THE STAFF-MEETING BEHAVIORS OF EFFECTIVE, GOAL-FOCUSED LEADERS

Author: Mehmet Sahin Karip
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede
The Netherlands

memo_kar@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

In the present study we took a multi-method approach with 2 sources of data (video-based coding, follower and leader surveys). During regular staff meetings 14 leaders were video-taped and their exhibited task-oriented and relation-oriented behaviors were coded with an earlier developed, detailed observation scheme. The followers (n=172) assessed the relative leader effectiveness as well as the degree of the goal-focused leadership style. As hypothesized, the results show that a leader's goal-focused style is positively associated with leader effectiveness. Additionally, we found a positive relation between task monitoring behavior and goal-focused leadership. We report also some unexpected findings; for instance, the results show that negative feedback behavior is positively related to goal-focused leadership. Additionally, we found a positive relation between providing positive feedback behavior and goal-focused leadership. Furthermore, the results are showing that a leader who scores high on goal-focused style is more likely to defend his or her position than a leader who scores low on goal-focused leadership style. The present study also shows a negative relation between goal-focused leadership and visioning/giving one's own opinion, and disagreeing behavior. All in all, this study provides a better insight in the specific behaviors that goal-focused leaders display. It is important to understand how goal-focused leaders behave. They are important for the organizations because they clarify, specify and communicate the goals of the organization to the followers who have to accomplish these goals which in turn is needed to perform well as an organization. The organization can seldom define all goals and all the possible variation of responsibilities and personnel expectations which is expected of all followers in all situations (Stogdill, 1950), so the organization needs goal-focused leaders who clarify and communicate these goals of the organization to the followers.

Supervisors: Drs. A.M.G.M. Hoogeboom
Prof. Dr. C.P.M Wilderom

Keywords

Goal-focused leadership, Leader-effectiveness, Relation-oriented behaviors, Task-oriented behaviors, Video-based field study

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of goal-focused leadership has emerged from the early studies and articles of Locke about the goal-setting theory. His first article about the goal-setting theory was published in 1968: *"Towards a theory of task motivation and incentives"*. This article was one of his most important works, because it laid the foundation for the further developments of the goal-setting theory and it confirmed that there was a positive relationship between clearly identified goals and the performance of the followers. This is also supported by many other studies (Locke, 1968; Latham & Lee, Goal setting, 1986; Locke & Latham, 1984). Locke states in his article, *"Towards a theory of task motivation and incentives"*, that goals which are both specific and difficult lead to the highest performance of the followers. He states also that the commitment of the followers to the goals is very important to achieve high performance. When each follower is assigned to the same difficult goals, followers who are committed to achieving those goals will perform better than the followers who are not committed to those goals (Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984). The followers, who are committed, are more motivated when they get assigned difficult goals then when they get assigned simple goals. They work harder and perform better because they are more motivated with those difficult goals (Locke, 1968). Hannan (1975) tested the participation effect between the leaders and the followers in the goal-setting processes and found a positive relation between participation of the two parties in the goal-setting process and the goal acceptance of the followers. There are also findings suggesting that the involvement of the followers in the goal-setting leads to higher attainment of the goal and higher satisfaction among the followers (Willer & Miller, 1976). There are also studies which focus on the effect of the goal-focused leaders on the behaviors of the followers within the companies.

Colbert and Witt, for instance, found that goal-focused leaders trigger only the behaviors of the conscientious followers which in turn lead to high goal congruence and effective performance of only the highly conscientious followers. She defines conscientious followers as *"those workers who often know best how to effectively execute their work tasks"* (Colbert & Witt, 2009). The effect of goal-focused leaders on the performance of the low conscientious followers is significantly less than the high conscientious followers (Colbert & Witt, 2009). Klein and Kim (1998) are stating that there is a positive relation between leader-member exchange and goal commitment of the followers. The followers with higher leader-member exchange relationships are more committed to the goals than the followers with low leader-member exchange relationships, this is because the followers with higher leader-member exchange relationships have more motivation and therefore are willing to spend more time and energy to achieve a goal (Howard & Jay, 1998; Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Fairhurst, 1993; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Also the greater the followers` opportunity to affect the goal and exercise control, the more intrinsically valent the work goal accomplishment (House, 1971). Earlier studies also described the goal-setting process, about how to formulate and to set goals for the followers which in return leads to high effective performance of the followers and also the organization (House, 1971; Locke, 1968; Locke, 1996; Latham & Locke, 1991; Klein, Alge, Wesson, & Hollenbeck, 1999; Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991). However, all of these studies focus on effective goal-setting by the leader or the organization on the performances of the followers. Before we can proceed with the paper we have to define the concept goal-focused leadership. We define goal-focused leadership as leaders who develop practices and policies to communicate the organizational goals and align followers` effort with these goals, in line with Colbert and Witt (2009). A goal-focused leader sets the goals and defines the role responsibilities for his or her followers (Stogdill, 1950). The goal-focused leader also sets the direction and clarifies the goals for the followers which enable the followers to perform well (Colbert & Witt, 2009). As we have mentioned, the focus of the previous studies was on the effect of specific and difficult goals which were set by the goal-focused leaders, but no research has looked at the different behaviors of the goal-focused leaders. In this present study we will examine the different behaviors of the goal-focused leaders. This is of great importance, because if goal-focused leaders are showing more distinct behaviors than only setting difficult and specific goals, the leadership training and development programs would be able to focus on this kind of behaviors to train the leaders to become more effectively goal-focused.

In the next section of the paper a brief description is offered about the goal-focused leader. We will describe eight behaviors which frequently occur in a typical work context that, goal-focused leaders might exhibit. After we report the results of having tested the hypotheses in which behaviors of a goal-focused leader engages followers more than a non-goal-focused leader we know better characteristic of a goal-focused leader. Moreover, there is no earlier research being done on the relation between goal-focused leadership style and leader effectiveness. Hence, this study is also exploring those issues. It has also not yet been tested whether there are significant differences in the behaviors of goal-focused leaders. There are some scientific papers which describe effective leaders in the goal-setting processes (Latham & Locke, 1991; House, 1971; Erez & Kanfer, 1983) but the focus is more on the attributes of the goals which are set by the leaders for the followers and the leaders who are described in these articles are not always named as goal-focused leaders. We will test in this current study whether there is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership style and leader effectiveness, so we will look if goal-focused leaders are effective leaders. This is very important because this is what is widely assumed yet not shown by earlier studies. Earlier studies only focused on the relation between goal-focused leadership and follower or organizational effectiveness, the other papers focus on the attributes of the goals which are set by the leaders.

In the next part of the paper we will also further explain what we mean by leader effectiveness. We are assuming that there is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. Therefore the first aim of the present study is to examine whether a relationship exists between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. The second aim of the present study is to examine the different behaviors of the goal-focused leaders. There is no preliminary research done about the actual behaviors which goal-focused leaders show in the work place. However, there are some scientific papers on the effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship (Evans, 1970). In the early study of Evans (1970), he looked at two types of behaviors of supervisors which had potential influence on the path-goal instrumentality of the followers. The first behavior is initiation (Fleishman & Harris, 1955); the initiation includes behavior in which the leader defines the activities and the roles of each follower within the organization, the behavior also includes planning ahead and establishing ways to getting things done by the followers. The second behavior is consideration (Fleishman & Harris, 1955); consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust and respect between the supervisor and the followers. Both behaviors will be discussed in the next part of the paper. Evans (1970) showed that there is a relationship

between high initiation behavior of a leader and the positive path-goal instrumentality ("*instrumentality is the extent to which the path is seen as helping or hindering the individual in attaining his goals*") of a follower, only in conditions of high consideration (Evans, 1970). Evans (1970) focused only on those two types of behaviors and the effect on enabling the followers to attain their goals. In the present study we will not look at the effect of the behaviors of the goal-focused leader on their followers, but we will also analyze which behaviors the goal-focused leader shows when they meet with their followers.

