

Toward a generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior: A comparative study across nations and private sector industries

Item Type	Journal article
Authors	Patel, Taran;Hamlin, Robert G.;Louis, Dima
Citation	Patel, T., Hamlin, R.G. and Louis, D. (2022) Toward a generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior: A comparative study across nations and private sector industries. <i>European Management Review</i> , 19(4), pp. 608-624. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12507
DOI	10.1111/emre.12507
Publisher	Wiley
Journal	European Management Review
Download date	2026-03-16 15:34:18
License	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/2436/624590

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Patel, T., Hamlin, R. G. , & Louis, D (2022 *In press*) Toward a generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior: A comparative study across nations and private sector industries. *European Management Review*. Vol. ? No. : pp. ??

Toward a Generic Framework of Perceived Negative Manager/Leader Behavior A Comparative Study Across Nations and Private Sector Industries

Abstract

Reviewing three relevant streams of extant literature reveals a marked absence of a generic framework comprised of a full range of negative manager/leader behaviors (from moderate to extreme) across sectors and countries, a void particularly detrimental to the effectiveness of management and leadership development (MLD) programs. To address this concern, we conduct a multiple cross-case/cross-nation comparative analysis (MCCA) of data collected from our own 13 previous empirical replication studies (using the critical incident technique) of effective/ineffective managerial/leader behavior across nine culturally diverse countries and varied private sector industries, resulting in a comprehensive framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior. Our generic framework is comprised of five behavioral dimensions: general inadequate behavior, unethical behavior, impersonal domineering behavior, depriving behavior, and closed/negative-minded behavior, and lends support to the universal school of culture in business literature by showing that neither national culture nor sectorial specificities influence people's perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior. It also stresses the importance of the mundane (as opposed to the glorious) in managerial/leadership work by revealing that employees' perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior includes not only conspicuously 'bad' behaviors, but also less conspicuous 'poor' behaviors.

Keywords: perceived managerial/leader behavior, negative managerial/leader behavior, multiple cross-case/cross-nation comparative analysis, critical incident technique, empirical replication

Introduction

In recent years, scholars have increasingly focused on the ‘dark side’ of management/leadership practice. This has been done along three different streams of literature, each simultaneously advancing and constraining the discourse. One stream of literature has focused on exposing different kinds of negative management/leadership labelling them as destructive (Aasland et al., 2010), toxic (Goldman, 2006), unethical (Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2021), dysfunctional (Kets de Vries, 2003), narcissistic (O’Reilly et al., 2014), and aversive (Thoroughgood, Hunter and Sawyer, 2011). Other terms in this stream include abusive supervision and abusive managerial behavior (Han, Harms and Bai, 2017). This literature has increasingly countered the dominant “positive-sounding versions of leadership”, while scrutinizing the term’s “obscured underlying meanings” (Clifton, 2019, p. 83), and even suggesting a decreased desire to assume managerial/leadership roles (Aycaan and Shelia, 2019). While this is a welcome shift in ongoing discourse, this literature has also inadvertently implied that negative management/leadership is about conspicuously ‘bad’ (*extremely negative*) behaviors, while ignoring less conspicuous or ‘poor’ (*moderately negative*) behaviors. This oversight is particularly regrettable considering the increasing recognition of the significance of mundane managerial/leadership work (Wilson, 2013; Alvesson, 2020).

Concomitantly, studies have also multiplied under the banner of implicit leadership theories (ILTs). Although these inquiries have shed significant light on followers’ perceptions of leadership, most have singularly focused on the positive aspects while neglecting the negative aspects. This practice is regrettable for a variety of reasons: (1) negative information exerts a greater influence on people’s behaviors and cognitions than comparable positive information (Goldsmith and Dhar, 2013); (2) managerial behaviors perceived as negative can more strongly influence employee performance than those perceived as positive (Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta and Kramer, 2004; Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad, 2007); and (3) positive

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

role models only influence behaviors of employees intending to engage in potentially beneficial activities (i.e., additive behaviors), while employees considering abstaining from a potentially deleterious activity (i.e. subtractive behaviors) are more likely to view negative models as effective motivators (see Lockwood, Jordon and Kunda, 2002). Another drawback is that most ILT studies are limited to a single country context (e.g., Schyns and Schilling's [2011] Dutch study) and fail to offer a generalized understanding across nations and sectors. Rare ILT-based studies focusing on multiple countries (e.g., the GLOBE study, Den Hartog et al., 1999) support the contingency school of culture in business studies (see Wendt et al., 2009), implying that perceptions of leadership effectiveness are contingent upon national cultures, a claim strongly contested by proponents of the universal school (e.g., Horner-Long and Schoenberg, 2002).

Finally, a third relevant stream of literature focuses on leadership and managerial behavior research. Within this stream of literature, a few studies offer behavioral frameworks comprised of 'good' (*positive*), 'poor' (*moderately negative*), and 'bad' (*extremely negative*) management/leadership. These include the inquiries of Miner (1963) and Schriesheim and Stogdill (1975) in the USA, and the cumulative series of replication studies conducted by Author 2 of the present paper within public, private, and third sector organizations. But most of these studies were country-specific, and even where comparisons were conducted, they involved at most three countries (e.g., Anon. 1 et al., 2019). Thus, unfortunately, these studies too do not explicate the full range of behaviors (moderate to extreme) that employees from different countries and sectors perceive as negative.

Our review of the three afore-cited streams of literature reveals that there is not a single comprehensive and generic (globally relevant across culturally diverse countries and different industrial sectors) framework comprised of a full range of negative manager/leader behaviors (from moderate to extreme). This void is particularly problematic for the development and effectiveness of contemporary management and leadership development (MLD) initiatives and

programs. Despite large scale investments, many such programs fail to achieve their goals of bringing about desired changes in managerial (manager/leader) behavior (Ardichvili et al., 2016; Bregman, 2013; Pfeffer, 2016). Most of these programs are underpinned by classical leadership theories, models, and frameworks resulting from USA-centric research from the 1970s and 1980s, which are generally expressed in positive behavioral terms and widely assumed to be universally applicable. One reason behind the failure of MLD provisions is the dearth of negative managerial behavior research, and the consequent absence within off-the-shelf competency frameworks of examples ranging from moderate to extremely negative managerial behaviors. Another limitation is their excessive embedding with US-centric research on manager/leader behaviors. It is therefore crucial that the design of future MLD provisions be infused with knowledge regarding a full range of negative manager/leader behavior drawn from a wider geographic and sectorial scope, if they are to be more effective. Therefore, in the present paper, we ask: What types of manager/leader behaviors are perceived as (*moderately to extremely*) negative in private sector organizations across various industries and across a wide range of culturally diverse countries?

To address this core research question, we conduct a qualitative multiple cross-case/cross-nation comparative analysis (MCCA) of empirical source data obtained from 13 private sector replication studies of effective and ineffective managerial (manager/leader) behavior conducted by Author 2 with his various co-authors in nine countries. Our comparative study results in a comprehensive and generic framework of perceived negative (ranging from moderate to extreme) manager/leader behavior that has relevance and transferability across numerous culturally diverse nations and private sector industries. Our finding that neither national culture nor sectorial specificities influence people's perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior lends support to the universal school of culture in business literature. Additionally, our emergent framework offers three interesting insights. First, what pervades

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

employees' perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior includes not only conspicuously 'bad' (*extremely negative*) behaviors, but also less conspicuous 'poor' (*moderately negative*) behaviors, thereby lending support to the recent movement in contemporary leadership studies calling for an increased focus on the 'mundane' as opposed to the 'glorious' aspects of managerial/leadership work (Crevani et al. 2010; Alvesson, 2020). Second, by identifying five negative behavioral dimensions (BDs) underpinned by 23 negative generic behavioral categories (GBCs), we offer a comprehensive range of negative (subtractive behaviors as opposed to oft-cited additive behaviors) that some managers might rely on to motivate their behaviors (Lockwood et al, 2004). Third, we find that negative manager/leader behaviors include not only a range of 'acts of commission' but also distinctive 'acts of omission'. This finding suggests that managers/leaders not only need to avoid exhibiting certain behaviors if they wish to escape negative perceptions, they must also not fail to exhibit certain types of behaviors that their subordinates expect to be displayed in various situations, and the absence of which could potentially engender employee dissatisfaction and discontent.

