Mexico should take into consideration the Mexican cultural values when managing Mexican employees.

Slater, Boone, Alvarez, and Topete (2006) provide insights into effective leadership practices in Mexico. Using a qualitative methodology they analyzed ideal images of educational leadership among administrators in Mexico City and South Texas, and found that

effective leadership practices were similar for both groups. Participation, clear communication, planned change, and attention to values were components of best leadership practices. The only other relevant studies found in the literature are our own inquiries. Hamlin et al. (2011) identified a set of behavioural indicators that differentiated effective managers from ineffective managers in a Mexican public sector hospital situated in Yucatan. They compared these findings against equivalent sets of behavioural indicators previously identified in two British public sector hospitals and found them to be much the same in substance and meaning. These findings were supported by a later study conducted by Ruiz et al. (2013) in six different companies in the South East of Mexico. Neither of these studies, nor any of the few aforementioned indigenous managerial behaviour-related studies carried out by other researchers in Mexico, attempted to compare the perceptions of managers versus the perceptions of non-managerial employees regarding what behaviourally distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers. Our replication study addresses this gap in the literature.

Theoretical context

The study has been guided by the notion of *managerial reputational effectiveness* and *implicit leadership theory*. The concept of managerial reputational effectiveness offered by Tsui (1984) originates from the idea that managerial effectiveness is a "multi-determined entity depending on the manager, his or her position, the organization and the socio-economic environment" (Langford 1979, 34), and arises from different interaction processes and is socially constructed (Weick and Daft 1983). Based on the expectancy approach to management (Machin 1979), role set analysis (Merton 1957), and role theory (Katz and Kahn 1978), Tsui (1990) suggests that in order to study organizational effectiveness a multiple-constituency (MC) perspective is appropriate. She argues that the MC approach is an alternative to the *goal* and *system* approaches used to measure organizational effectiveness.

According to the MC model of organizational and managerial effectiveness, managers operate within a social context which is composed of multiple constituencies: superiors, peers, and subordinates. These constituencies have their own expectations and reactions to the manager's behaviour. Therefore, managerial behaviour should be influenced by the expectations of the different constituencies in the organization (superiors, peers, subordinates). Consequently, understanding the perceptions of other managers and subordinates regarding a manager's reputational effectiveness is important for managerial success or failure. The manager's behaviour can cause subordinates to either follow or ignore the manager's leadership (Tsui and Ashford 1994). Tsui's (1990) advocacy of the MC approach for studying managerial effectiveness is supported by Luthans, Rosenkrantz, and Hennessey's (1985) claim that a manager's success depends on two criteria: i) the quantity and quality of his or her managerial performance, and ii) his/her stakeholders (constituencies) being satisfied and committed. We argue that ineffective managerial behaviour exhibited by managers will have a negative impact on the satisfaction and commitment of their respective stakeholders, and that this will likely damage their reputational effectiveness and performance.

Implicit leadership theory, which also guided our study, states that individuals have preconceived beliefs and assumptions *(implicit leadership theories-ILTs)* about what constitutes effective and ineffective leadership behaviour (Eden and Leviathan 1975). Leadership behaviour is judged in terms of how well it fits with the implicit theories that followers have about leaders (Cantor and Mischel 1978). The better the fit between the perceptions that subordinates have about the behaviour of their respective manager and his or her actual behaviour, the more likely it is that he or she will be judged as effective by their subordinates. In addition, a subordinate's perception about manifested leadership behaviour is influenced by national culture (Helgstrand and Stuhlmacher 1999) and the environment of

the organization (Gerstner and Day 1994). Thus, subordinates and followers from different cultures/societies may perceive the effectiveness of the same manager in a different manner due to the cultural differences (Chong and Thomas 1997). Discrepancies between the ILTs held by subordinates and those held by managers could result in disengagement, dissatisfaction, and increased employee turnover (Engle and Lord 1997).

Study purpose and research questions

The purpose of the study was to identify and compare the perceptions and judgments of managers and non-managerial employees in Mexican organizations regarding examples of *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviour that they had personally observed. We addressed two research questions as follows:

1) What is it that managers and non-managerial employees within selected public and private sector organizations in various regions of Mexico perceive as *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviour?

2) What are the differences and similarities between the perceptions of managers and non-managerial employees as revealed by the answer to Question 1?

Method

We conducted our study in a way consistent with the methodology used for our previous replication studies in Mexico and the earlier British studies which they had replicated (see Hamlin 2004; Hamlin et al. 2007). Our philosophical position was located within the 'pragmatic approach' (Morgan 2007), and we assumed a post-positivist ontology and constructivist-interpretivist epistemology (Guba and Lincoln 1994; Ponterotto 2005).

Sample of research participants

Our research design sought to collect 400 or more concrete examples of *effective* and *ineffective* managerial behaviour from a sample of 20 managers and 20 non-managerial

employees in organizations located in the South East (Yucatan) and North (Nuevo Leon) of Mexico. Establishing contact with Mexican people willing to participate in the research could only be achieved by two of us (Ruiz and Esparza Martinez) who are natives of Mexico. The range of organizations we were able to access were in both the Mexican public sector ('education', 'healthcare' and 'Internal Revenue Service') and private sector ('foreign trade', 'manufacturing' and 'service industry'). Through a snowball sampling technique (Bryman and Bell 2003) we obtained a convenience sample of 38 research participants of whom 13 were males and 25 were females. Of these, 18 were non-managerial employees and 20 were managerial staff (9 first level managers and 11 middle-level managers).