In this present study we use the three meta-categories also named the three taxonomies of leadership behavior (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002), to subdivide the different behaviors of the goal-focused leadership in three broadly defined behavioral categories. This makes it easier to get an overview of the different behaviors which a goal-focused leader might show, and to better understand this leadership style. Therefore, the second aim of the present study is to examine which behaviors a goal-focused leader shows. We will look in this study only at two broadly defined categories of behaviors; Tasks-oriented behavior and Relations-oriented behavior. These two meta-categories will be explained more in detail in the next part of the paper.

The behaviors will be analyzed by video-observation method. The added value of this method for this study is that it enables the observers to observe the actual behaviors of the leaders and not the perceptual behaviors. In the Method part of this paper there will be given more explanation about the method which we have used. In summary, our aim with this current study is to briefly explain the positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness, and clearly describe the goal-focused leaders in terms of the behaviors which they show or engage in.

It is important to understand how goal-focused leaders behave. They are important for the organizations because they clarify, specify and communicate the goals of the organization to the followers who have to accomplish these goals which in turn is needed to perform well as an organization. The organization can seldom define all goals and all the possible variation of responsibilities and personnel expectations which is expected of all followers in all situations (Stogdill, 1950), so the organization needs goal-focused leaders who clarify and communicate the goals of the organization to the followers. This study will be important for the organizations if we can prove that there is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. The organizations need effective leaders to perform efficiently and effectively. If our assumptions are correct we then know that goal-focused leaders are effective leaders but we have still to gain insight in their behavioral repertoire. Only after we have examined the different behaviors of goal-focused leaders which we hypothesize, we can draw the conclusion on how a goal-focused leader behaves which in turn makes him or her effective leader.

The relevance of our research for the future studies is that our paper will give a detailed description about the goal-focused leader and his or her leader effectiveness. Some of the early studies have given a global description about goal-focused leadership and most of them did not named goal-focused leader at all in their papers, but the papers had the commonality that they spoke about the leader who was setting and directing the goals for their followers. As we have mentioned earlier in the Introduction there are few articles that specifically use the term goal-focused leadership, the concept is still almost new. In the next part of our paper we will look to the different behaviors which we expect from the goal-focused leaders and formulate hypothesis. For defining different behaviors which we expect

from the goal-focused leader we made use of scientific articles, which is outlined in the next part.

2. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

In this part of our paper we will explicate our expectations regarding goal-focused leaders. We do so with support of early scientific literatures; we convert our expectations in a limited set of hypotheses. We will first look at the relation between the goal-focused style of the leader and leader effectiveness. First, we have to define effective leadership. An effective leader is a person who leads a group which is effective (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Further, an effective leader is the person who achieves the organizational goals in an effective manner and represents his or her followers in an effective manner in the higher authority of the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1995). We assume that goal-focused leaders are effective leaders because they exhibit a more directing behavior; this behavior includes planning of short-term activities, clarifying task objectives and role expectations (Yukl, 2002). As mentioned in the introduction, there are scientific articles which are stating that goal-focused leaders trigger the behaviors of the conscientious followers which in turn leads to high goal congruence and effective performance of the conscientious followers (Colbert & Witt, 2009), so there is scientific support that goal-focused leaders influence the behaviors of the conscientious followers and make them more effective followers. In summary, a goal-focused leader leads effective followers; this is consistent with the description of an effective leader (Bass & Avolio, 1995). An effective leader is also the person who meets the job related needs of the followers in an efficient and effective way (Bass & Avolio, 1995). We assume that goal-focused leaders are effective leaders because when they assign clear goals to their followers, they are able to facilitate the followers better by providing them support and resources like money, time or additional equipment which enables the followers to achieve their goals (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991); these are some the characteristics of an effective leader referred by Bass and Avolio as mentioned above. The characteristics of an effective leader are also described by House (1971). First, an effective leader determines the rewards which are associated with goal accomplishment (House, 1971). Second, the effective leader assigns interesting tasks or opportunities for personal growth and development of the followers (House, 1971). Third, an effective leader provides support to their followers' efforts through his behavior, which enables the followers to achieve their goals (House, 1971). Fourth, the effective leader influences the intrinsic valences which are associated with goal achievement, by assigning and delegating the tasks for the followers (House, 1971). The greater the followers` opportunity to affect the goal and exercise control, the more intrinsically valent the work goal accomplishment (House, 1971). Finally, an effective leader reduces barriers for the followers, supports them in times of stress and has care for the needs of the followers (House, 1971). All these characteristics implicitly or explicitly refer to goals or goal accomplishment; therefore we are expecting all these characteristics of an effective leader which is described by Bass, Avolio and House in the behaviors of the goal-focused leader. First, we expect a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. Thus we hypothesize;

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness.

In the first part of our study we will test the first hypotheses, so testing if there is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. As already mentioned above, we expect that there is a positive relation between goal-focused leaders and leader effectiveness. If the hypothesis is correct we then know that goal-focused leaders are more effective leaders. This is very important because organizations need effective leaders to function properly, which is also mentioned in the Introduction. Because we expect that there is a positive relation between these two concepts, it is important to get insight in the behaviors that goal-focused leaders display. If we know how goal-focused leaders behave, we know how effective leaders behave, so we can train other leaders who are not goal-focused to learn this kind of behaviors to become a more goal focused and a more effective leader. In the second part of our study we will look what typical behaviors a goal-focused leader shows to define which behaviors make a leader a goal-focused leader.

A distinction is made between three broadly defined behavioral categories ("meta-categories"), in several hierarchical taxonomies (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002); Relations-oriented behavior, Tasks-oriented behavior and Change-oriented behavior (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). We have only used the meta-categories Tasks-oriented behavior and Relations-oriented behaviors because the behaviors we will examine in this present study are included in these two taxonomies and not in Change-oriented behaviors. Change-oriented behaviors include external monitoring, envisioning change and implementing change. It is important to make a clear distinction between the two taxonomies Relations-oriented behavior and Tasks-oriented behavior, because these two taxonomies are relevant for understanding and identifying goal-focused leaders and identifying behaviors which are potentially relevant for effective leadership. We have subdivided the first meta-category Tasks-oriented behavior into more specific behaviors which will be tested. The specific Task-oriented behaviors of the goal-focused leader which will be tested are; directing behavior, task monitoring behavior, informing behavior and negative feedback behavior. The second meta-category Relations-oriented behavior of the goal-focused leaders is subdivided into; visioning behavior, intellectual stimulation behavior, individualized consideration behavior and listening behavior. The specific behaviors that are expected of the goal-focused leader, the task and the relation oriented behaviors, will know be explained in more detail with support of scientific articles and also the hypotheses will be formulated.

First, we expect that there is a positive relation between visioning behavior and goal-focused leadership. The visioning behavior includes giving own opinion and suggestions (Bales, 1950). The behavior includes also explaining long term goals, directions, suggesting solutions (Borgatta, 1964) and encouraging innovative thinking (Yukl, 2002). The goal-focused leader (Latham & Locke, 1991) develops a vision for the organization that excites and inspires the followers; this is because the vision makes it clear to the followers why the work what they are performing is important for the future performance of the organization and gives them a sense of direction (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). The vision states and communicates the desired future position which an organization wants to achieve in the long-term of her operations. When the goal-focused leaders provide a strategic direction for the followers by setting goals that are related to the vision of the organization and by defining roles, responsibilities, and priorities, the followers respond with higher levels of performance (Colbert & Witt, 2009). Therefore we expect that a goal-focused leader exhibit a more visioning long term behavior

and visioning/giving own opinion behavior. Thus we hypothesize;

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relation between the visioning behavior and goal-focused leadership.