Literature Review

Before we delve into reviewing the three relevant streams of literature, we offer some precisions regarding our choice of terminology. First, following Yukl (1989), we do not separate leadership from management. This is because many scholars (see Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003; Kotterman, 2006) do not consider 'management' and 'leadership' to be distinct constructs, whilst others (Mintzberg, 2004; Yukl, 2006) argue that leading is an integral part of management. Like many people in the corporate and academic worlds who use the concepts interchangeably (Raelin, 2004), the researchers of our 13 empirical source studies also chose not to separate leadership from management. Finally, our use of the term 'leadership' refers to 'supervisory leadership' (House and Aditya, 1997) performed by managers across levels, and not to the 'strategic leadership' performed by top

managers/organizational leaders (House et al., 2004). Further, for the present MCCA study as for our empirical source studies, we define ineffective behavior as *'behavior which, if it occurred repeatedly or even once in certain circumstances might cause you to begin to question the ability of that particular subject (manager and managerial leader) in that instance'*. Conversely, effective behavior was defined as: *'behavior which you would wish all subjects (managers and managerial leaders) to adopt if and when faced with similar situations'*.

Negative leadership and negative management

In recent decades, much attention has been paid to negative leadership and negative management (Harris and Jones, 2018; Mackey, Parker Ellen III, McAllister, and Alexander, 2021). Extant literature identifies a myriad of negative behaviors linked to specific types of negative leadership. Destructive leadership behaviors (see Aasland et al., 2010) include self-promoting, ignoring the feelings of others, exploiting them for personal gain (Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser, 2007), and encouraging followers to pursue destructive goals (Krasikova, Green and LeBreton, 2013). Unethical leadership behaviors include dishonesty, corruption, egocentrism, and manipulation (Eisenbeiß and Brodbeck, 2014; Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2021). Behaviors of psychopathic leaders include using fear and intimidation, denying followers' voices, discouraging discussions, and wanting to control decisions while withholding leadership on larger issues (Boddy, 2017). Narcissistic leaders lack empathy, are motivated by personal needs, and can have aggressive and exploitative behaviors (Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006). Toxic leaders are conflict prone, repeatedly violate cultural norms (Goldman, 2006), bully, threaten, and yell, manipulate their followers, and intentionally—or unintentionally—harm others (Lipman-Blumen, 2005). Aversive leaders use threats, intimidation, and punishment (Bligh et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2011). Finally, abusive managers/supervisors engage in coercion, intimidation, derision, or vindictiveness (Han, Harms and Bai, 2017; Hoobler and Hu, 2013).

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

These studies mainly focus on qualifying specific types of negative manager/leader behaviors, usually ones that are conspicuously ‘bad’ and which lead to *extremely negative* outcomes. More recently, a few authors have attempted to identify behavioral categories encompassing a broader spectrum of negative leadership behaviors, including those every day mundane ‘poor’ managerial behaviors that most if not all managers sometimes exhibit, and which lead to *moderately negative* outcomes. For instance, Patel and Hamlin (2017) have proposed a unified framework of negative leadership comprised of unauthentic, dysfunctional, and ineffective leadership behaviors. However, this study was limited to the education sector and to two countries, namely, the UK and France. To our knowledge, no attempt has been made by these or other scholars to develop a generic (across countries and industry sectors) understanding of the wide variety of ‘poor’ (*moderately negative*) to ‘bad’ (*extremely negative*) manager/leader behaviors.

This neglect is particularly regrettable considering increasing evidence of the potentially mundane nature of much management/leadership work (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Wilson, 2013; Alvesson, 2020). This implies that negative or ineffective manager/leader behavior may well be about their substandard performance on mundane tasks, and not necessarily always about conspicuously ‘bad’ behaviors such as those commonly described in this stream of literature. This understanding could have significant implications for the discussion around the range of remedial solutions required to tackle different kinds of negative manager/leader behavior, and therefore deserves more attention than has been previously attributed. Our present paper aims to overcome this drawback by focusing on the full range of behaviors (poor to bad) identified as negative by employees across varied sectors and countries.

Implicit leadership theories (ILTs).

Over four decades ago, Eden and Leviatan (1975) recognized that followers’ perceptions play an important role in leadership. They proposed that followers hold beliefs,

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

convictions, and assumptions concerning the attributes and behaviors that distinguish good leaders from bad leaders. Followers then form so-called mental models or implicit leadership theories (ILTs). In subsequent years, ILT scholars have contributed much to our understanding of followers' perception of leader behavior. For instance, taking Offermann et al.'s (1994) original work conducted in the USA as their starting point, Epitropaki and Martin (2004) developed higher-order factors which they called leadership prototypes (including sensitivity, intelligence, dedication, and dynamism) and leadership antiprototypes (tyranny and masculinity). Notwithstanding its many contributions, this stream of literature has also generated some dissatisfactions.

First, the ILT literature has focused predominantly on effective or ideal leadership behaviors and attributes that facilitate or inhibit effective leadership (House et al., 2004). Critics, such as Schyns and Schilling (2011), claim it is not enough to say that something inhibits effective leadership because this could simply mean it does not contribute to effectiveness, or its absence may lead to less effectiveness. These scholars pointed to the need for an explicit focus on ineffective leadership. In their own work, they consciously chose to explore both effective and ineffective leadership behaviors. However, their study was limited only to the Dutch context. This leads us to the second limitation of this stream of literature: most studies embedded in ILT literature (see also Ling, Chia, and Fang's [2000] study in China and Offermann et al.'s [1994] study in the USA) have remained limited to one country and have not reached for external validation/generalization by comparing their findings against those of other studies. Although such studies offer us the possibility of understanding the ILTs held by local employees in these countries, they offer little insight for situations (such as multinational companies or international strategic alliances) in which employees of different national origins are brought about to interact with one another.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

The GLOBE project (Den Hartog et al., 1999) represents a rare exception in this stream of literature. This project explored the perceived effectiveness of leadership behaviors across countries and offered nine cultural dimensions distinguishing societies (cluster of countries) from one another. Based on the scores obtained on these dimensions, significant similarities within societies and significant differences between them were identified regarding employees' perceptions of leadership effectiveness (House et al. 2004). This study, thus, provided support to the contingency school, with proponents arguing that leaders need to adapt their behaviors to different societal cultures in order to be effective, and that leadership effectiveness is contingent upon similarities between cultures of leaders and followers (Brodbeck et al., 2000; Wendt et al., 2009). This viewpoint was vehemently challenged by supporters of the universal school, who argued that the behaviors leaders need to demonstrate to be positively (or negatively, we might argue) perceived by employees are independent of culture and other contingency variables (Bass, 1997; Horner-Long and Schoenberg, 2002). In the present paper, by comparing empirical data regarding employees' perceptions of manager/leader behavior from 13 cases spread across nine culturally diverse countries and varied private sector industries, we attempt to partially resolve the disagreement between proponents of the contingency and universal schools.

Managerial (manager/leader) behavior studies

The most notable early inquiries that explored the 'process' component of managerial effectiveness include Ohio State University's leader/supervisory behavior studies (see Schriesheim and Stogdill, [1975]; Fleishman, Harrison and Burt [1955]), Michigan State University's managerial behavior study (see Miner, 1963), and the managerial behavior/effectiveness study of Morse and Wagner (1978). In Canada, Latham and Wexley (1977) and Latham, Fay and Saari (1979) conducted managerial behavior studies to create behavioral observation scales (BOS) for appraising the performance of supervisors, while in New Zealand, Cammock, Nilakant and Dakin (1995) carried out a single organization

managerial behavior study to develop a lay model of managerial effectiveness. Other than the afore-cited studies, we know of only three notable contemporary manager/leader behavior inquiries. In the UK Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe (2001) used the repertory grid technique to develop a ‘new transformational leadership questionnaire’. Brown and Hanlon (2004) used CIT to create behavioral observation scales (BOS) for the purpose of coaching and developing entrepreneurs operating in the Canadian private sector; and also in Canada, Brown, McCracken and Hillier (2013) conducted a CIT managerial behavior study to identify the ‘soft skills’ of executives within public sector organizations.