Data collection

The method used to generate data was Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique which had been used by two of us (Ruiz and Hamlin) for our previous replication studies of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in Mexico. CIT is considered to be one of the best research techniques for exploring the performance aspects of managerial behaviour (see Borman and Brush 1993; Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick 1970; Latham and Wexley 1981). Prior to the CIT interviews the participants were informed about the purpose of the research and what was hoped to be achieved. In addition, key terminology used such as *critical, incident, critical incident,* and *effective* and *ineffective* managerial performance were made clear to the participants. Following Hamlin (1988) who had adapted the CIT protocol used by Latham and Wexley (1981), the definitions of *effective* and *ineffective* managerial performance were as follows: Effective managerial performance is *"behaviour which you wish all managers would adopt if and when faced with a similar circumstance."* Ineffective managerial performance is *"behaviour which, if it occurred repeatedly or was seen once in certain circumstances, might cause you to begin to question or doubt the ability of that particular manager in that instance"* (69). The CIT interviews typically lasted for 60-

90 minutes during which time the interviewee was asked to describe up to a total of 10 critical incidents (CIs) that s/he had personally observed within the past 6-12 months. The CIs could relate either to behaviour exhibited by managers above, below, or at their same level in the organizational hierarchy. For each CI the researcher posed and strictly adhered to three standard questions: *1) What was the background situation, circumstance or context that led up to the critical incident you have in mind? 2) What and in what way exactly did the subject (the manager you observed) do/say or not do/say that was either effective or ineffective?* and *3) What was the specific result or outcome of the critical incident that you have described, and on reflection, why do you perceive/judge this to be an example of 'effective' or 'ineffective' managerial behaviour/ managerial performance?* The responses of the participants were recorded using the same words used by the CIT informant when s/he described the critical incident. It is important to note that those CIT informants who were in managerial roles were not allowed to offer CIs based on their own managerial practice. Participants were asked not to reveal the identity of the manager whose behaviour they were describing.

Data analysis

The CIs obtained from the managers and non-managerial employees respectively were treated as two separate CIT data sets and analyzed accordingly. The first step was to subject each CI to open coding at a semantic level in order to identify and code its constituent 'unit(s) of meaning'. Where more than one were identified they were 'disentangled' and the enlarged number of CIs were thereafter referred to as 'coded critical incidents' (CCIs). The CCIs were then subjected to a form of 'thematic analysis' (Braun and Clarke 2006) involving axial and selective coding (Flick 2002) to (i) categorize the identified critical elements of managerial behaviour; (ii) identify any convergence of meaning between them; and (iii) group them accordingly into CCI clusters of best fit to form behavioural categories. Each behavioural

category was analysed, interpreted, and labelled with a behavioural statement (BS) describing in essence the meaning held in common with all of the constituent CCIs. In combination, the two sets of BSs derived from the two CIT data sets were regarded as the behavioural indications and contra-indications of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness, as defined respectively by managers and non-managerial employees in Mexico.

Ensuring trustworthiness of the findings

At the end of the CIT interviews the respective interviewee was asked to verify the meaning of each recorded critical incident. The CIs were subsequently translated from Spanish to English by one of us (Ruiz) who is a native Spanish speaker. In order to reduce any risk of loss of meaning in the translation a native English speaker who teaches Spanish in a US university translated the English version back into Spanish. All of the inconsistencies in the translation were then discussed between the two translators until agreement was reached. To ensure the reliability (*dependability*) and internal validity (*credibility*) of our results, 'realist triangulation' (Madill, Jordon, and Shirley 2000) and 'investigator triangulation' (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Lowe 1991) methods were adopted with ourselves acting as the multiple researchers.

Results

The CIT interviews generated 342 usable critical incidents (174 from managers and 168 from non-managerial employees). Of the 174 critical incidents (CIs) obtained from the 20 managers, 80 were examples of positive (*effective*) managerial behaviour and 94 of negative (*ineffective*) managerial behaviour. Of the 168 CIs obtained from the 18 non-managerial employees, 80 were examples of positive (*effective*) managerial behaviour and 88 of negative (*ineffective*) managerial behaviour. The open coding of the 342 CIs resulted in a slightly larger number of coded critical incidents (CCIs) being identified (n=348). Overall, the axial and selective coding of the CCIs resulted in 73 behavioural categories being identified with

labels (behavioural statements-BSs) attached, as shown in Table 1. It will be noted that fewer CCIs was derived from the CIT data

INSERT Table 1 ABOUT HERE

set obtained from the non-managerial employees. This was due to the fact that several of the 88 CIs were discarded because of a lack of clarity of meaning or ambiguity. To illustrate the interrelatedness of the CCIs and BS labels of the identified behavioural categories, several examples are given in Table 2. The 'axial' and 'selective' coding of the CCIs derived from the

INSERT Table 2 ABOUT HERE

'manager' CIT data set led to the emergence of 38 behavioural categories and BS labels, of which 19 were related to *effective* ('good'*)* and 19 to *ineffective* ('bad') management/leadership. Similarly, 35 behavioural categories and associated BS labels were deduced from the CCIs derived from the 'non-managerial employee' CIT data set, of which 18 were related to *effective* ('good'*)* and 17 to *ineffective* ('bad') management/leadership. The 73 deduced behavioural categories and their respective number of constituent CCIs, which range from 2 to 8, are shown in Appendix 1. The 'manager' BSs are listed in the left hand column and the 'non-managerial employee' BSs in the right hand column.