Second, we assume that there is a positive relation between informing behavior and goal-focused leadership. The informing behavior includes giving factual information (Borgatta, 1964). The goal-focused leader sets and communicates challenging short-term goals for the followers which reflect and implement the vision (Latham & Locke, 1991). They use policies and practices to communicate organizational goals and align followers` efforts with these goals (Colbert & Witt, 2009). Using short-term goals; the vision is made more concrete and clear to the followers. "*The followers should understand clearly why these goals are set for them, and understand how their performance is being measured*" (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991). It is important for a goal-focused leadership to communicate and to inform the short-term goals clearly to their followers because otherwise problems like incomprehension and diffusion can occur among the followers, because they do not know what to do, how to do, or why they are performing certain tasks. So, informing includes communicating specific tasks objectives and directing of these objectives toward performance of important duties and responsibilities which encourages the followers to search for efficient ways to accomplish the goals (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). Based on the articles mentioned above we expect that goal-focused leader exhibit a more informing behavior. We formulate the third hypothesis as;

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive relation between the informing behavior and goal-focused leadership.

Third, we expect that there is a positive relation between directing behavior and goal-focused leadership. We formulate directing behavior as following; dividing the tasks among followers and determining the direction for the followers. The behavior includes planning of short-term activities, clarifying task objectives and role expectations (Yukl, 2002). A third characteristic of a goal-focused leadership is modelling the behavior of the followers on decision-making and problem-solving and also taking action steps for achieving the short-term goals which are necessary for achieving the distal goals (Latham & Locke, 1991). The goal-focused leader is differentiated from the other members of the organization in terms of the influence he exerts upon the goal-setting and goal achievement activities of the organization (Stogdill, 1950). They should provide sufficient support and resources like time, money or additional equipment to achieve the goals (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991). The goal-focused leaders can provide support for the followers by their own behavior and thereby influence the probability that this effort will result in goal achievement (House, 1971). The support which the followers obtain form the goal-focused leaders influence their determination to strive to achieve their goals (Howard & Jay, 1998). The goal-focused leaders also define role responsibilities (Stogdill, 1950), role responsibility defines the duties which a follower is expected to perform and also defines the persons to whom and for whom he or she is accountable for in the discharge of his or her duties, and determine the right direction for the followers (Colbert & Witt, 2009). It is also important for the goal-focused leaders to determine what extrinsic rewards should be associated with goal accomplishment of the followers (House, 1971); this could be financial bonuses, assignment of more interesting tasks, opportunities for personal development, promotion, job security (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991) or time off. If this is done correctly by the goal-focused leader

there will be made clear linkage between work-goal achievement and reward. Therefore we expect that goal-focused leaders exhibit a more directing behavior against their followers. The directing behavior which we will test corresponds with the initiation behavior (Evans, 1970), the initiation includes behavior in which the leader defines the activities and the roles of each follower within the organization, the behavior also includes planning ahead and establishing ways to getting things done by the followers. The early study of Evans (1970) showed that there is a relationship between high initiation behavior of a leader and the positive path-goal instrumentality (*"instrumentality is the extent to which the path is seen as helping or hindering the individual in attaining his goals"*) of a follower, only in conditions of high consideration (Evans, 1970). Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust and respect between the leader and the followers, which will be discussed in the eighth hypothesis. We assume that goal-focused leaders show a more directing behavior. For example, a situation where the leader imposes the follower to perform a certain task within a certain period of time and the follower cannot refuse it because he or she have to perform that certain task because "the boss said so". Thus we hypothesize the following;

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive relation between the directing behavior and goal-focused leadership.

Fourth, we expect that goal-focused leaders are showing more listening and intellectual stimulation behavior. We formulate the listening behavior as; listening actively, showing verbally and or nonverbally that the speaker is understood. The intellectual stimulation behavior is formulated as; positively stimulating the behaviors of the followers and challenging them professionally. The behavior includes asking for orientation, opinion and suggestions (Bales, 1950). The behavior includes also consulting with the follower when making decisions and empowering followers to take initiative in problem solving (Yukl, 2002). The goal-focused leaders listen to the ideas and concerns of the followers about the short-term and the distal goals (Latham & Locke, 1991). The goal-focused leader may involve followers in co-operative setting and implementing their goals for task accomplishment so that the followers can help develop effective action plans and strategies (Campbell & Gingrich, 1986; Earley, 1985). According to Erez and Kafner (1983) participation in decision making is suggested as an effective strategy to cope with low acceptance. With participation in decision making the followers' knowledge and the understanding increases, this is because of providing of information on personal level by the leader to the follower (Lewin, 1951). The understanding of the followers' increases also because of the leader communicates the inputs from all followers and gives them the opportunity to analyze the information and to fit it with their own view of the situation (Lewin, 1951). According to Lewin (1951) participation in decision making gives the follower more control of the goal which he or she has to achieve and creates more commitment to that goal. Participation in decision making between the leader and the follower has also a positive effect on the performance of the follower because the participation serves to clarify the effort-performance linkage (Neider, 1980). Participation in decision making is more effective when the goal-focused leader lacks the information which is necessary for defining a goal and when the acceptance of the followers is not certain (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Willer and Miller (1976) found evidence that involvement of followers in goal-setting leads to a significantly higher goal attainment, shorter stay and higher satisfaction of the followers. The study of Hannan (1975) has also found a positive relationship between participation of the followers in

the goal-setting process and goal acceptance by the followers. Based on the articles which are mentioned above we expect that goal-focused leaders exhibit a more listening and intellectual stimulation behavior. We formulate the following hypotheses which;

Hypothesis 5: There is a positive relation between the listening behavior and goal-focused leadership.

Hypothesis 6: There is a positive relation between the intellectual stimulation behavior and goal-focused leadership.

Further, we expect a positive relation between two behaviors, task monitoring behavior and individualized consideration behavior, and goal-focused leadership. We formulate task monitoring behavior as; checking on the current situation, coming back on previously made agreements and interrupting when someone is talking. The behavior includes giving evaluation and showing inadequacy (Borgatta, 1964). The behavior includes also monitoring operations and performance (Yukl, 2002). We formulate individualized consideration as; showing interest for the follower's feelings or situation, showing empathy and creating a friendly environment. The behavior includes social acknowledgements (Borgatta, 1964) and supporting like using humor (Feyerherm, 1994). The behavior also includes providing recognition for achievements and contributions, providing support and encouragement, developing follower skills and confidence (Yukl, 2002). Further we assume that there is a negative relation between negative feedback behavior and goal-focused leadership, so we assume that goal-focused leaders do not exhibit the negative feedback behavior. We formulate negative feedback behavior as; criticizing the behavior of the followers. The behavior occurs often when there is a disagreement between the followers and the leaders (Borgatta, 1964).

The goal-focused leader should value the progress of the tasks and the performance of individual followers by measuring it and giving feedback to the followers about their performances and support them (Latham & Locke, 1991). It could be measured by observing the work of the follower, reading written reports and holding progress review meetings with the follower or the group (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). Without such feedback from the leaders, the followers will not know if they are performing well or that their task strategies are appropriate (Becker , 1978; Erez, 1977; Matsui, Okada, & Inoshita, 1983). If there is a positive feedback about the performance of the follower, the follower experiences satisfaction with goal attainment so he or she will be motivated (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991) on the other hand negative feedback may generate a negative effect on the motivation of the followers. An effective goal-focused leader should also reduce the frustrating barriers within a company and being supportive in times of stress (House, 1971). The frustrating barriers can be compared with the situational constraints of goal-commitment identified by Hollenbeck and Klein (1987). The situational constraints are characteristics of a work environment which act as a barrier for performance of the followers, by preventing them from converting their motivation and ability into performance (Peters, O'Connor, & Eurlberg, 1985). Some examples of situational constraints are lack of materials, information and time. The followers who are faced with these situational constraints become frustrated because they cannot perform well while they have the ability and the motivation to succeed. The frustration that arises by the followers because of the situational constraints reduces the motivation of the followers by reducing expectancy perceptions (Peters, O'Connor, & Eurlberg, 1985). Some studies (Latham & Saari, Importance of supportive relationships in goal setting,