Although some of these studies explored ineffective as well as effective behavior, all except those of Miner (1963), and Schriesheim and Stogdill (1975) developed frameworks, models, or scales comprised of behavioral factors underpinned predominantly by effective behavioral items. Hence, these studies (like most ILT studies outlined in the previous subsection) offer little insight about the wide range of manager/leader behaviors which lead to ineffective performance and may thus be perceived as negative within organizations. To address this knowledge gap, Author 2 of the present study led a series of studies in which equal emphasis was placed on collecting critical incidents of ineffective as well as effective managerial behaviors. While these studies overcame the drawback of past managerial (manager/leader) behavior studies, most were single organization inquiries. Subsequently Author 2 and his co-researchers conducted comparative studies in search of generalizable behavioral criteria/dimensions of effective and ineffective managerial behavior. In one such study, they (Anon 1 and Anon 2, 2012) compared findings obtained from six private sector cases conducted across three countries, namely, the United Kingdom (UK), Germany and Romania. In another study, Anon. 1 et al. (2019) compared the results of prior studies conducted in Egypt and the UAE in search of similarities and differences across these two Islamic countries. While these efforts contributed to a broader understanding regarding

perceived effective/ineffective managerial behavior, their comparisons remained limited to two or three countries and were usually conducted within the same industry. Therefore, the findings of these comparative studies cannot be considered generic. Our present paper attempts to overcome this limitation.

Purpose of the study and research questions

Our review of the three relevant streams of literature revealed that there is not a single comprehensive and generic framework comprising of a full range of manager/leader behaviors that employees perceive as moderately and/or extremely negative across culturally diverse countries and a variety of industrial sectors. To address this knowledge gap we decided to conduct a qualitative multiple cross-case/cross-nation comparative analysis (MCCA) of empirical source data obtained from 13 private sector critical incident technique (CIT) replication studies of effective and ineffective managerial (manager/leader) behavior conducted by Author 2 with his various co-authors (including Author 1 in some cases) in nine culturally diverse countries spread across private sector organization from varied industries. Our eventual goal was to generate a parsimonious and generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior. To achieve this goal we raised two research questions:

RQ1: To what extent are perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior obtained from selected CIT emic replication studies of effective and ineffective managerial behavior conducted in varied private sector organizations within nine culturally diverse countries, similar or different?

RQ 2: Can those perceptions identified as similar be integrated inductively, and expressed in the form of a generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior?

Research methods

Philosophical approach and paradigmatic stance

For our comparative study we adopted a philosophical approach and paradigmatic stance informed by the pragmatic approach and notions of epistemological instrumentalism and abduction (Friedrichs and Kratochwil, 2009; Morgan, 2007) which allows researchers to assume a pluralist ontology and epistemology best suited to address the specified research questions. Hence, we assumed a post-positivist (empirical realism) ontology and a constructivist-interpretivist (transactional-subjectivism) epistemology (Bryman and Bell, 2003; Cunliffe, 2011); this philosophical approach is similar to the notion of ‘qualitative positivism’ (Aguinis and Solarino, 2019).

We were guided by the understanding that multiple-case comparative studies typically provide a stronger base for theory building by allowing for comparisons across cases (Yin, 1994), and that theory building from multiple cases yields more robust, generalizable, and testable theory than single-case research (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). Tsang and Kwan’s (1999) notion of theory development through empirical generalization replication research also influenced our thinking. We restricted the focus of our present MCCA study to ineffective managerial behaviors manifested by managers in private companies because the only equivalent contemporary private sector studies against which to compare and demonstrate the transferability (external validity) of our findings were those of Schilling (2009) in Germany and Schyns and Schilling (2011) in the Netherlands.

Empirical source data

As previously mentioned, the present inquiry relies on empirical source data obtained from 13 past critical incident technique (CIT) emic replication studies of effective and ineffective managerial (manager/leader) behavior conducted by Author 2 with various local researchers. These studies, referred to as cases, were carried out within private-sector organizations in the UK (three cases), Germany (three cases), France, Hungary, India, the

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Netherlands, Portugal, South Korea, and the UAE (one case each) between 2007 and 2019. Together, they cover various industries ranging from telecommunications, education and advertising to finance and banking. We chose to compare these 13 cases for two reasons. First, they conform to what Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) referred to as replica studies. A prerequisite for such comparative research is some form of central control; this was offered in the present case by Author 2. Second, their focus on different industries offered sufficient diversity that allowed us to elaborate a parsimonious and generic framework of manager/leader behavior which people across private sector industries as well as nations perceive as negative (see Eisenhardt and Graebner [2007] on theoretical sampling). We provide an overview of these 13 cases in Table 1.

-----Insert Table 1 about here-----

Our empirical source data was comprised of sets of negative (*ineffective*) behavioral statements (BSs) obtained from the afore-cited 13 cases. These BSs had been deduced from critical incidents (CIs) of ineffective managerial behavior as judged by the research participants of each case. The subject foci of the cases were managers of the respective collaborating organizations which variously included top, senior, middle, and/or first line managers, and in some cases supervisors who spent about 40% of their time performing managerial as opposed to practitioner work. The samples of research participants were comprised of managers and non-managerial employees who had volunteered to act as CIT informants. The number of CIT informants, CIs collected, and negative (*ineffective*) BSs deduced from each study (case) are shown in Table 2.

-----Insert Table 2 about here-----

Data analysis

The negative (*ineffective*) BSs obtained from the 13 cases (n=437) became the units of analysis for our present MCCA inquiry. Author 1 and Author 2 subjected these to independent and then joint qualitative realist analysis (Madill, Jordan, and Shirley, 2000) using a form of

open coding and axial coding (Flick, 2014) which allowed the richness of the data to emerge through a process of ongoing discovery (Miles and Huberman, 1995). At the first stage of data analytic abstraction (*open coding*) those BSs that contained two or more units of meaning were disentangled, thus creating a larger number of coded BSs (n = 483) containing just one unit of meaning. Three of these BSs were discarded for being ambiguous in meaning. This left 480 usable BSs for coding at the second stage of data analytic abstraction (*axial coding*), the purpose of which was to identify the greatest number of discrete behavioral categories. Those BSs identified as being either the *same*, *similar*, or containing an element of *congruence* were accordingly grouped into clusters using the criterion that each deduced cluster (category) should contain at least one BS from at least one of the studies conducted in at least seven of the nine countries, which meant it could be regarded as generic. *Sameness* existed when the sentences or phrases used to describe two or more BSs were identical or near identical. *Similarity* existed when the BS 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.

There was a high degree of agreement between the respective independent analyses conducted by Author 1 and Author 2 with a large majority of their coding and categorization being the same (rater reliability: 89.06%). Where discrepancies were detected, the relevant BSs were jointly scrutinized and elaborated on the evolving behavioral categories (see Welch et al., 2011) until mutual consensus was reached through an iterative process of discussion (Barbour, 2001). Each of the emergent generic behavioral categories (GBCs) was interpreted and assigned a short descriptive label encapsulating the overarching meaning held in common with all its constituent BSs. These were then sent to Author 3 for code cross-checking (Gibbs, 2007).