A detailed comparison of the two lists of BSs and associated CCIs revealed the majority of the juxtaposed convergent behavioural categories to be near identical or similar in substance and meaning. As can be seen in Appendix 1, 13 of the 19 'manager' positive *(effective)* behavioural categories are highly or moderately convergent in meaning with 13 of the 18 'non-managerial employee' behavioural categories. Similarly, 14 of the 19 'manager' and 14 of the 17 'non-managerial employee' negative (*ineffective*) behavioural categories are convergent in meaning. This finding suggests that 73.97% (54 of 73) of the positive (*effective*) and negative (*ineffective*) categories of managerial behaviour identified by both

managers and non-managerial employees in Mexico are virtually the same. However, as can also be seen, the managers and non-managerial employees identified 6 and 5 'perspective-specific' positive (*effective*) categories of managerial behaviour, and 6 and 3 'perspective-specific' negative (*ineffective*) categories of managerial behaviour, respectively.

Our findings suggest that managers in Mexican organizations are perceived and judged effective by both managers and non-managerial employees when they: *i) address employees' concerns, doubts or queries and help to resolve them; ii) consult with employees and democratically involve them in decision-making; iii) make good, fair and unbiased judgments in decision making iv) show understanding and flexibility when employees are confronted by difficult personal circumstances; v) allow employees to change or choose their vacation periods in exceptional circumstances; vi) reward employees for good performance or for doing extra work; vii) actively support the training, education and professional development of their employees; viii) personally provide guidance, instruction and training to help employees improve their performance; ix) ensure employees have good, clean and well maintained working conditions, facilities and equipment; x) show concern for the provision of good customer service; xi) give a helping hand to employees when they are under exceptional pressure, or stand in for them for a while if they are unexpectedly absent; xii) quickly address and resolve problems and conflict situation; and xiii) show care and consideration for employees confronted by undue stress at work.* Additionally, from the 'manager perspective', managers are also perceived effective when they: *lead by example; grant concessions in exceptional circumstances; encourage learning from mistakes; recognize and show in public their appreciation of their employees; ensure they have the necessary materials/resources and equipment to perform their jobs;* and when they *communicate with employees in a polite manner,* rather than in an *'arrogant and rude'* manner which non-managerial employees perceive as a characteristic of ineffective managers

(see Appendix 1). Furthermore, from the 'non-managerial employee perspective', managers are also perceived effective when they: *empower and trust employees to make their own on-the-job decisions; exhibit good planning and organization skills*; and *support and promote the suggestions, ideas and/or projects of their employees* as opposed to *showing no interest* or *exhibiting a closed mind and negative attitude.* Two additional categories of effective managerial behaviour from the 'non-managerial employee perspective' relate to managers who *treat employees fairly and with due consideration* and are *good at monitoring and controlling sub-standard performance*. Interestingly, these latter behavioural categories are polar opposite in meaning to two 'manager perspective' categories of ineffective managerial behaviour which managers associate with colleague managers who *treat employees unfairly* and *omit to take action to correct or discipline employees underperforming employees.*

Conversely, Mexican managers are perceived ineffective by both managers and non-managerial employees when they fail to exhibit the type of positive (*effective*) managerial behaviours outlined above, but also when they: *i) exhibit favouritism and/or prejudice towards particular employees; ii) engage in demeaning/humiliating and/or undermining behaviour; iii) overload employees with work and/or fail to take action to alleviate work overload; iv) fail to communicate or communicate on time important information to employees; v) fail to do what they have said they will do, or do something different; vi) omit to monitor operations and/or take action to address issues that concern their employees; vii) avoid or procrastinate in addressing and/or solving problem/conflict situations; viii) exhibit autocratic, non-consulting and controlling behaviour;* and *ix) jump to conclusions and then blame or unfairly judge employees, and/or reprimand them without seeking and knowing the full facts.* Additionally, from the 'manager perspective,' managers are perceived ineffective when they *abdicate from taking action to find constructive solutions to problems caused by outside constraints;* and *behave in ways that are self-serving and/or nepotistic.* Furthermore,

from a 'non-managerial employee perspective,' managers are perceived ineffective when they *exhibit a rigid/inflexible attitude toward and/or lack of care for the personal well being of their employees.*

Discussion

The study contributes new insight and deeper understanding of the issue of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in Mexico. Our research supports to a large extent the findings of Hamlin, Ruiz and Wang (2011) whose replication study was conducted within a Mexican acute-care public sector hospital. A simple cross-case comparative analysis has revealed high degrees of overlap between the behavioural categories resulting from both studies, with 72.97% (27 of 37) of our 'manager' and 'non-managerial employee' positive (*effective*) and 77.78% (28 of 36) of our negative (*ineffective*) behavioural statements congruent in meaning with 72.22% (13 of 18) of their positive (*effective*) and 83.33% (15 of 18) of their negative (*ineffective*) behavioural indicators (BSs) of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness, respectively (see mapping in Appendix 1). This high level of convergence and mutual external validation suggests the findings from both studies are likely to be relevant and transferable to other specific organizational settings within Mexico.

The most salient finding of our study suggests that, in the main, managers and non-managerial employees in Mexican public and private sector organizations perceive and define managerial and leadership effectiveness in much the same way. As previously discussed, and as can be seen in Appendix 1, of the 73 identified behavioural categories 54 are either highly or moderately convergent, and 3 of the manager and 3 of the non-managerial employee divergent categories (in *italics*) are polar opposite in meaning. Thus, from the perspective of managers and non-managerial employees alike, what behaviourally distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers in Mexico are the types of CCIs that constitute 82.19% (n=60) of the behavioural indicators (categories) that we have identified. Other significant

findings are the differences between the two perspectives. Whereas Mexican managers additionally emphasise the need (i) *to show employees how they are appreciated and to give them recognition in public;* (ii) *to demonstrate care and consideration*; (iii) *to encourage them to learn from their mistakes*; and iv) *to ensure they have the right materials/equipment*, Mexican workers additionally characterize effective manager as those who (i) *are good at planning, organizing, monitoring and controlling performance*; (ii) *listen to and support the ideas of employees*; (iii) *empower and show trust in them*; and (iv) *are fair*. Furthermore, whereas Mexican managers additionally characterize ineffective managers as those who (i) *allow employees to work with unsatisfactory materials/equipment*; (ii) *abdicate from searching for solutions to problems*; and (iii) *are self-serving and/or nepotistic*, Mexican workers additionally identify ineffective managers as those who: (i) *exhibit a negative attitude and a closed mind to the ideas/suggestions of employees*; and (ii) *show a lack of care for and rigid/inflexible attitude toward the personal well being of their employees.*