1979) have defined leader supportiveness as showing interest in the personal growth, well-being and development of a follower, which we call in this current paper as individualized consideration. In the study of Klein and Kim (1998) the concept of leader supportiveness is examined in terms of the leader-member exchange (LMX). According to the LMX theory, the leaders develop several relationships with their followers on a dyadic basis (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The leaders can have low-quality exchange as high-quality exchange with their followers (Howard & Jay, 1998). Several early studies have documented that higher-LMX followers are given greater rewards, status and support by their leaders and enjoy more mutual trust and respect than lower-LMX followers (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Fairhurst, 1993; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). It has also been proven by Fairhurst (1993), that higher LMX followers have a greater sense of obligation and internalization of common goals. There is also positive relation found by Klein and Kim (1998) between leader-member exchange and goal commitment of the followers, LMX was primarily determinant of goal commitment of the followers. The followers with higher quality exchange relationships are willing to make extra effort, for example they do extra tasks which are not prescribed by the company (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Goal-focused leaders should consider the social values in relation with their members in striving toward goal achievement; if the leader ignores the social values of the followers he is likely to lose their followers (Stogdill, 1950). There is already proven by early study that there is a positive relationship between the consideration exhibited by the leader and the path-goal instrumentality of a follower, in some conditions (Evans, 1970). Consideration includes behavior which emphasizes a deeper concern for the follower needs and includes behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication (Evans, 1970). The followers are then more likely to develop high levels of person-organization goal congruence; this enables in turn the followers to achieve goals and leads to effective performance of the followers and also the company (Colbert & Witt, 2009). Based on these articles which are mentioned above, we formulate the following hypotheses;

Hypothesis 7: There is a positive relation between the task monitoring behavior and goal-focused leadership.
Hypothesis 8: There is a positive relation between the individualized consideration behavior and goal-focused leadership.
Hypothesis 9: There is a negative relation between negative feedback behavior and goal-focused leadership.

3. METHOD

3.1 Design of study
In this cross-sectional study design two different data sources are used: (1) a survey measured the goal-focused style and the effectiveness of each leader, and (2) reliably video-coded monitoring followers' and leader behavior during staff meetings. The overall effectiveness and the goal-focused style of each leader were rated per leader by the survey scores of the followers. By systematic video-coding, various behaviors of the leaders and followers have been observed. By using this variety of methods and sources, common source bias is reduced in this study (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

3.2 Sampling
The leader sample consisted of 14 leaders employed in a large Dutch public sector organization. Those leaders were either from M1 level of management or M2 level of management within this public organization. The sample was comprised of 9 male (64.3%) and 5 female (35.7%) leaders and the leaders were on average 52.5 years old, ranging from 46 to 61 (SD=4.6). The average job tenure of the leader sample is 27.2 years, ranging from 3 to 43 (SD=13.92). Next to the leader sample, the sample of the followers consisted of 172 employees employed in the same large Dutch public sector organization as the leaders. The sample was comprised of 112 male (65.1%) and 50 female followers (29.1%) while 10 participants did not answer the question. These followers were on average 49.4 years of age, ranging from 22 to 64 (SD=10.31). The followers have an average job tenure of 24.7 years (SD=13.43), ranging from 6 months to 44 years. The leaders and followers were asked, directly after the video recorded staff meeting, to fill out a survey in which they were asked about goal-focused style and leader effectiveness. In total, 14 leaders and 172 followers filled in the survey, which resulted in a response rate of 100% for the leaders and 100% for the followers.

3.3 Measures
Leader effectiveness. As mentioned above there are 14 leaders observed in this study. The degree to which a leader is perceived as an effective leader was assessed through followers' survey scores. The leader effectiveness is measured with the 4 items which are described by Bass and Avolio (1995), see Appendix. In the survey we formulated statements about the effectiveness of the leaders. The response categories ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items about the effectiveness of the leader which had to be scored by the followers were; "Leader (X) leads a group that is effective", "leader (X) is effective in meeting my job-related need", "leader (X) is effective in meeting organizational requirements", "leader (X) is effective in representing me to higher authority". The Cronbach´s alpha for the 4 items of leader effectiveness was .917. The followers have filled in the score sheet independently of each other, so they do not influence each other in giving scores. Follower rating effectiveness scores were calculated by averaging the scores which they have given for each leader, which ranged from 2 to 7 (SD=0.92684).
Goal-focused Leadership. The degree to which a leader is perceived as having a goal-focused style was also assessed through followers' survey scores. The goal-focused style is measured with the goal-focused style items which are described by Colbert and Wit (2009) and Lee (1991), see Appendix. In the survey there are given statements about the degree of goal-focused style of the leaders. The response categories ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The statements about the goal-focused style of the leader which had to be scored by the followers comes from the article of Colbert and Wit (2009), these statements were; "Leader (X) provides directions and defines priorities", "leader (X) clarifies specific roles and responsibilities", "leader (X) translates strategies in understandable objectives and plans", "leader (X) links the unit's missions in to the mission of the company overall" and "leader (X) follows up to make sure the job gets done". If a follower for example, gives a score of 7 for all of these statements, we know that this follower rates his leader as a high goal-focused leader. The Cronbach´s alpha for the 5 items of goal-focused style was .913. The followers filled in the score sheets independently of each other, so they do not influence each other in giving the scores. The followers´ scores on goal-

focused style were calculated by averaging the scores which they have given for each leader, which ranged from 2.6 to 7 (SD=0.84190).

Tasks-oriented behavior and Relations-oriented behavior.
The 14 leaders which are observed for this study are video recorded during regular staff meetings. There were in total 3 cameras placed at each meeting. The cameras were placed at fixed positions in the meeting room, directed to the leader(s) and the followers. The three cameras were considered as a permanent part of the background (Erickson, 1992; Foster & Cone, 1980; Mead, 1995). After the meetings we asked the followers how they perceived the behavior of the leader during the video-taped meeting, we have asked this kind of questions to control the reactivity assumptions. To this effect, we asked also the followers about the relative representativeness off the leader's behavior in the video-taped meetings. The response categories ranged from 1 (*not representative*) to 7 (*highly representative*). The average score of the responses was (5.5732) (SD=1.33872), indicating that the leader´s behavior was representative. In coding the Tasks-oriented behavior and Relations-oriented behavior in a systematic way we used a detailed behavioral observation scheme, which is designed and developed in the previous studies (Gupta , Wilderom, & Van Hillegersberg, 2009; Hoogeboom, Wilderom, Nijhuis, & Van Den Berg, 2011; Van Der Weide, 2007). Two independent observers, per video, have minutely coded the different behaviors of the leaders by using a specialized software program "The Observer XT" (Noldus, Trienes, Hendriksen, Jansen, & Jansen , 2000; Spiers, 2004). All independent observers were trained to use the software, observation scheme and the associated codebook (Gupta , Wilderom, & Van Hillegersberg, 2009). The behavioral codebook consists of 15 pages detailed description of the 15 mutually exclusive leader behaviors. In the Appendix, there is given a table with a short description about the 15 different leader behaviors. The two independent observers discussed their results with each other after coding the videos. The results of the video observations are discussed with the use of the confusion error matrix and inter-rater reliability output generated by the program. There has been reached an inter-rater reliability of 94.83% (Kappa =.9483), this can be interpreted as an "almost perfect" agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). The different behaviors of the goal-focused leader were coded as frequencies and as duration. One of the Relations-oriented behaviors will not be examined any more in this present study, and that is the listening behavior. Hypothesis 6 will not be tested in this study. The behavior is not been coded because it is too difficult to code listening behavior for all of the followers and the leaders during the staff meetings when someone else is speaking, therefore we omitted the listening behavior in this present study. The positive relation between goal-focused leadership and listening behavior should be examined by future studies.