Finally, all three authors subjected the deduced GBCs to a third level of data analytic abstraction (*selective coding*) to identify a smaller number of discrete core categories around

which they could be grouped and integrated (Flick, 2014). We refer to these derived core categories as behavioral dimensions (BDs) of negative manager/leader behavior. How the authors progressed from the first order concepts identified in the ‘raw’ empirical data (BSs) through to the deduced second order categories (GBCs) and subsequently to the derived third order dimensions (BDs), is demonstrated schematically in the form of a data structure (following Gioia, Corley, and Hamilton, 2013) (see Figure 1 below).

----Insert figure 1 about here----

Ensuring trustworthiness of the findings

The trustworthiness of our findings in terms of their credibility (internal validity) and dependability (reliability) has been ensured through the following two steps. We engaged in investigator triangulation by firstly conducting independent and then joint data analyses (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, and Lowe, 1991). Second, our emergent GBCs were code cross-checked by an independent qualified confirmability auditor experienced in CIT and cross-case/cross-nation comparative research, the outcome of which was 98.75% convergence in coding. The transferability (*external validity*) of our findings has been demonstrated empirically by the ‘testing’ of our deduced GBCs using comparable findings from the studies of Schilling (2009) in Germany, and Schyns and Schilling (2011) in the Netherlands.

Findings

In addressing RQ1, our study resulted in 23 emergent GBCs deduced from the 480 BSs, of which only two were found to be non-convergent. The respective number of BSs underpinning each GBC and supporting references from extant literature are shown in Table 3.

-----Insert Table 3 about here ---

Of the 23 derived GBCs, 16 are underpinned completely or predominantly by BSs that are ‘acts of commission’ and seven by BSs that are ‘acts of omission’. While a clear distinction is offered in Table 3 (with acts of omission italicized), here we offer some examples of each.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

GBCs which are acts of commission include (but are not limited to): exhibits uncivil, disrespectful, insulting, and/or intimidating behavior, exhibits self-serving/selfish behavior, and makes untimely, ill-timed, and/or ill-informed decisions. In contrast, GBCs describing acts of omission include: deprives staff of timely and/or sufficient constructive feedback, abdicates from taking ownership, responsibility, and being held accountable, and omits to provide training, coaching, mentoring, or other work-based learning, and/or opportunities for personal development/growth.

In addressing RQ2, the selective coding of the 23 deduced GBCs resulted in the identification of five BDs of negative manager/leader behavior underpinned by 2 to 8 GBCs, as outlined in Table 4. We label these dimensions as follows: BD1: *inadequate functional behavior*; BD2: *unethical behavior*; BD3: *impersonal domineering behavior*; BD4: *depriving behavior*; and BD5: *closed/negative-minded behavior*. These BDs serve to constitute our 5-dimensional generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior. BD1 (*inadequate functional behavior*) which relates solely to behaviors that managers/leaders exhibit performing one or more of the ‘five functions of management’ and is derived from eight GBCs deduced from a total of 180 underpinning BSs, seems to be the most common type of negative manager/leader behavior manifested across countries and industries. This is followed by BD2 (*unethical behavior*) and BD3 (*impersonal domineering behavior*), which are derived from five and three GBCs underpinned by 101 and 88 BSs, respectively.

We qualify these derived BDs and constituent GBCs as indicative of ‘poor’ or ‘bad’ negative manager/leader behavior by reference to the following definitions: Poor behaviors are those that are ‘non-value based’, ‘less than adequate’, ‘below required/expected standards of behavior’, and lead to low-quality managerial performance due to inferior/faulty thinking or decision-making. Conversely, bad behaviors as those that are ‘value based’, ‘not desirable in any manner or degree’, ‘morally unacceptable’ which directly cause significant personal harm

to individuals and/or serious damage to organizations. Based on these definitions, and as can be seen in Table 4, we have qualified only one of the derived behavioral dimensions, namely BD 2 (*unethical behavior*) as ‘bad’ whereas the other four BDs are qualified as ‘poor’.

----Insert Table 4 about here----

Discussion

The most significant insight from our MCCA study is that employees from varied private sector organizations in nine culturally-diverse countries perceive negative manager/leader behavior in very similar terms. Furthermore, all 23 deduced GBCs can be expressed in the form of a generic behavioral framework comprised of five discrete behavioral dimensions (BDs), all of which have been shown to be externally validated. As seen in Table 5, 82.6% (19 of 23) of the GBCs underpinning our five BDs are supported either by the German findings of Schilling (2009) (see BD4: *depriving behavior*) or the Dutch findings of Schyns and Schilling (2011) (see BD5: *closed/negative minded behavior*), or findings from both studies (see BDs 1 to 3). Of the four GBCs not yet externally validated, three underpin BD1 (*inadequate functional behavior*) and one underpins BD 4 (*depriving behavior*).

Our research lends considerable support to 25 of the 28 statements of ‘negative leadership behavior’ identified by Schilling (2009), and 11 of the 15 categories of ‘ineffective leaders’ identified by Schyns and Schilling (2011), especially the ones labelled as ‘disinterested’, ‘tyrannical’, ‘non-communicative’, ‘individualist’, and ‘unpleasant leadership’. Additionally, we offer conceptual enrichment by demonstrating empirically that managers/leaders can also be perceived negatively if they ‘engage in untimely, ill-timed, ill-informed, and/or autocratic decision making’; ‘exhibit indecisive, procrastinating, avoidance, and/or ignoring behavior’; ‘are poor at monitoring and controlling and tolerate underperforming staff’; or if they ‘deprive staff of timely and/or sufficient constructive feedback’. Thus, our 5-dimensional framework is not only validated by past findings (Schilling,

2009; Schyns and Schilling, 2011), it expands and significantly enriches our understanding of the wide range of manager/leader behaviors perceived as negative across sectors and countries.

Comparing our findings with those of the GLOBE study (House et al., 2004) reveals two interesting observations. First, there are partial overlaps between the GLOBE study's antiprototype 'malevolent' (hostile, dishonest) and our BD2 (*unethical behavior*), its antiprototype 'autocratic' (dictatorial, bossy, elitist, and non-participative) and our BD3 (*impersonal domineering behavior*), plus its antiprototype 'indirect/evasive' and our BD1 (*inadequate functional behavior*). Regarding our other two dimensions, namely BD4 (*depriving behavior*) and BD5 (*closed/negative-minded behavior*), we find no parallels in the GLOBE study. The second and more interesting observation is that while House et al. (2004) claim considerable influence of culture on perceived effectiveness (and ineffectiveness, we might argue) of leaders, we show that people's perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior is considerably similar across different national cultures and across varied private sector industries. Although scholars (see Hofstede, 1984) have scored the countries included in our study very differently along different national cultural dimensions, our findings appear to show that these differences do not influence people's perceptions of manager/leader behavior. Our findings could well be indicative of an emerging consensus on people's expectations from their managers/leaders across sectors and nations. This consensus across countries and industry sectors is illustrated through the example of one GBC in Table 5 below.

----Insert Table 5 about here----

Theoretical implications

Our MCCA study has revealed very high degrees of sameness between the findings of 13 replication studies, which suggests that people's perceptions of negative manager/leader behavior in and across nine countries and varied industries are considerably similar. Our emergent generic framework of negative manager/leader behavior shows that previously understood influence of contingency variables such as culture and sectorial specificities on

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

perceptions of managers/leaders may have been misguided. We find that irrespective of differences in national culture and sectorial characteristics, employees perceive negative manager/leader behavior in very similar ways. Thus, our study lends support to the universal school of culture in business studies. More broadly, it adds to the gradually increasing criticism of the practice of equating nations with cultures and considering national culture as a determinant of human behavior (see Patel and Rayner [2012] and Patel [2017]).