Overall, our findings go against the grain of predominant discourse which claims that authoritarian leadership is likely to be the most effective leadership style in Mexico. As previously discussed, various studies in the 1980s and 1990s categorized Mexican leadership as 'paternalistic-authoritarian' (see Hofstede 1980; Stephens and Greer 1995; Dorfman and Howell 1997) which is a style supported by the more recent findings of Miramontes (2008). This suggests that for managers in Mexico to be effective they should be authoritarian and tell their subordinates what to do without involving them in decision making. However, our findings indicate that managers are perceived effective by their superiors, peers and subordinates when they exhibit managerial behaviours that are consistent with the 'paternalistic-participative' category of leadership. Attributes such as caring, understanding, and being supportive and participative are indicative of 'paternalistic-participative' styles of leadership which our findings suggest are also prevalent within Mexico.

Limitations of the study

We acknowledge two limitations to our study. The first relates to the size of the sample of research participants and the amount of CIT data collected which had been less than planned. Consequently, we were unable to check that we had achieved data saturation. There is a possibility that if we had been able to obtain more CIs, then there might have been greater overlaps between the manager and non-managerial employee perceptions of what behaviourally differentiates effective managers from ineffective managers. Furthermore, additional categories of managerial behaviour may have emerged. Our second limitation relates to the demographics of the sample of research participants. The enforced use of 'snowball sampling' resulted in more female than male CIT informants. This could mean that gender may have had an influence on the nature of our findings, and consequently they might contain an over representation of managerial behaviours indicative of 'participative' styles of managing and leading. Literature suggests that such styles are associated more with female managers/leaders than with male managers/leaders because, as various writers have claimed, women use different approaches to leading and managing by focusing more on social and emotional concerns and being supportive and participative, whereas men adopt more task-oriented command and control styles (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen 2003; Eddleston, Veiga, and Powell, 2006; Gray, 1992). However, other writers have argued that there is little difference between the managerial behaviours and leadership styles of male versus female managers/leaders (Eagly and Johnson 1990; Powell 1990). This view has been supported by recent empirical research. For example, within the context of the USA Military Academy Morgan (2004) found minimal evidence supporting the notion of gender differences in leadership performance or style; whilst in Germany men and women leaders have been found to generally behave in the same way and show the same degree of verbal consideration (Kent, Blair, and Rudd 2010;. Mohr and Wolfram 2008). In the absence of

equivalent definitive empirical evidence from other countries, including Mexico, we suggest a degree of caution should be exercised in the application of our Mexican findings. Furthermore, we recommend that future researchers who wish to replicate or extend our managerial behaviour research should strive to secure a more balanced number of male and female research participants, and also a larger number of critical incidents from a more diverse range of organizational settings.

Implications for HRD practice and research

The results of our study could be used by HRD practitioners and other HR professionals to inform the selection, training, development, and retention of domestic and international managers working in Mexico. In addition, employees aspiring to become managers, and managers wishing to become more effective, could use our deduced sets of positive (*effective*) and negative *(ineffective)* behavioural indicators as self-development tools, in order to help them recognize those particular types of managerial behaviour that they should be striving to emulate and avoid respectively. If Tsui's (1984) notion of 'reputational effectiveness' holds true, then managers need to understand how they are perceived by their superiors, peers and subordinates, and anticipate their expectations by being more aware of the likely personal ILT cognitive prototypes of effective and ineffective managers held by their respective stakeholders. Our findings provide clear pointers to what those behavioural prototypes are likely to be in the minds of the managerial colleagues of domestic managers, as well as of their non-managerial employees. With a heightened awareness and knowledge of the identified behavioural indicators of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness, Mexican managers should be able to make adjustments in their managerial behaviour and management/leadership styles in order to improve and increase their personal effectiveness. As suggested by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), the performance of the organization will increase when managers are able to develop quality relationships with subordinates.

Alignment between the perceptions of managers and their subordinates about the behavioural indicators of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness will have a positive impact on the organization and organizational performance (Testa 2001).

We suggest our findings could be particularly relevant for multinational companies (MNCs) operating in Mexico because they could be used by their HRD practitioners to better prepare expatriates for managerial positions in Mexico. We argue that it is imperative for international managers to be aware of the apparent importance placed on participative management/leadership behaviours by non-managerial employees as revealed by our study, especially because it has been widely and traditionally thought that Mexican workers prefer authoritarian managers. MNCs could also use the findings for designing management development programmes for top managers, executive leaders, and global leaders working in Mexico. Additionally, our findings could have practical implications for HRD and HRM professionals seeking to i) help managers in Mexico to better understand the needs of the Mexican workforce, ii) develop behavioural management competency frameworks, iii) design competency-based HR systems (e.g. selection and performance appraisal systems), and iv) critically evaluate existing management and leadership development programmes, or create them.