3.4 Video Observation Method
During randomly selected staff meetings in the ordinary course of business the 14 leaders and 172 followers were videotaped. A total of 1800 minutes have been recorded while each meeting took 138 minutes on average. Through the behavioral software program "The Observer XT" which has been developed for the analysis, management and presentation of observational data (Noldus, Trienes, Hendriksen, Jansen, & Jansen , 2000), the videos were precisely coded and analyzed. The observers were six third year students of International Business Administration and three master students of the University of Twente who all received training about "The Observer XT". Additionally, they learnt how to apply the 15-pages behavioral coding scheme within the software (Van Der Weide, 2007). These trainings and

clear instructions helped to enhance the accuracy of the coding of different behaviors. On basis of the behavioral coding scheme, the pre-defined sets of behaviors were coded very precisely for each leader and each follower to ensure valid and reliable results. In order to avoid subjectivity bias, two observers coded each video independently and subsequently the results were compared through the so-called confusion error matrix by "The Observer XT" to determine inter-reliability. This inter-reliability was defined as the percentage of agreement of a specific code within a time range of two seconds and if significant differences or disagreements occurred, the observers reviewed, discussed and recoded the affected fragment. In this study, the obtained average inter-reliability rate was 94.83%. Video cameras are used instead of outside people sitting in the same room who observe the meeting and take notes. Hence, observer bias is prevented and the meeting takes place without any interferences.

3.5 Behavioral Coding Scheme
There has been developed a behavioral coding scheme in order to define specific leadership behaviors during the daily work practices (Gupta , Wilderom, & Van Hillegersberg, 2009; Nijhuis, Hulsman, Wildeorm, & Van Den Berg, 2009; Van Der Weide, 2007). In the Appendix, there has been added a table which contains different leadership behaviors which are coded in this current study. After each behavior, there has been given a short description about the behavior and a couple of examples to understand the different behaviors more in detail. A solid base for this video coding scheme has been developed by Bales (1950) and Borgatta (1964). Bales (1950) and Borgatta (1964) observed in their early studies the interaction processes between the leaders and their followers. The observation of the interaction processes is done without any use of tape-recording device. In their exploratory work they made distinction between three broadly defined behaviors; neutral task oriented behavior, positive-social emotional behavior and the remaining socio-emotional behavior. Bales' (1950) and Borgatta´s (1964) work provided a practical scheme for coding of a range of leadership behaviors (Yukl, 2002). Feyerherm (1994) extended the work of Bales and Borgatta; he used an experimental approach towards measuring the leadership behaviors and added some task-oriented and social-oriented behaviors to the work of Bales and Borgatta. The three coding schemes, (Bales, 1950; Borgatta, 1964; Feyerherm, 1994), have two important commonalities. First, all of the three schemes assess the directly observable behavior. Second, the three studies use behavioral schemes to code leader behavior in a group context (*e.g.,* (Avolio, Howell, & Sosik, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1995; Pearce, et al., 2003; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). We have also used the behavioral taxonomy of Yukl et al. (2002) in the development of the behavioral coding scheme. It is more accurately to describe the behaviors of the leaders more in detail, the observable behaviors, than in one or two meta-constructs such as transactional or transformational leadership. Examples of behavior coded as directing behavior are; "I want you to have the work done next week", "You handle this one", and "Do you want to figure this out for me?".

4. RESULTS
Table 1 present an overview of the frequency and the duration of the coded behaviors. Informing behavior (27%) is the most frequently occurring behavior in comparison with the other types of behaviors which we have coded. In Table 1 we see, that the leaders in 42% of the total meeting time were showing informing behavior. Visioning/giving own opinion (16%) is the

second most frequently occurring behavior; they showed this behavior for 17% of the total meeting time. Thirdly, the most frequent behavior is structuring the conservation (7%), with duration of 10% of the total time. Showing disinterest has the lowest frequency in this present study with 0.16% and duration of 0.02%. The second, lowest frequency of displayed behavior is individualized consideration (1%), with duration of 0.4%. Thirdly, the lowest frequency is personal informing (1.06%), with duration of 1.6% of the total time. We can draw the conclusion that the leaders, who were observed in this present study, are showing more informing, visioning/giving own opinion and structuring the conversation behaviors in comparison with the other types of behaviors.

TABLE 1 Frequency and duration of the behaviors in %

Displayed behaviors	Frequency	Duration
1. Showing disinterest	0,16%	0,02%
2. Defending one's own position	3,54%	3,79%
3. Providing negative feedback	1,37%	1,40%
4. Disagreeing	2,01%	0,48%
5. Agreeing	6,88%	1,91%
6. Directing/Correcting	5,18%	1,16%
7. Directing/Delegating	2,97%	2,70%
8. Task monitoring	9,49%	3,72%
9. Structuring the conversation	7,35%	9,91%
10. Informing	27,03%	41,89%
11. Visioning/giving own opinion	15,60%	17,34%
12. Visioning, long term	2,87%	5,38%
13. Intellectual stimulation	4,64%	3,61%
14. Individualized consideration	4.9%	2,24%
15. Humor	3,20%	1,48%
16. Providing positive feedback	1,75%	1,36%
17. Personal informing	1,06%	1,61%
Total	100,00%	100,00%

In this present study we have used the *zero-order Spearman statistics* to compute bivariate correlation of the key variables. We did this for the frequency and also for the duration of the behaviors, see Table 2a for the duration and Table 2b for the frequency of the behaviors. The zero-order Spearman statistics provide an initial view on the first hypothesis. Hypothesis 1 predicted that leaders with goal-focused style engender high scores on leader effectiveness; Table 2a and Table 2b indeed show that there is a significant positive correlation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness (r=.868, p<.001), supporting Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 predicted a positive relation between visioning behavior and goal-focused leadership. The results are showing that there is no significant correlation between the visioning long term behavior and goal-focused leadership, not in frequency or duration (respectively; r=.313, p>.05, r= .236, p>.05). Furthermore a significant negative correlation between goal-focused leadership and visioning/giving own opinion behavior is found (r=-.596, p<.05, r=-.51, p<.05), rejecting Hypothesis 2 completely. The third hypothesis focused on the positive relation between informing behavior and goal-focused leadership, no correlation between these variables was found, either in duration or frequency (r=.282, p>.05, r=,053, p>.05), rejecting Hypothesis 3. The fourth hypothesis predicted a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and directing behavior. Correlational

analysis indicated a little correlation between these two variables (r=.354, p>.05, r=.38, p>.05). These results show no support for Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 6 focused on the positive relation between intellectual stimulation behavior and goal-focused leadership, also no correlation between these two variables was found (r=-.264, p>.05, r=-.356, p>.05), rejecting Hypothesis 6. Hypothesis 7 predicted a positive relation between task monitoring behavior and goal-focused leadership; Table 2b shows indeed a significant positive correlation between goal-focused leadership and the frequency of task monitoring behavior (r=.541, p<.05). Table 2a shows no significant correlation between goal-focused leadership and the duration of task monitoring behavior (r=.42, p>.05). These results show support for Hypothesis 7, only for the frequency of the task monitoring behavior. Hypothesis 8, suggested a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and individualized consideration behavior; the results show no significant correlation between these two key variables (r=-.148, p>.05, r=-.092, p>.05), rejecting Hypothesis 8. Hypothesis 9 focused on the negative relation between goal-focused leadership and negative feedback behavior; Table 2a shows the opposite, it shows a significant positive relation between goal-focused leadership and the duration of negative feedback behavior (r=.559, p<.05). Table 2b shows no significant correlation for the frequency of the behavior (r=.352, p>.05). These results show no support for Hypothesis 9.