Additionally, our emergent comprehensive and generic framework offers three interesting theoretical insights. First, it reveals the salience of negative manager/leader behavior relating to routine managerial work associated with the ‘five functions of management’-planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling- (BD1: *inadequate functional behavior*) which emerged as the most significant behavioral dimension in our framework. This BD is grounded in several underlying GBCs covering the general managerial functions of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling. We find this to be quite counterintuitive, considering most negative leadership/management literature has focused on conspicuously ‘bad’ (*extremely negative*) behaviors, inadvertently giving the impression that negative manager/leader behaviors somehow stand out. In contrast, our findings show that managers/leaders are most often perceived negatively when they exhibit ‘poor’ (*moderately negative*) behaviors, for example, when their performance of routine managerial tasks are substandard or when they engage in depriving behavior. This finding emphasizes the need to give as much attention to ‘poor’ as to ‘bad’ manager/leader behavior. Our findings lend support to the contemporary movement emphasizing the significance of mundane managerial acts (see Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003; Alvesson, 2020), and calling for a focus on the ‘mundane’ as opposed to the ‘grandiose’ nature of managerial/leadership work (see Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Wilson, 2013). In so doing, we challenge the dominant

discourse that has tended to prioritize the glorious aspects of manager/leader work while neglecting the mundane (Crevani et al., 2010).

Second, by identifying five negative behavioral dimensions underpinned by 23 negative GBCs, we address a very important knowledge gap in extant literature. As past scholars (see for example, Lockwood et al, 2004) have suggested, individuals considering engaging in a potentially beneficial activity, an additive behavior, are more likely to view positive models as effective motivators. Conversely, individuals considering refraining from a potentially harmful activity, a subtractive behavior, are more likely to view negative models as effective motivators (Higgins, 1998; Lockwood, Jordon and Kunda, 2002; Lockwood et al.; 2004; Roese, Hur and Pennington, 1999). Unfortunately, most extant literature has focused only on additive behaviors while neglecting subtractive behaviors. By focusing on a full range of negative (subtractive) manager/leader behaviors, we overcome this limitation.

The third and final theoretical insight emerging from our findings is that, of the 23 derived GBCs, 16 are underpinned completely or predominantly by BSs which are ‘acts of commission’ and seven by BSs which are ‘acts of omission’. We argue these two kinds of behaviors are very distinct from one another and would result in different implications for managers. GBCs that are ‘acts of omission’ could be perceived as managers withholding certain behaviors resulting in dissatisfaction and discontent among employees. Nevertheless, when managers engage in these behaviors, this would simply result the fulfilment of employees’ normal expectations, and not necessarily in a distinctively positive perception of manager/leader behavior. In contrast, GBCs deduced from ‘acts of commission’ indicate those behaviors that are unequivocally experienced as negative by employees and need to be explicitly avoided if managers/leaders wish to preclude being perceived as ineffective. Thus, while managers/leaders need to consciously avoid certain behaviors if they wish to escape

negative perceptions, they also need to proactively ensure certain types of behaviors to avoid employee dissatisfaction/discontent.

Practical implications

We offer three practical implications. First, the wide range of negative BDs and the underpinning GBCs constituting our generic framework engenders a new question: *How may organizations curtail such behaviors among their managers/leaders?* Since our identified negative manager/leader behaviors are the result of different underlying managerial weaknesses, each needs to be addressed through a different set of remedial actions. For instance, ‘general inadequate behaviors’ would best be addressed through formal management/leadership courses and management education programs (e.g., MBAs). To minimize ‘unethical behaviors’, organizations should consider setting up clear policies and accountability systems. For both ‘impersonal domineering behaviors’ and ‘closed/negative-minded behaviors’, sensitivity training and training courses on topics such as emotional and social intelligence, and mindfulness should be utilized. However, ‘depriving behaviors’ will most likely be addressed best by creating performance appraisal systems that incorporate the subordinate’s performance within the manager’s assessment. Thus, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to overcome negative manager/leader behaviors; a combination of remedial actions are required to address them.

Second, we believe managers cannot be trained and developed wholly without knowledge of the perceptions of effective and ineffective manager/leader behaviors held by employees (see also Schyns and Schilling, 2011). Therefore, we support designing management/leadership training programs that sensitize participants to employees’ perceptions regarding what behaviorally differentiates effective managers/leaders from ineffective ones. Such perceptions remain largely unarticulated and implicit, and the few frameworks that have attempted to articulate employees’ perceptions, unfortunately remain limited in their scope to very few countries. A framework such as ours can be useful, not only because it makes this

implicit knowledge explicit, but also because its generic nature makes it relevant for managers/leaders interacting with employees from different national cultures and in different sectors of activity (for example, in a multi-national firm or a conglomerate). Sensitizing managers/leaders to how others perceive their behaviors can inspire them to alter some of their less desirable behaviors and thereby improve their reputation for behavioral effectiveness.

Third, to address the problem of so many MLD-related programs failing in multiple countries, as discussed in the introductory section of this paper, we suggest the BDs and underpinning GBCs constituting our ‘generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior’ could be judiciously used to supplement the content of extant generic ‘off-the-shelf’ management/leadership behavioral competency frameworks used to inform and shape MLD provision. MLD programs underpinned by behavioral competency frameworks containing ‘subtractive behaviors’, as well as ‘additive behaviors’, are likely to have greater impact than extant frameworks in motivating managers to change their behavioral practices regardless of whether they are driven by ‘promotion goals’ or ‘prevention goals’.

Limitations and directions for future research

Our study suffers from some conceptual and some methodological limitations. One potential conceptual limitation arises from its focus on employees’ perceptions of managerial/leader behaviors, which, so it could be argued, may be biased. However, the researchers of our empirical source studies consciously attempted to reduce this subjectivity by excluding from the data set any critical incident that appeared more about CIT informant’s biases or opinions rather than describing an actual observed managerial behavior. Our study also suffers from certain methodological limitations. For instance, the researchers of one of our three German empirical source studies (Case GE2) interviewed only 24 participants due to constraints imposed by the collaborating organization. Hence, it is unlikely the point of data saturation had been achieved in that study, as had been the case with the other 12 empirical

source studies. Consequently, it is possible our emergent generic framework has not yet fully reached theoretical saturation.

As a future extension of this line of inquiry, our findings can be tested further and refined by adding more private-sector cases from the same or different countries. Another extension could involve conducting emic replication studies and subsequent MCCA studies within public-sector and third-sector organizations. Finally, assuming that the impact of certain negative managerial/leader behaviors could be mitigated by the positive impact of other behaviors, another avenue for future research could involve a simultaneous study of both positive and negative manager/leader behaviors. It is possible to envisage such a study from our data set using a mixed (qualitative plus quantitative) methodology. The qualitative component would deduce all the positive and negative BSs from the CIT data, which would then be used to create a Behavioral Item Questionnaire (BIQ) survey instrument for use in the quantitative component, the results of which could be subjected to factor analysis to derive a parsimonious framework of positive and negative behavioral dimensions.

Conclusion

Although there have been considerable advances in the understanding of negative manager/leader behaviors, most empirical studies in recent years have focused on those behaviors that we qualify as ‘bad’ (extremely negative) which harm individuals or damage organizations. In sharp contrast, our study contributes an enriched understanding of the more numerous and ubiquitous ‘poor’ (moderately negative) manager/leader behaviors that lead to low quality managerial performance. It also draws attention to the fact that people’s perceptions of ineffective managers or leaders are not limited to the most conspicuous negative behaviors associated with what has become known as the ‘dark side’ of management and leadership practice. Rather, these perceptions significantly consider mundane managerial and leadership behaviors that have hitherto been underexplored in extant literature. It is toward these less conspicuous managerial and leadership behaviors that future scholars should consider focusing