The high degree of overlap between our findings and those of Hamlin et al. (2011) indicates that managers and non-managerial employees in a range of public and private sector organizations in the North and South East of Mexico perceive and judge managerial and leadership effectiveness in much the same manner. To our knowledge no other equivalent study relating to our topic in Mexico or any other country has compared the perceptions of managers against those of non-managerial employees. Hence, we recommend that more such replication studies are conducted so as to confirm/validate this aspect of our findings. We suggest the overall results of our study might well be translatable and transferable to many

other organizations throughout Mexico. However, this is speculation that needs to be demonstrated empirically. Consequently, we recommend that future research should be directed toward conducting a larger number and wider range of replication and comparative studies in Mexico in search of the existence of generic behavioural indicators. This might then lead to the emergence of a 'Mexican taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness' that has country wide relevance and utility.

References

Addis, M. 2003. "Basic Skills and Small Business Competitiveness: Some Conceptual Considerations." *Education & Training* 45 (2): 152-161.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., and R. Alban-Metcalfe, 2001. "The Development of a New Transformational Leadership Questionnaire." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 74 (1): 1-23.

Agata, D. 2005. "Cross-National Differences in the Work Values of Employees of a US-Based Multi-National Corporation: A Comparative Study of the United States, Poland, and Mexico." PhD diss., George Washington University.

Anderson, E. W., C. Fornell, and D. R. Lehmann. 1994. "Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability: Findings From Sweden." *Journal of Marketing* 58 (3): 53-66.

Ayman, R. 1993. "Leadership Perception: The Role of Gender and Culture." In *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions,* edited by M. M. Chemers and R Ayman, 137-166. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., and B. J. Avolio. 1993. "Transformational Leadership: A Response to Critiques. In *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions, edited by.* M.M. Chemers and R. Ayman, 49-80. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Borman, W. C., and D. H. Brush. 1993. "More Progress Toward a Taxonomy of Managerial Performance Requirements." *Human Performance* 6 (1): 1-21.

Braun, V., and V. Clarke, 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3: 77-101.

Bryman, A., and E. Bell, 2003. *Business Research Methods.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

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

Cammock, P., V. Nilakant, and S. Dakin. 1995. "Developing a Lay Model of Managerial Effectiveness." *Journal of Management Studies* 32 (4): 443-447.

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

Cantor, N., and W. Mischel. 1979. "Prototypes in Person Perception." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 12: 3-53.

Chong, L. M. A., and D. C. Thomas. 1997. "Leadership Perceptions in Cross Cultural Context: Pakeha and Pacific Islanders in New Zealand." *The Leadership Quarterly* 8 (3): 275-293.

Crane, J. S., and N. K. Crane. 2000. "A Multi-Level Performance Appraisal Tool: Transition

from the Traditional to a CQI Approach." *Health Care Management Review* 24 (1): 64-73.

Dodson, M. R. 2006. "Relationship of Manager-Subordinate MBTI Similarities to Subordinates'
Perception of Management Effectiveness and Leader Member Exchange Relationships." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University.

Dorfman, P. W., and J. P. Howell. 1988. "Dimensions of National Culture and Effective Leadership Patterns: Hofstede Revisited." *Advances in International Comparative Management* 3: 127-150.

Eagly, A. H., and B. T. Johnson. 1990. "Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analaysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 108 (2): 233-256.

Eagly, A. H., M. C. Johannesen-Schmidt, M. L. van Engen. 2003. "Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men." *Psychological Bulletin* 129 (4): 569-591

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

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. 2011. "Foreign Direct Investment in Latin America and the Caribbean." Accessed March 3. 2013 http://www.eclac.cl/publicaciones/xml/2/46572/2012-182-LIEI-WEB.pdf

Eddleston, K., J. Veiga, and N. Powell. 2006. "Explaining Sex Differences in Managerial Career Satisfier Preferences: The Role of Gender Self-Schema." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91 (2): 437-445.

Eden, D., and U. Leviatan. 1975. "Implicit Leadership Theory as a Determinant of the Factor Structure Underlying Supervisory Behaviour Scales." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60 (6): 736-741.

Engle, E. M., and R. G. Lord. 1997. "Implicit Theories, Self-Schemas, and Leader-Member Exchange." *Academy of Management Journal* 40 (4): 988-1010.

Flanagan, J. C. 1954. "The Critical Incident Technique." *Psychological Bulletin* 51 (4): 327-358.

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

Gerstner, C. R., and D. V. Day. 1994. "Cross-Cultural Comparison of Leadership Prototypes."
Leadership Quarterly 5 (2): 121-134.

Goldman Sachs. 2007. "Brics and Beyond." Accessed February 12. 2013 http://www.goldmansachs.com/china/ideas/brics/Brics-and-Beyond-Book-pdfs/BRIC-Full.pdf

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

Gray, J. 1992. *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Guba, E. G., and Y. S. Lincoln. 1994. "Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* edited by N. K. Denzin and Y S. Lincoln, 105-117. London: Sage.

Hamlin, R. G. 1988. "The Criteria of Managerial Effectiveness in Secondary Schools." *CORE: Collected and Original Resources in Education. The International Journal of Educational Research in Mircofiche* 12 (1): 1-221.

Hamlin, R. G. 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. G., and D. J. Cooper. 2007. "Developing Effective Managers and Leaders Within Healthcare and Social Care Contexts: An Evidence-Based Approach." In *HRD in the Public Sector: The Case of Health and Social Care,* edited by S. Sambrook and J. D. Stewart, 187-212. London: Routledge.

Hamlin, R. G., C. E. Ruiz., and J. Wang. 2011. "Perceived Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness within Mexican and British Public Sector Hospitals: A Cross-Nation Comparative Analysis." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 22 (4): 491-517.