TABLE 2a Correlations between goal-focused leadership and leader behavior during regular staff meetings

Duration	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (1 tailed)
Leader Effectiveness **	0,868	0,01
Behavior		
1. Showing disinterest *	0,516	0,029
2. Defending one´s own position*	0,528	0,026
3. Providing negative feedback *	0,559	0,019
4. Disagreeing	-0,433	0,061
5. Agreeing	0,2	0,246
6. Directing/Correcting	0,007	0,491
7. Directing/Delegating	0,354	0,107
8. Task monitoring	0,42	0,067
9. Structuring the conversation	0,246	0,198
10. Informing	0,282	0,165
11. Visioning/giving own opinion*	-0,596	0,012
12. Visioning, long term	0,313	0,138
13. Intellectual stimulation	-0,264	0,181
14. Individualized consideration	-0,148	0,307
15. Humor *	0,515	0,03
16. Providing positive feedback **	0,731	0,001
17. Personal informing	0,451	0,053

*p<.05, one tailed

**p<.01, one tailed

TABLE 2b Correlations between goal-focused leadership and leader behavior during regular staff meetings

Frequency	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (1 tailed)
Leader Effectiveness **	0,868	0,01
Behavior		
1. Showing disinterest *	0,495	0,036
2. Defending one´s own position*	0,543	0,022
3. Providing negative feedback	0,352	0,109
4. Disagreeing *	-0,555	0,02
5. Agreeing	0,035	0,452
6. Directing/Correcting	0,002	0,497
7. Directing/Delegating	0,38	0,09
8. Task monitoring *	0,541	0,023
9. Structuring the conversation	0,22	0,225
10. Informing	0,053	0,429
11. Visioning/giving own opinion*	-0,51	0,031
12. Visioning, long term	0,236	0,208
13. Intellectual stimulation	-0,356	0,105
14. Individualized consideration	-0,092	0,337
15. Humor	0,418	0,068
16. Providing positive feedback*	0,603	0,011
17. Personal informing	0,437	0,059

*p <.05, one tailed

**p <.01, one tailed

Since, the behaviors were not normally distributed we used the *Mann-Whitney U tests* to compute the 1-tailed significant differences between the two comparison groups, (i.e., leader scoring high on goal-focused leadership , and leader scoring low on goal-focused leadership). In Table 3a the duration of the behaviors is presented and in Table 3b the frequency of the behaviors is shown. We compared the duration and the frequency of the behaviors for the 3 team leaders who scored low on goal-focused style with the 3 team leaders who scored high on goal-focused style. We did not find a positive significant difference between the highly and lower goal-focused leaders for the visioning long term behavior (respectively; p>.05, p>.05). For the visioning/giving own opinion behavior we found a negative significant difference between the two comparison groups (p<.05, p<.05). Additionally, no significant difference between the comparison groups was found for the informing behavior (p>.05, p>.05). We found also no significant difference between the highly and lower goal-focused leaders for the directing behavior (p>.05, p>.05). Furthermore, the results show no significant difference between the highly and lower goal-focused leaders for the frequency of the task monitoring behavior (p>.05), see Table 3b. For the duration of the task monitoring behavior we found positive significant difference between the comparison groups (p<.05), see Table 3a. The results show no significant difference between the highly and lower goal-focused leader for the duration and the frequency of the individualized consideration behavior (p>.05, p>.05). We did not also find significant difference between the comparison groups for the negative feedback behavior (p>.05, p>.05).

The present study shows also some interesting results. The results show that the difference between the comparison groups is significant for the behavior defending one`s own position (p<.05, p<.05), but we did not expect this kind of behavior for goal-focused leaders so we did not hypothesized

this behavior. For the frequency of disagreeing behavior we found a significant difference between the comparison groups (p <.05), see Table 3b. There is also found a significant difference between the highly and lower goal-focused leaders for the duration of the behavior providing positive feedback (p<.05), see Table3a.

TABLE 3a Mann-Whitney Test and Direction in Terms of the Behaviors of the Leaders Scoring Highest and Lowest on Goal-focused style

Duration Behavior	n=3 high	n=3 low	Sig. 2 tailed	Sig. 1 tailed
1. Showing disinterest	0,05%	0,00%	0,629	0,3145
2. Defending one's own position*	5,69%	0,52%	0,057	0,0285
3. Providing negative feedback	3,71%	0,70%	0,114	0,057
4. Disagreeing	0,17%	1,16%	0,229	0,1145
5. Agreeing	2,19%	2,50%	1	0,5
6. Directing/Correcting	1,02%	1,72%	0,857	0,4285
7. Directing/Delegating	2,52%	0,78%	0,114	0,057
8. Task monitoring *	7,33%	2,06%	0,057	0,0285
9. Structuring the conversation	4,79%	2,34%	0,229	0,1145
10. Informing	43,74%	35,83%	0,4	0,2
11. Visioning, giving own opinion *	8,63%	40,81%	0,057	0,0285
12. Visioning, long term	6,27%	2,89%	0,229	0,1145
13. Intellectual stimulation	2,85%	4,21%	0,229	0,1145
14. Individualized consideration	2,76%	2,15%	0,629	0,3145
15. Humor	1,82%	1,35%	0,4	0,2
16. Providing positive feedback *	3,19%	0,05%	0,057	0,0285
17. Personal informing	2,37%	0,20%	0,4	0,2

*p <.05, one tailed

**p<.01, one tailed

TABLE 3b Mann-Whitney Test and Direction in Terms of the Behaviors of the Leaders Scoring Highest and Lowest on Goal-focused style

Frequency Behavior	n=3 high	n=3 low	Sig. 2 tailed	Sig. 1 tailed
1. Showing disinterest	0,19%	0,00%	0,629	0,3145
2. Defending one's own position*	5,39%	0,77%	0,057	0,0285
3. Providing negative feedback	2,14%	0,80%	0,229	0,1145
4. Disagreeing *	0,46%	4,25%	0,057	0,0285
5. Agreeing	6,88%	8,80%	0,857	0,4285
6. Directing/Correcting	4,74%	5,59%	1	0,5
7. Directing/Delegating	2,98%	0,92%	0,114	0,057
8. Task monitoring	15,39%	4,44%	0,114	0,057
9. Structuring the conversation	7,07%	3,67%	0,629	0,3145
10. Informing	23,38%	23,30%	0,629	0,3145
11. Visioning/giving own opinion *	8,69%	31,03%	0,057	0,0285
12. Visioning, long term	2,98%	2,14%	0,629	0,3145
13. Intellectual stimulation	3,35%	5,59%	0,229	0,1145
14. Individualized consideration	4,83%	4,51%	0,857	0,4285
15. Humor	4,04%	3,40%	0,4	0,2
16. Providing positive feedback	2,60%	0,19%	0,114	0,057
17. Personal informing	1,95%	0,38%	0,4	0,2

*p <.05, one tailed

**p<.01, one tailed

5. DISCUSSION

In order to get insight in different behaviors that goal-focused leaders display and the relation between the goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness, this study used a method which is still rarely deployed in the leadership studies; it entails

fine-grained analysis of video-based leader behaviors captured during regularly held staff meetings. We contribute with this present study to the leadership literature in several ways. First, we have found positive significant correlation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. There is no research done yet, to our knowledge, about the positive relation between goal-focused leadership style and leader effectiveness. There are some scientific papers which describe effective leaders in the goal-setting processes (Latham & Locke, 1991; House, 1971; Erez & Kanfer, 1983), but the focus in these studies is more on the attributes of the goals which are set by the leaders for their followers. The leaders which are described in these studies are not always exhibiting a goal-focused style, so these papers are not specific about the level of goal-focused leadership. We can conclude from our results that leaders with a more goal-focused style are more effective.

The study found a direct relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. Previous research found that a goal-focused leader triggers the behaviors of the conscientious followers which in turn leads to high goal congruence and effective performance of the conscientious followers (Colbert & Witt, 2009), he or she also plans short term activities and clarifies task objectives and role expectations (Yukl, 2002). The goal-focused leader also meets the job related needs of the followers in a more efficient and effective way (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The tasks and style which are mentioned in the previous sentences make it even more plausible that a goal-focused leader is more effective.