their attention. Future replication studies, especially in non-Western countries, as well as across public and third sector organizations could further enrich and complement our emergent framework of perceived negative manager/leader behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Aycan, Z. and S. Shelia (2019). ““Leadership? No, Thanks!” A New Construct: Worries About Leadership”. *European Management Review*, 16(1): 21-35.
- Aasland, M. S., A. Skogstad, G. Notelaers, M.B. Nielsen and S. Einarsen (2010). “The prevalence of destructive leadership behavior”. *British Journal of Management*, 21: 438-452.
- Aguinis, H. and A. M. Solarino (2019). “Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants”. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40: 1291-1315.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. and R. J. Alban-Metcalfe (2001). “The development of a New Transformational Leadership Questionnaire”. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 4(1): 1-23.
- Alvesson, M. (2020). “Upbeat leadership: A recipe for—or against—“successful” leadership studies”. *The Leadership Quarterly*, December 2020, 101439.
- Alvesson, M. and S. Sveningsson (2003). “Managers doing leadership: The extraordinaryization of the mundane”. *Human Relations*, 56: 1435-1459.
- Amabile, T. M., E.A. Schatzel, B. Moneta, and S.J. Kramer (2004). “Leader behaviors and work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support”. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15: 5-32.
- Ardichvili, A., K. N. Dag, and S. Manderscheid (2016). “Leadership development: current and emerging models and practices”. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 18(3): 275-285.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- Avolio, B. J., B. M. Bass, B. M. and D. I. Jung (1999). "Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership". *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4): 441-462.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?". *American Psychologist*, 52(2): 130-139.
- Bregman, P. (2013). "Why so many leadership programs ultimately fail". *Harvard Business Review*, July <https://hbr.org/2013/07/why-so-many-leadership-program>
- Brodbeck, F. C., M. Frese, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, H. Bendova, ... and R. Wunderer (2000). "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries". *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(1): 1-29.
- Brown, T. C., and D. Hanlon (2004). "Developing behavioral observation scales to foster effective entrepreneurship". *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 17(2): 103-117.
- Brown, T. C., M. McCracken and T-L. Hillier (2013). "Using evidence-based practices to enhance transfer of training: Assessing the effectiveness of goal setting and behavioral observation scales". *Human Resource Development International*, 16(4): 374-389.
- Bryman, A. and E. Bell (2003). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Calarco, A. and J. Gurvis (2006). *Adaptability: Responding Effectively to Change*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Cammock, P., V. Nilakant and S. Dakin, S. (1995). "Developing a lay model of managerial Effectiveness". *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(4): 443-474.
- Clifton, J. (2019). "Investigating the dark side of stories of "good" leadership: A discursive approach to leadership gurus' storytelling". *International Journal of Business Communication*, 56: 82-99.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- Crevani, L., M. Lindgren, M. and J. Packendorff (2010). "Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions". *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(1): 77-86.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2011). "Crafting qualitative research: Morgan and Smircich 30 years on". *Organizational Research Methods*, 14: 647-673.
- Cunliffe, A. L. and M. Eriksen (2011). "Relational leadership". *Human Relations*, 64(11): 1425-1449.
- Den Hartog, D. N., R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quantanilla, P. Dorfman, I. A. Abdalla and J. Zhou (1999). "Culture-specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 219-256.
- Duffy, M. K., D. C. Ganster and M. Pagon (2002). "Social undermining in the workplace". *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 331-351.
- Easterby-Smith, M., R. Thorpe and A. Lowe (1991). *Management Research: An Introduction*. London, UK: Sage.
- Eden, D. and U. Leviatan (1975). "Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 736-741.
- Einarsen, S., M. S. Aasland and A. Skogstad (2007). "Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 207-216.
- Eisenbeiß, S. A. and F. Brodbeck (2014). "Ethical and unethical leadership: A cross-cultural and cross-sectoral analysis". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122: 343-359.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. and M. E. Graebner (2007). "Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges". *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 25-32.
- Epitropaki, O. and R. Martin (2004). "Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- structure, generalizability, and stability over time". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 293-310.
- Erickson, A., J. Shaw and Z. Agabe (2007). "An empirical investigation of the antecedents, behaviors, and outcomes of bad leadership". *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1: 26-43.
- Fleishman E. A., E. F. Harris and H. F. Burt (1955). *Leadership and Supervision in Industry*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Flick, U. (2014). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 5th edition. London: Sage.
- Friedrichs, J. and F. Kratochwil (2009). "On acting and knowing: How pragmatism can advance international relations research and methodology". *International Organization*, 63: 701-731.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Sage.
- Gioia, D. A., K. G. Corley and A. L. Hamilton (2013). "Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology". *Organizational Research Methods*, 16: 15-31.
- Goldman, A. (2006). "Personality disorders in leaders: Implications of the DSM IV-TR in assessing dysfunctional organizations". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21: 392-414.
- Goldsmith, K., and R. Dhar (2013). "Negativity bias and task motivation: Testing the effectiveness of positively versus negatively framed incentives". *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 19(4): 358-366.
- Hall, A., F. Blass, G. Ferris, and R. Massengale (2004). "Leader reputation and accountability in organizations: Implications for dysfunctional leader behavior". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15: 515-536.
- Han, G. H., P. D. Harms and Y. Bai (2017). "Nightmare bosses: The impact of abusive supervision on employees' sleep, emotions, and creativity". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145: 21-31.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- Harris, A and M. Jones (2018). "The dark side of leadership and management". *School Leadership & Management*, 38(5): 475-477.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). "Promotion and prevention. Regulating focus as a motivational Principle". *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30: 1-46.
- Hoobler, J. M. and J. Hu (2013). "A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24: 256-269.
- Horner-Long, P. and R. Schoenberg (2002). "Does e-business require different leadership characteristics?: An empirical investigation". *European Management Journal*, 20(6): 611-619.
- House, R. J. and R. N. Aditya (1997). "The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis?". *Journal of Management*, 23(3): 409-473.
- House, R. J., P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman and V. Gupta (eds) (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, W. B. and J. M. Huwe (2002). "Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school". *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/ Practice/Training*, 39: 44-55.
- Kets de Vries, M. (2003). "Dysfunctional Leadership". Working paper series 2003/58/ENT, INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France.
- Kotterman, J. (2006). "Leadership versus management: What's the difference". *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 29(2): 13-17.
- Krasikova, D. V., S. G. Green and J. M. LeBreton (2013). "Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda". *Journal of Management*, 39: 308-338.
- Latham, G. P. and K. N. Wexley, (1977). "Behavioral observation scales for performance Appraisal". *Personnel Psychology*, 30(2): 255-268.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- Latham, G. P., C. H. Fay and L. M. Saari (1979). "The development of behavioral observation scales for appraising the performance of foremen". *Personnel Psychology*, 32: 299-311.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The Allure of Toxic Leaders. Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians—and How We Can Survive Them*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ling, W., Chia, R. C., & Fang, L. (2000). "Chinese implicit leadership theory". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(6): 729-739.
- Lockwood P., C. Jordon, and Z. Kunda. (2002). "Motivation by positive and negative role models. Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4): 854-864.
- Lockwood, P., P. Sadler, K. Fyman and S. Tuck. (2004). "To do or not to do. Using positive and negative role models to harness motivation". *Social Cognition*, 22(4): 422-450
- Mackey, J. D., B. Parker Ellen III, C. P. McAllister and K. C. Alexander (2021 *In press*). "The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research". *Journal of Business Research*.
- 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.
- Miles, M. and A. Huberman (1995). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miner, J. B. (1963). *The Management of Effective Performance*. University of Michigan, New York NY: McGraw Hill
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Morgan, D. L. (2007). "Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods". *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*,

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

1: 48-76.

Morse, J. J. and F. R. Wagner (1978). "Measuring the process of managerial effectiveness".

Academy of Management Journal, 21(1): 23-35.

Neuman, J. H. and R. A. Baron (2005). "Aggression in the workplace: A social-psychological

perspective". In S. Fox and R. E. Spector (eds), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, pp. 13-40. Washington, DC: American

Psychological Association.

Psychological Association.

Offermann, L. R., J. K. Jr. Kennedy and P. W. Wirtz (1994). "Implicit leadership theories:

Content, structure, and generalizability". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5: 43-58.

O'Reilly, C. A., B. Doerr, D. F. Caldwell and J. A. Chatman (2014). "Narcissistic CEOs and

executive compensation". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25: 218-231.