Helgstrand, K. K., and A. F. Stuhlmacher, A. F. 1999. "National Culture: An Influence on Leader Evaluations." *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis* 7 (2): 153-168.

Hernandez-Romero, E. 2010. "Characteristics of Mexican Leaders in Complex Organizations in Monterrey Mexico: An Exploratory Study of the Perceptions of Human Resource Executives." PhD diss., Pepperdine University.

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Holt, D. H. 1998. *International Management.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.

House, R. J., and R. N. Aditya. 1997. "The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management* 23 (3): 409-465.

House, R. J., P. J. Hanges., M. Javidan., P. W. Dorfman., and V. Gupta. 2004. *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. London: Sage.

Ireland, D., and M. Hitt. 2005. "Achieving and maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership." *The Academy of Management Executive* 19 (4): 66-77.

Katz, D., and R. L. Kahn. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Wiley.

Kent, T. W., C. A. Blair, and H. F. Rudd. 2010. "Gender Differences and Transformational Leadership Behavior: Do Both German Men and Women Lead in the Same Way?" *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 6 (1): 52-66.

Langford, V. 1979. "Managerial Effectiveness: A Review of the Literature. In *Perspectives on Managerial Effectiveness,* edited by. M. Brodie and R. Bennett, 32-62. Slough, UK: Thames Valley Regional Management Centre.

Latham, G. P., K. N. Wexley. 1981. *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal.*
Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Luthans, F., and J. P. Doh. 2012. *International Management: Culture, Strategy, and Behavior.*
8th ed. New York, N.Y: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Luthans, F., S. Rosenkrantz., and H. Hennessey. 1985. "What Do Successful Managers Really Do? An Observation Study of Managerial Activities." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 21 (3): 255-270.

Machin, J. L. J. 1979. "A Contingency Methodology for Management Control." *Journal of Management Studies* 16 (1): 1-29.

Madill, A., A. Jordon, and C. Shirley. 2000. "Objectivity and Reliability in Qualitative Analysis: Realist, Contextualist and Radical Constructionist Epistemologies." *British Journal of Psychology* 91: 1-20.

Martinez, S., and P. W. Dorfman. 1998. "The Mexican Entrepreneur: An Ethnographic Study of the Mexican Empresario." *International Studies of Management and Organization* 28 (2): 97-123.

Merton, R. 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure.* 2nd ed. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Miramontes, G. 2008. "A Qualitative Study Examining Leadership Characteristics of Mexican

Leaders." PhD diss., Pepperdine University.

Mohr, G., and H-J. Wolfram. 2008. "Leadership and Effectiveness in the Context of Gender: The Role of Leaders' Verbal Behavior." *British Journal of Management* 19: 4-16. doi: 10.111/j.1467-8551.2007.00521.x

Morgan, D. L. 2007. "Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1 (1): 48-76.

Morgan, M. J. 2004. "Women in a Man's World: Gender Differences in Leadership at the Military Academy." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 34 (12): 2482-2502.

Navarro, D. 2005. "The Influence of National Culture of Charismatic Leadership Perceptions: An Exploratory Study of Mexico, Poland, and the United States of America." PhD diss., George Washington University.

Noordegraaf, M., and R. Stewart. 2000. "Managerial Behaviour Research in Private and Public Sectors: Distinctiveness, Disputes and Directions." *Journal of Management Studies* 37 (3): 427-443.

Peterson, M. F., and J. G. Hunt. 1997. "International Perspectives on International Leadership." *Leadership Quarterly* 8 (3): 85-105.

Ponterotto, J. 2005. "Qualitative Research in Counseling Psychology: A Primer on Research Paradigms and Philosophy of Science." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52 (2): 126-136.

Powell, G. N. 1990. "One More Time: Do Female and Male Managers Differ?" *Academy of Management Executive* 4 (3): 68-74.

Rausch, E. 1999. "Management/Leadership Decision Guidelines: Critical Ingredients for Competitiveness." *Competitiveness Review* 9 (2): 19-27.

Ruiz, C., J. Wang, and R. G. Hamlin. 2013. "What Makes Managers Effective in Mexico?" *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 34 (2): 130-146.

Singh, P., A. Nadim, and S. R. Ezzedeen. 2012. "Leadership Styles and Gender: An Extension." *Journal of Leadership Studies* 5 (4): 6-19. doi: 10.1002/jls.20239

Slater, C., M. Boone., I. Alvarez., and C. Topete. 2006. "Ideal Images of Educational Leadership in Mexico City and South Texas." *The Educational Forum* 70 (2): 154-171.

Stephens, G., and C. Greer. 1995. "Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Cultural Differences." *Organizational Dynamics* 24 (1): 39-55.

Testa, M. R. 2001. "Do They Know How Their Employees Feel About Them?" *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 5: 80-89.

Triandis, C. H. 1993. "The Contingency Model in Cross-Cultural Perspectives. In *Leadership Theory and Research Perspectives and Directions*," edited by M. M. Chemers and R Ayman, 167-188. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Trompenaars, F., and C. Hampden-Turner. 1998. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business.* 2nd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tsui, A. S. 1984. "A Multiple-Constituency Framework of Managerial Reputational Effectiveness." In *Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership,* edited by. J. Hunt., J. Hoskings., C. Schriesheim., and R. Stewart, 28-44. New York, NY: Pergamon.

Tsui, A. S. 1990. "A Multiple-Constituency Model of Effectiveness: An Empirical Examination at the Human Resource Subunit Level." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 458-483.

Tsui, A.S., and S. Ashford, S.1994. "Adaptive Self-Regulation: A Process View of Managerial Effectiveness." *Journal of Management* 20 (1): 93-121.