Second, task monitoring behavior during team meetings is found to be significantly related to goal-focused leadership, in a positive direction. There are some early studies, as mentioned in the Theory part of this study, suggesting that leaders in the goal-setting process should value the progress of the tasks and the performance of the individual followers by measuring it (by reading written reports and holding progress review meetings with the individual follower) and giving feedback to the followers about their performance and support them (Latham & Locke, 1991; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research, 2002). Without such task monitoring behavior of the goal-focused leaders, the followers will not know if they are performing well or that their tasks strategies are appropriate (Becker , 1978; Erez, 1977; Matsui, Okada, & Inoshita, 1983). In this present study we have shown that the leader who scores high on goal-focused style is exhibiting more task monitoring behavior in a meeting than a leader who scores low on this style. As mentioned earlier, the early studies made some suggestions about the visioning behavior of the leader in goal-setting process, but we have examined and shown in this present study that goal-focused leaders are actually showing this behavior during staff meetings. Our results support the suggestions of the previous studies about the task monitoring behavior of the leaders in the goal-setting process.

We also found some other interesting results. Hypothesis 9 predicted a negative relation between goal-focused leadership and negative feedback behavior. To our surprise, we found a significant positive relation between these two variables. In general a goal-focused leader defines role responsibilities for their followers (Stogdill, 1950), and the role responsibilities defines the duties which a follower is expected to perform and also defines the persons to whom he or she is accountable for in the discharge of his or her duties (Colbert & Witt, 2009), to keep them on track. By giving such feedback followers can perceive leaders who display such behaviors as more goal-focused. We can conclude that a goal-focused leader exactly knows which duties should be performed at what level

by the individual follower. This implies that if a follower not meet the leader's expectations, it is normal that the goal-focused leader will give negative feedback to their followers. If a goal-focused leader does not provide negative feedback to their followers, followers could develop unrealistically favorable view of them self (Silverman, Pogson, & Cober, 2005). A follower who is unaware of his or her actual performance and capabilities may underestimate the time it takes to accomplish a certain goal, which can reduce the work quality and therefore the goal accomplishment (Silverman, Pogson, & Cober, 2005). The most effective feedback interventions focus attention at the task level, provide specific recommendations for improvements, and come from a trusted and knowledgeable source (Silverman, Pogson, & Cober, 2005), in this case the goal-focused leader. It should be further examined by future studies whether a goal-focused leader gives feedback in a specific way. Silverman (2005) recommends that leaders should provide task-focused, clear, specific and frequent feedback, which may be negative.

Goal-focused leadership and positive feedback behavior were also related. The results are showing that a leader, who scores high on goal-focused style, gives more positive feedback to his or her follower than a leader who scores low on goal-focused style. Previous studies suggested that if there is a positive feedback about the performance of the follower, the follower experiences satisfaction with goal attainment, so he or she will be motivated (Lee, Bobko, Early, & Locke, 1991). This may explain the positive relation between goal-focused leadership and providing positive feedback. A goal-focused leader gives positive feedback to his or her followers to motivate them to reach the goals.

We also found a significant positive relation between goal-focused leadership and the behavior "defending one's own position". The results show that a leader who scores high on goal-focused style is more defending his or her position than a leader who scores low on goal-focused style. We did not examine more of the counterproductive behaviors in this present study, because the focus in this study is more on the Tasks and Relations-oriented behaviors. The positive relation can be caused by the assertiveness of the goal-focused leaders. Assertiveness is considered as a dimension describing people's tendency to speak up for, defend and act in the interest of themselves and their own goals, values and preferences (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Wilson & Gallois, 1993). High level of assertiveness often brings instrumental rewards and short term goal achievements, but it can be costly when the relationship fails (Ames & Flynn, 2007). On the other hand, low levels of assertiveness bring social benefits but it can undermine goal achievement (Ames & Flynn, 2007). The goal-focused leaders stimulate and motivate followers to achieve certain goals, because of that we expect that a goal-focused leader exhibit a higher assertiveness than other leadership styles. The high assertiveness of the goal-focused leader can be interpreted as defending own position by the followers, because a highly assertive person defends and acts in the interest of himself. It is important for future research to examine the positive relation between the counterproductive behaviors and goal-focused leaders, because of the significant relationship we have found.

Furthermore, we found a significantly negative relation between goal-focused leadership and visioning/giving own opinion behavior, while we hypothesized a positive relation between these two variables. We found that leaders who scored high on goal-focused style show less visioning and give fewer opinions than the leaders who scored low on goal-focused leadership. The goal-focused leader is differentiated from the other members of the organization in terms of the influence he exerts upon the goal-setting and goal achievement

activities of the organization (Stogdill, 1950). As noted before, a goal-focused leaders knows exactly which goals have to be achieved and by whom. It is understandable that a leader who scores high on goal-focused style is less visioning/giving fewer opinions, because he or she has the knowledge about the goals which have to be performed and how they should be reached, so he or she gives the followers the right information instead of giving opinions about the goals and how to reach the goals. The goal-focused leader has the responsibility to clarify the specific task objectives, communications plans, policies and role expectations. The purpose of clarifying is to guide and coordinate the work activities and make sure people know what to do and how to do it (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). Several studies have also found a positive relationship between clarifying and managerial effectiveness (Bauer & Green, 1996; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger , Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey, 1990).

There is also found a negative significant relation between goal-focused leadership and disagreeing behavior. The results are also showing that a leader who scores high on goal-focused style is disagreeing to a lesser extent with his or her followers than a leader who scores low on goal-focused style. The goal-focused leader may involve followers in co-operative setting and implementing their goals for task accomplishment so that the followers can help develop effective action plans and strategies (Campbell & Gingrich, 1986; Earley, 1985). According to Erez and Kafner (1983) participation in decision making is suggested as an effective strategy to cope with low acceptance of the goals. The negative relation could be explained by that goal-focused leaders do not want to discourage the followers to participate in setting and implementing goals. Because, for example, when they often disagree with one follower, the follower do not want to participate in setting and implementing the goals, whereby the goal acceptance of the follower will be reduced and the goal accomplishment will be more difficult for him or her.

5.1 Strengths, limitations and future research directions

The current study provides understanding about the effectiveness and the behaviors of goal-focused leaders. We used different data sources and methods in this study; with the video-observation method we retrieved information about the specific behaviors of goal-focused leaders. We have also used surveys to determine which leaders are more goal-focused and effective leaders. Despite the strengths of this current study and the uniqueness of the method, a number of limitations of this study should be pointed out (Ilgen & Fujii, 1976). First, we focused on a relatively small number of leaders (n=14) while we made use of a much larger subordinate pool (n=170) as well as nine students who minutely coded the video-recorded meetings. Future research should focus on much larger number of leaders, to make the distinction between goal-focused leaders and other leadership styles more clearly, which in turn will lead to more validity.

Secondly, the generalizability of the results to other organizations and countries could be a problem because all coders, followers and leaders in this study were Dutch. The behaviors that leaders show can be different for each country in the world. This may be due to cultural differences between the countries. For this reason, future research should more closely examine the behaviors of the goal-focused leaders in various cultures to get a general overview how goal-focused leaders behave. Third, we were aware that video-recording of the meetings could influence the behaviors of the leaders. Therefore, we asked all the followers immediately after the

meetings to rate the extent to which the leader behaved as he or she normally did without the cameras. We used this kind of questions to control the reactivity assumptions. Smith, McPhail and Pickens (1975) disconfirmed the reactivity assumptions, they state that only marginal reactivity occur when using the video camera as a mode of observation. Some of our findings may also underpin this claim; all of the leaders who were observed in this current study showed negative behavior, although in small amounts, see Table 1. Video-observational data could be considered as semi-objective and rich data, which enables the observer to capture the complexity of the behavior well beyond traditional methods and measurements (Haw & Hadfield, 2011). There is emerging body of literature in the last few years arguing that coding of the video-recorded behaviors may result in reliable and valid behavioral data (*e.g.,* (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2012; Fele, 2012; Yukl, 2002). As mentioned in the Method part of this report, two independent observers per video were used to encode the behaviors of the leaders. The two independent observers discussed their results with each other after coding the video, with the use of the confusion error matrix and inter-rater reliability generated by the program "The Observer XT". In this current study we used two independent observers to avoid subjectivity. We have seen that the agreement among the independent observers was very high (94.83%). Future research can increase the reliability of the results by using more than two independent observers per video and looking if there is still high agreement between the independent observers. In this current study, we only examined 7 different behaviors what we expected from the goal-focused leader. As mentioned in the result part, there were some behaviors (*defending one´s own position, visioning and giving own opinion, negative feedback, positive feedback and disagreeing*) which were significant related to goal-focused leader, which we did not expect. Future research should focus on the relation between those behaviors and goal-focused leadership, because of the significant relationship we have found in this present study. There is also the possibility for future studies to do research on other types of behaviors of the goal-focused leaders, different from the behavioral coding scheme which we have used for this study.