Padilla, A., R. Hogan and R. B. Kaiser (2007). "The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders,

susceptible followers, and conducive environments". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 176-

194.

Patel, T. (2017). "Multiparadigmatic studies of culture: needs, challenges, and

recommendations for management scholars". *European Management Review*, 14(1): 83-

100.

Patel, T. and R. G. Hamlin (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:

571-587.

Patel, T. and R. G. Hamlin (2017). "Toward a unified framework of perceived negative leader

behaviors insights from French and British educational sectors". *Journal of Business*

Ethics, 145: 157-182.

Patel, T. and S. Rayner (2012). "Towards a transactional approach to culture: Illustrating the

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- application of Douglasian cultural framework in a variety of management settings". *European Management Review*, 9(3): 121-138.
- Pfeffer, J. (2016). "Getting beyond the BS of leadership literature". *McKinsey Quarterly*, January.
- Raelin, J. (2004). "Don't bother putting leadership into people". *Academy of Management Executive*, 18: 340-355.
- Reave, L. (2005). "Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16: 655-687.
- Roese, N. J., T. Hur, and G. Pennington (1999). "Counterfactual thinking and regulatory focus: Implications for action versus inaction and sufficiency versus necessity". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77: 1109-1120.
- Rosenthal, S. and T. Pittinsky (2006). "Narcissistic leadership". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 617-633.
- Ruiz-Palomino, P., R. Martínez-Cañas, and A. Bañón-Gomis (2021). "Is unethical leadership a negative for Employees' personal growth and intention to stay? The buffering role of responsibility climate". *European Management Review* (Forthcoming).
- Schilling, J. (2009). "From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership". *Leadership*, 5: 102-128.
- Schmid, E. A., A. P. Verdorfer and C. Peus (2019). "Shedding light on leaders' self-interest: Theory and measurement of exploitative leadership". *Journal of Management*, 45: 1401-1433.
- Schriesheim, C. A. and R. M. Stogdill, R. M. (1975). "Differences in factor structure across three versions of the Ohio State Leadership Scales". *Personnel Psychology*, 28: 189-206.
- Schyns, B. and J. Schilling (2011). "Implicit leadership theories: Think leader, think effective?". *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20: 141-150.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

- Schyns, B. and J. Schilling (2013). "How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24: 138-158.
- Skogstad, A., S. Einarsen, T. Torsheim, M. S. Aasland and H. Hetland (2007). "The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behaviour". *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12: 80-92.
- Thoroughgood, C. N., S. T. Hunter and K. B. Sawyer (2011). "Bad apples, bad barrels, and broken followers? An empirical examination of contextual influences on follower perceptions and reactions to aversive leadership". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100: 647-672.
- Tsang, E. and K-M. Kwan (1999). "Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective". *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 759-780.
- Wilson, S. (2013). "The authentic leader reconsidered: Integrating the marvellous, mundane and mendacious". In *Authentic leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Welch, C., R. Piekkari, E. Plakoyiannaki and E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki (2011). "Theorising from case studies: Towards a pluralist future for international business research". *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42: 740-762.
- Wendt, H., M. Euwema and I. Emmerick (2009). "Leadership and team cohesiveness across cultures". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20: 358-370.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Designing Single-and Multiple-Case. Improving Educational Management: Through Research and Consultancy*, 135.
- Yukl, G. (1989). "Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research". *Journal of Management*, 15: 254-289.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*, 6th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- 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*

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Studies, 9: 15-31.

Yukl, G., R. Mahsud, S. Hassan and G. E. Prussia (2013). "An improved measure of ethical leadership". *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20: 38-48.

Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. and M. Viera-Armas (2019). "Using alienation at work to explain why managers' dishonesty does not lead to firm performance". *European Management Review*, 16(2): 273-284.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Overall description of the 13 empirical source studies

	Country	Abbreviation	Sector	Study conducted by	Publication year
A	UK	UK1	International communications and advertising	Author 2 and co-authors	2008
B	UK	UK2	International Telecommunications	Author 2 and co-authors	2007
C	UK	UK3	Banking	Author 2 and co-authors	2016
D	France	F1	Education	Author 1 under Author 2's guidance	2017
E	Germany	GE1	Multiple private companies	Author 1 and a local researcher under Author 2's guidance	2009
F	Germany	GE2	Multiple private companies	Author 2 and Author 1 with a local researcher	2013
G	Germany	GE3	Space systems and service industry	Author 2 and Author 1 with a local researcher	2014
H	Hungary	HUN1	Pharmaceuticals	Author 2 and co-authors	2017
I	Netherlands	NLD1	Banking/Finance	Author 2 and co-authors	2017
J	Portugal	PTL1	Food	Author 2 and co-authors	2017
K	India	IND1	Real estate software	Author 1 and a local researcher under Author 2's guidance	2016
L	South Korea	SK1	Multiple private companies	Author 2 and co-authors	2016
M	UAE	UAE1	Architecture and consulting	Author 1 and a local researcher under Author 2's guidance	2019

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Table 2. Empirical source data obtained from the 13 replication studies

	Cases	Number of CIT interviewees	Number of CIs collected	Number of negative BSs
A	UK1	55	555	35
B	UK2	37	370	13
C	UK3	30	277	14
D	F1	37	250	21
E	GE1	64	154	19
F	GE2	24	506	81
G	GE3	41	375	38
H	HUN1	30	235	53
I	NLD1	35	249	34
J	PTL1	48	303	29
K	IND1	35	277	21
L	SK1	45	560	51
M	UAE1	40	346	28
Total		521	4457	437

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Table 3. Emergent generic behavioral categories (GBCs)

	Deduced GBCs	Number of underpinning BSs	Supporting references
1.	<i>Deprives staff of timely and/or sufficient constructive feedback</i>	13	Neuman and Baron (2005), Patel and Hamlin (2012)
2.	Uncivil, disrespectful, insulting, and/or intimidating behavior	22	Boddy (2017)
3.	Deliberate or unwitting undermining behavior	22	Duffy et al., (2002), Schmid et al. (2019)
4.	<i>Provides staff with insufficient or no guidance and support as and when required or sought</i>	24	Yukl et al. (2013)
5.	Displays narrow minded/negative attitudes and/or affective behavior	14	Hoobler and Hu (2013)
6.	Exhibits self-serving/selfish behavior	19	Hall et al. (2004), Johnson and Huwe (2002)
7.	Exhibits inappropriate-autocratic, never wrong, non-delegating, micro-managing, controlling behavior	25	Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006)
8.	Non-consulting, non-listening, and non-participative leadership style, and/or not receptive to the ideas/suggestions of staff	27	Boddy (2017)
9.	Makes untimely, ill-timed, and/or ill-informed decisions	11	Kets de Vries (2003), Patel and Hamlin (2012), Schilling (2009)
10.	<i>Abdicates from taking ownership, responsibility, and being held accountable</i>	20	Hogan and Hogan (2001), Schilling (2009)
11.	<i>Exhibits indecisive, procrastinating, avoidance, and/or ignoring behavior</i>	24	Hogan and Hogan (2001), Schilling (2009), Skogstad et al. (2007)
12.	Unclear, inappropriate, indirect, or poorly conveyed communication, and/or rare communication with staff	21	Erickson et al. (2007), Yukl et al. (2013)
13.	<i>Omits to inform staff of important information or withholds information from them</i>	19	Schilling (2009), Yukl et al. (2013)
14.	Closed to new ideas and change	12	Calarco and Gurvis (2006)
15.	Poor planning, and/or slack, deficient, unprofessional management	35	Patel and Hamlin (2017), Yukl et al. (2013)
16.	Poor organization and provisioning of resources, and/or poor direction	33	Schilling (2009), Yukl et al. (2013)

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

	and allocation of goals/objectives, expectations, roles, and tasks		
17.	Is poor at monitoring and controlling, and tolerates underperforming staff	17	Patel and Hamlin (2017), Yukl et al. (2013)
18.	Exhibits favoritism, and/or other unfair, unequal, or discriminatory treatment of staff	25	Boddy (2017), Patel and Hamlin (2012, 2017), Schilling (2009)
19.	Exhibits deceitful, dishonest, and/or manipulative behavior	13	Patel and Hamlin (2017), Reave (2005), Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara and Viera-Armas (2019)
20.	Shows insensitivity to or mistrust and disinterest in staff as individuals and/or exhibits uncaring, unconcerned and inconsiderate attitude toward them	36	O'Reilly et al. (2014), Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006), Yukl et al. (2002)
21.	<i>Omits to provide training, coaching, mentoring, or other work-based learning, and/or opportunities for personal development/growth.</i>	13	Patel and Hamlin (2012), Schmid et al. (2019)
22.	Deprives staff of recognition and/or praise	14	Patel and Hamlin (2017), Schilling (2009), Schmid et al. (2019)
23.	Exhibits unreliable and/or inconsistent behavior	19	Erickson et al. (2007), Yukl et al. (2013)

Note: The GBCs in *italics* are those underpinned by BSs that describe 'acts of omission', the other GBCs are underpinned by BSs that describe 'acts of commission'.