Tsui, A. S., S. S. Nifadkar, and S. S. Ou. 2007. "Cross-National, Cross-Cultural Oganizational Behavior Research: Advances, Gaps, and Recommendations." *Journal of Management* 33 (3): 426-478.

Weick, K. E., and R. I. Daft. 1983. "The Effectiveness of Interpretation Systems." In *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models,* edited by K.S. Cameron., and D.A. Whetton, 71-93. New York, NY: Academic Press.

World Bank Group. 2012. "World Investment and Political Risk 2012." Accessed March 12, 2013. http://www.miga.org/documents/WIPR12.pdf

Yukl, G., A. Gordon., and T. Taber. 2002. "A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 9 (1): 15-31.

INSERT Appendix 1 HERE

Table 1 Result of the open, axial and selective coding of the collected critical incidents

Number of CIs, CCIs and BSs	Manager CIT Data Set	Non-Managerial Employee CIT Data Set	Totals
No. Positive CIs	80	80	160
No. Positive CCIs	87	81	168
No. Positive BSs	19	18	38
No. Negative CIs	94	88	182
No Negative CCIs	96	84	180
No. Negative BSs	19	17	36

Note: CI=critical incident; CCI= coded critical incident; BS= behavioural statement

Table 2 Illustration of the interrelatedness of the CCIs and deduced BSs of juxtaposed 'manager' and 'non-managerial employee' behavioural categories

Manager Behavioural Categories and Statements	Non Managerial Employee Behavioural Categories and Statements
Manager actively promotes the professional development of their employees Encourages his personnel to take these courses. Delegates more responsibilities to the employee because he thinks that he is ready for them. Supported the employee, gave the authorization and indicated that this was a good opportunity for the employees. Supported the employees taking classes by taking care of some of their responsibilities in order for them to be able to attend. Recommended good employees for positions in other places when he felt that they were ready for better jobs. Notified the personnel that there was going to be a training program available and that they would take it, and then ahead of time let them know when. Supports personnel who need training, and authorizes them to miss work for attending training sessions.	*Manager actively supports the training, education and career/personal development of their employees* Normally accedes to the employee petition [to transfer to another job] and makes the transfer whenever it is possible which means he tries to keep personnel happy. Is flexible with the employee's schedule being aware that the employee studies full time, and in this way supports him. Supports employees who are studying and trying to get more education by being flexible with these employees. Assigns a cubicle for providing training to students. Authorized sending my application for training to the school's principal. Cared about my professional development, and when there was a job opening he sent me to human resources for an interview and I got selected.
Ignores and/or does not care about or take action to address/improve problematic issues of concern to employees. Does not try to address the problem with the director of the hospital and seems not to care about the situation. Did not do anything when an upper manager set unrealistic goals to be met. As of today the manager has been informed that the accounting papers for the past year have not been warehoused in this special warehouse but has not done anything to rectify this matter. Does not try to improve the situation and does not acknowledge that there is a problem. Employees asked the manager to ask the HR department to reclassify the salaries of the workers according to the job risk, but he has not done anything about it.	*Omits to monitor operations/performance and/or take action to address/solve problem issues.* Having called the cleaning service the manager does not supervise the work and the cleaning people do a really bad job cleaning the area The hospital personnel department had problems making overtime payments to the doctors who then did not want overtime work anymore, and their manager did not do anything to solve the problem. The manager did not assign any task to the employee who then continued wasting his time. The manager does not travel to the office in Monterrey to check the operations of that office

Appendix 1 Comparison of the 'manager' and 'non-managerial employee' positive (*effective*) and negative (*ineffective*) behavioural categories

Manager Behavioural Categories	Non Managerial Employee Behavioural Categories
Positive Behavioural Statements(BSs)	**Positive Behavioural Statements(BSs)**
Highly Convergent	*Highly Convergent*
1. Addresses employees concerns, doubts and/or queries and helps to resolve them (4) P7	1. Listens to and addresses employees concerns, doubts and/or queries, calms their fears and helps to resolve them (4) P7
2. Adopts a participative management style by democratically involving employees in managerial decision-making (3) P8	2. Democratically involves employees in decisions that affect them by consulting and taking into consideration their input (4) P8
3. Manager exercises good judgment and is fair and unbiased in decision making (6)	3. Manager is fair and unbiased, and/or makes decisions based on merit (3)
4. When employees are confronted by difficult personal circumstances/needs the manager shows understanding and flexibility (7) P5	4. When employees are confronted by difficult or problematic personal circumstances/needs the manager shows understanding and flexible (e.g. giving time off, adjusting work schedule) (7) P5
5. In exceptional circumstances the manager will allow employees to change their vacation periods (3) P6	5. Manager is flexible in allowing employees to choose the timing of their vacations/holidays provided as long as there is no adverse affect on the department (4) P6
6. Manager rewards employees for their good work and/or for doing extra work (5) P10	6. Manager rewards employees for good work and/or doing extra work (3) P10
7. Manager actively promotes the professional development of their employees (7) P3	7. Manager actively supports the training, education and career/personal development of their employees (6) P3
8. Manager personally trains, instructs and provides guidance to his employees (3) P3	8. Manager personally provides advice, suggestions, and encouragement to help employees improve their performance (3) P3
9. Makes sure that employees have clean and safe working conditions and well maintained equipment (4) P17	9. Manager makes sure that employees have clean, safe, healthy and sound working conditions/facilities. (6) P17
10. Manager shows concern for the provision of good customer service, and actively gets involved when necessary (3) P15	10. Manager shows concern for the provision of good customer service/care, and actively gets involved when necessary (4) P15
11. Manager lends support/help to, and/or stands in for staff when they are under pressure or unexpectedly unavailable (6) P12	11. Manager lends support/help to, and/or stands in for staff when they are under pressure or unexpectedly unavailable (5) P12
Moderately Convergent	*Moderately Convergent*
12. Manager quickly addresses problems or conflict confronting employees and effectively solves them (3) P4	12. Manager effectively and calmly handles actual and/or potential problem and/or conflict situations (e.g. conflict between employees; customer complaints, changeover problems between shifts) (7) P4)
13. Manager shows care and consideration for employees confronted by undue stress at work (3) P9	13. Manager shows care and concern for employees who are unwell and/or not fully recovered from illness (e.g. giving time off; getting other to help with the work) (3)
Divergent	*Divergent*
14. *Manager communicates with employees in a polite personal manner* (2)	14. Manager supports and promotes the suggestions, ideas and/or projects proposed by employees (3)
15. Manager leads by example (4)	15. Manager empowers and trusts employees to make their own on-the job decisions (e.g. setting goals and work schedules, deciding how the work is to be done, being creative, resolving conflict between employees) (4)
16. Manager grants concessions to employees in exceptional circumstances (6)	16. *Manager treats employees fairly and with due consideration* (4)
17 When employees make mistakes the manager	17 Manager shows good planning and organization

shows understanding, does not reprimand but instead encourages them to learn from the mistake (3) P11	skills (4)
18. Manager recognizes and shows in public their appreciation of their employees individually and collectively (e.g. through compliments, congratulations, awards and celebrations) (5) P10	18. *Manager is good at monitoring and controlling sub-standard performance* (4) P14
19. Manager makes sure that employees have the necessary materials/resources and equipment to perform their job (8) P16	
Negative Behavioural Statements	***Negative Behavioural Statements***
Highly Convergent	*Highly Convergent*
1. Manager fails to encourage, enable and/or provide training and development for their employees (6) N4	1. Manager fails to support, authorize, and/or provide training and development for their employees (4) N4
2. Managers fails to order or chase up orders for replacement equipment and/or materials (8) N5	2. Managers fails to respond to requests for, or to order and supply replacement equipment and/or materials (5) N5
3. Manager shows favouritism for certain employees or clients and treats them better or more leniently than others (7) N7 N12 N18	3. Manager exhibits unfairness, favouritism and/or prejudice towards particular employees (6) N7 N12 N18
4 Manager engages in demeaning/humiliating and/or undermining behaviour (5) N15	4. Manager engages uncooperative, inconsiderate, abusive, and/or other humiliating and undermining behaviour (4) N15
5. Manager overloads employees with work and/or fails to take action to alleviate employee work overload (8) N10	5. Manager overloads employees with work and/or fails to take action to alleviate employee work overload (6) N10
6 Fails to communicate important information to employees and/or inform them in time on important matters (5) N2	6. Fails to communicate important information to employees, to share desirable knowledge and/or to provide contact details when away or hold regular communication meetings (4) N2
7. Manager says what he will do, but then omits to do it or does something else instead (6) N5	7. Manager says what he will do but then omits to follow up and take action to do it (7) N5
8. Manager ignores and/or does not care about or take action to address/improve problematic issues of concern to employees (5) N8 N9	8. Manager omits to monitor operations/performance and/or take action to address/solve problem issues (4) N8 N9
9. Manager avoids or procrastinates in addressing tasks and/or solving problem/conflict situations (6) N8 N9	9. Manager avoids or procrastinates in addressing tasks and/or solving problem/conflict situations (8) N8 N9
10. Manager fails to implement policies properly and/ or bypasses/violates company policies (3) N17	10. Manager bypasses and/or violates company policies (4) N17
11. Manager is autocratic, controlling and lacking in consideration or understanding of the impact on employees, and is closed to their opinions (7)	11. Manager exhibits autocratic, non-consulting and controlling behaviour (5)
Moderately Convergent	*Moderately Convergent*
12. Manager fails to ensure safe and healthy working conditions for employees (3) N11	12. Manager fails to ensure the well being of employees through the provision of well working equipment and/or adequate dining facilities (3) N11
13. Manager accuses/blames and/or hastily reprimands employees without investigating or fully knowing the facts (4) N1	13. Manager jumps to conclusions without first knowing and/or eliciting the facts, and unfairly judges situations and/or reprimands employees (7) N1
14. Manager deprives employees of extra benefits or rewards (3) N3	14. Manager fails to acknowledge or give recognition, thanks or reward for good work and achievement (6) N3
Divergent	*Divergent*
15. Manager allows or requires employees to use unsatisfactory equipment/materials and/or work without safety devices (5)	15. *Manager is arrogant and/or or rude in his/her communication with employees* (3) N14
16. Manager abdicates from taking action to find constructive solutions to problems caused by outside constraints (3)	16. Manager shows no interest in the ideas/suggestions of employees, and instead exhibits a closed mind and negative attitude (2)

17 *Manager treats employees unfairly* (3) N7	17 Manager exhibits a rigid/inflexible attitude toward and/or lack of care for the personal well being of employees (4)
18. Manager behaves in a way that is self-serving and/or nepotistic (3)	
19. *Manager omits to take action to correct or discipline employees who are underperforming or exhibiting undesirable attitudes/behaviour* (6)	

Note: (i) The number of CCIs constituting each category is given in brackets at the end of the respective BS.

(ii) The 'P' numbers and 'N' numbers at the end of each BS refer to Hamlin, Ruiz and Wang's (2011) behavioural indicators (BSs) which converge in meaning.

(iii) The 3 positive 'non-convergent' categories (BSs) typed in italics indicate those categories that are polar opposite in meaning to the 3 respective negative 'divergent' categories (BSs) also typed in *italics.*