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Table 4. Our 5-dimensional generic framework of perceived negative manager/leader behavior

Derived Behavioral Dimensions and underpinning BSs	Underpinning Generic Behavioral Categories (GBCs)	External Validation Data Schilling (2009) (Statements)	External Validation Data Schyns & Schilling (2011) (Categories)
<p>BD1 Inadequate functional* behavior (BSs n = 180)</p>	<p>9. Makes untimely, ill-timed, and/or ill-informed decisions</p> <p>10. Abdicates taking ownership, responsibility, and accountability</p> <p>11. Exhibits indecisive, procrastinating, avoidance, and/or ignoring behavior</p> <p>12. Unclear, inappropriate, indirect, rare, or poorly conveyed communication with staff</p> <p>15. Poor planning, and/or slack, deficient, unprofessional management</p> <p>16. Poor organization and resource provisioning and/or poor direction and allocation of goals/-objectives, expectations, roles, and tasks</p> <p>17. Is poor at monitoring and controlling, and tolerates underperforming staff</p> <p>23. Exhibits unreliable and/or inconsistent behavior</p>	<p>Not bearing responsibility</p> <p>Communicating insufficiently</p> <p>Laissez-faire leadership; Ingratiating with followers</p> <p>Involving oneself too much into daily work;</p> <p>Erroneously deploying follower; Not being results-oriented; Setting no goals/-direction</p> <p>Being inconstant</p>	<p>Disinterested (indifferent, inactive)</p> <p>Not communicative (difficulties to express)</p> <p>Weak (unstable, unsure) Not conscientious (chaotic, careless)</p> <p>Unorganized (leaves things over to chance, thinking short-term)</p>
	<p>2. Uncivil, disrespectful, insulting, and/or intimidating behavior</p> <p>3. Deliberate or unwitting undermining behavior</p>	<p>Attacking followers personally; threatening/-scaring followers</p> <p>Acting disloyally</p>	<p>Unpleasant (unfriendly, not nice)</p>

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

<p>BD2. Unethical behavior (BSs n = 101)</p>	<p>6.Exhibits self-serving/selfish behavior</p> <p>18. Exhibits favoritism and/or other unfair, unequal, or discriminatory treatment of staff</p> <p>19. Exhibits deceitful, dishonest, and/or manipulative behavior</p>	<p>Treating followers unjustly/inequitably</p> <p>Acting perfidiously Being inauthentic/not convincing</p>	<p>Individualistic (egoistic, selfish)</p> <p>Dishonest (not always honest, untransparent)</p>
<p>BD3. Impersonal domineering behavior (BSs n = 88)</p>	<p>8. Non-consulting, non-listening, and non-participative leadership style, and/or not receptive to the ideas/ suggestions of staff</p> <p>7. Exhibits inappropriate-autocratic, never wrong, non-delegating, micro-managing, over-controlling behavior</p> <p>20. Shows no sensitivity to or trust and interest in staff as individuals and/or exhibits a lack of care, concern, and consideration for them</p>	<p>Being inapproachable, Not involving/- passing followers over</p> <p>Authoritarian behavior</p> <p>Exerting pressure on followers; Acting inconsiderately/- ruthlessly</p>	<p>Tyrannical (authoritarian, bossy) Hard (insensitive, heartless)</p>
<p>BD4 Depriving behavior (BSs n = 83)</p>	<p>1. Deprives staff of timely and/or sufficient constructive feedback</p> <p>4. Provides staff with insufficient or no guidance and support when required or sought</p> <p>13. Omits to inform staff of important information or withholds information from them</p> <p>21.Omits to provide training, coaching, mentoring, or other work-based learning and/or</p>	<p>Not backing followers</p> <p>Distorting/- withholding information</p> <p>Not offering scope for/not empowering followers</p> <p>Not recognizing/- motivating</p>	

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

	opportunities for personal development-/growth 22. Deprives staff of recognition and/or praise		
BD5 Closed/ negative-minded behavior (BSs n = 26)	5. Displays narrow minded, negative attitudes and/or affective behavior 14. Closed to new ideas and change		Narrow minded (not interested in new ideas, rather administrative) -same as above-

Note: :i) The word 'functional behavior' in the BD1 descriptive label refers solely to behaviors that managers/leaders adopt when performing one or more of the 'five functions of management'.

ii) BD 2 is highlighted in bold to indicate it suggests 'bad' (extremely negative) manager/leader behaviors

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Table 5. Illustrating the consensus across different cases (across nations and industry sectors) in employees' perception of one negative generic behavioral category (GBC)

Cases (country)	Industry Sector	GBC 12: Unclear, inappropriate, indirect, or poorly conveyed communication and/or rare communication with staff (21 BSs)
Case A UK	International communications and advertising	A23 Imparts confidential and/or sensitive information to employees
Case B UK	International Telecommunications	B42 Unclear, vague communication B43 Does not communicate/manage change effectively
Case C UK	Banking	
Case D France	Education	D83 Manager gives information hurriedly and at inapt times and places, and not checking it has been properly or understood.
Case E Germany	Multiple private companies	E98 b) Is rarely available for communication/ does not provide help
Case F Germany	Multiple private companies	F105 The manager does not communicate internal changes [i.e., communicates unclearly]. F106 The manager does not communicate clearly with his/her employees [i.e., communicates unclearly]. F107 The manager does not clearly communicate information. [i.e., communicates unclearly]. F108 The manager does not communicate with his employees. F109 The manager does not communicate intended actions with his/her employees. F145 The manager doesn't organize meetings with employees to exchange information. F180 The manager passes along confidential information to unauthorized personnel.
Case G Germany	Space systems and service industry	G205 a) Manager overloads self with work which precludes sufficient time to communicate with staff and have regular meetings with them. G214 Manager rarely makes himself visible/available for regular team meetings and/or to communicate face to face with individual employees.
Case H Hungary	Pharmaceuticals	H230 Communicating indirectly
Case I The Netherlands	Banking/Finance	I287 Manager shared information that is confidential or harmful to a process or employees. I298 Manager communicates information that is unclear or incorrect, and/or insufficient or negatively expressed or addressed.
Case J Portugal	Food	J328 Distant from staff [and thus rarely available to interact/communicate]

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR

Case K India	Real estate software	K357 Manager fails to network/interact sufficiently and/or effectively with colleague managers and/or staff, and/or instigate events to promote social bonding with staff [and thus rarely communicates].
Case L South Korea	Multiple private companies	L404 A manager communicates only with his/her sub-managers and has no direct communication with the entire staff or whole team.
Case M UAE	Architecture and consulting	M434 The manager does not communicate effectively. [i.e., communicates indirectly].

A FRAMEWORK OF NEGATIVE MANAGER/LEADER BEHAVIOR




Figure 1. Data structure outlining the three stages of abstraction