5.2 Practical implications

It is important to understand the positive relation between goal-focused leadership style and leader effectiveness. In this current study, the highly effective leaders are found to distinguish themselves from the low and moderately effective ones through goal-focused leadership style. Our current study states that goal-focused leadership style is advisable in leadership training and selection situations. It is important for organizations to understand this link because they need effective leaders to perform well as an organization. We also tested 7 different behaviors which we expected from the relatively highly goal-focused leaders. The results of this exploration show the specific single behaviors which were showed by goal-focused leaders. The different behaviors we have observed, enables the organizations to identify the goal-focused leaders. By identifying goal-focused leaders, the organizations automatically identify effective leaders; because there is found positive relation between goal-focused leadership style and leadership effectiveness. It is also possible to train the leaders to become a more goal-focused leader and effective leader by learning them the behaviors of the goal-focused leader. As mentioned in the Result part, there has been found a positive significant relation between task monitoring behavior and goal-focused leadership, so we know that goal-focused leaders are

exhibiting more task monitoring behavior. To make the leaders more goal-focused and effective, the organizations should offer them training where the leaders can learn to check the current progress of the followers and how to evaluate and monitor the operations and performances of the followers in a positive way. This also applies for the behaviors which we did not expect of goal-focused leaders, only for the ones with a positive significant correlation such as positive feedback, negative feedback and defending one`s own position.

6. CONCLUSION

Overall, the results showed that leaders who are exhibiting a more goal-focused style are more effective. The present study proves that there is a positive relation between goal-focused leadership and leader effectiveness. It is important for organizations to identify effective leaders, because the organizations need effective leaders to perform efficiently and effectively. This study enables the organization to gain insight in the behavioral repertoire of a goal-focused leader, to make it easier for them to identify a goal-focused and also an effective leader. It is important to get insight in the behavioral repertoire of the goal-focused leaders because they clarify, specify and communicate the goals of the organization to the followers who have to accomplish these goals which is needed to perform well as an organization. The organization can seldom define all goals and all the possible variation of responsibilities and personnel expectations which are expected of all followers in all situations (Stogdill, 1950), so the organization needs goal-focused leaders who translate these organizational goals into operational goals for their followers. We know from our results that a leader who scores high on goal-focused style is showing more task monitoring behavior in staff meetings than a leader who scores low on goal-focused style. This means that a highly goal-focused leader, during staff meetings, is monitoring the progress of the tasks and the performance of the individual followers by verifying it and by providing feedback to them about their performance, to support them in the right direction. In providing followers with feedback to accomplish their goals we see that goal-focused leader both use positive as negative feedback. Furthermore, we found that highly goal-focused leaders are defending their own position more than leaders who score low on goal-focused style. This present study also proves that highly goal-focused leaders are showing less visioning/giving own opinions as showing fewer disagree with their followers. The present study shows that video-based evidence of (goal-focused) leader behavior in the field is a powerful data source, especially when combined with surveys which captures the variables like the goal-focused leadership style and leader effectiveness. Leadership research need no longer be limited to the survey measures of followers' impressions of leader behavior. This study`s video-based approach is fitting in the growing consensus in the field of leadership research that new, context-specific leader effectiveness explorations are required. This present study demonstrates furthermore, that goal-focused leader behavior would need to be more thoroughly examined by the previous studies.

7. REFERENCES

1. Ames, D., & Flynn, F. (2007). What Breaks a Leader: The Curvilinear Relation Between Assertiveness and Leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1-18.

2. Avolio, B., Howell, J., & Sosik, J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as moderator of leadership style effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 219-227.

3. Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. (1997). *Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

4. Bales, R. (1950). A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *America Sociological Review*, 257-263.

5. Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1995). Full range leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden*.

6. Bauer , T., & Green, S. (1996). The development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1538-1567.

7. Becker , L. (1978). Joint effects of feedback and goal setting on performance: a field study of residential energy conservation. *Jour nal of Applied Psychology*, 428-433.

8. Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. *New York: Harper and Row*.

9. Borgatta, E. (1964). A not on consistency of subject behavior in interaction process analysis. *Sociometry*, 222-229.

10. Campbell, D., & Gingrich, K. (1986). The interactive effects of task complexity and participation on task performance: a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 162-180.

11. Colbert, A., & Witt, L. (2009). The Role of Goal-Focused Leadership in Enabling the Expression of Conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 790-796.

12. Costa , P., J. R., & McCrae, R. (1992). *The Neo Personality Inventory- Revised (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

13. Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975). A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role Making Process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 46-78.

14. DeCuir-Gunby, J., Marshall, P., & McCulloch, A. (2012). Using mixed methods to analyze video data: A mathematics teacher professional development

example. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 199-216.

15. Diefendorf, J., Silverman, S., & Greguras, G. (2005). Measurement equivalence and multisource ratings for non-managerial positions: Recommendations for research and practice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 399-425.

16. Earley, P. (1985). The influence of information, choice and task complexity upon goal acceptance, performance and personal goals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 481-491.

17. Erez, M. (1977). Feedback: a necessary condition for the goal setting-performance relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 624-627.

18. Erez, M., & Kanfer, F. (1983). The Role of Goal Acceptance in Goal Setting and Task Performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 454-463.

19. Erickson, F. (1992). The interface between ethnography and microanlysis. *The handbook of qualitative research in education*, 201-255.

20. Evans, M. (1970). The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 277-298.

21. Fairhurst, G. (1993). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry; A discourse analysis. *Communication Monograph*, 215-239.

22. Fele, G. (2012). The use of video to document tacit participation in an emrgency operations centre. *Qualitative Research*, 280-303.

23. Feyerherm, A. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two inter-organizational rule-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 253-270.

24. Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. (1955). *Leadership and supervision in industry.* Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.

25. Foster, S., & Cone, J. (1980). Current issues in direct observation. *Behavioral Assessment*, 313-338.

26. Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 219-247.

27. Grant, A. M. (2006). An integrative Goal-Focused Approach to Executive Coaching. In D. R. Stober, & A. M. Grant, *Evidence Based Coaching* (pp. 153-187). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Willey & Sons, Inc.

28. Gupta , K., Wilderom, C., & Van Hillegersberg, J. (2009). *Exploring the behavior of highly effective CIOs using video analysis.* AMCIS 2009 Proceedings.

29. Hannan, R. (1975). *The effects of participation in goal-setting on acceptance and performance: A laboratory experiment.* University of Maryland: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

30. Haw, K., & Hadfield, M. (2011). *Video in social science research: Functions and forms.* London: Routledge.

31. Hollenbeck, J., & Klein, H. (1987). Goal commitment and the goal setting process: Problems, prospects and proposals for future research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 212-220.

32. Hoogeboom, A., Wilderom, C., Nijhuis, J., & Van Den Berg, P. (2011). *Leader values, styles and behavior during meetings: Triangulated evidence of effective leadership.* Texas: San Antonio: Paper Submitted and presented at the OB division of the AoM Meetings.

33. House, R. J. (1971). A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Sage Publications, Inc. on behalf of the Johnson Graduate School of Management,Cornell University*, 321-339.

34. Howard, J., & Jay, S. (1998). A Field Study of the Influence of Situational Constraints, Leader-Member Exchange, and Goal Commitment on Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal,*, 88-95.

35. Ilgen, D., & Fujii, D. (1976). An investigation of the validity of leader behavior description obtained from subordinates. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 642-651.

36. Kent, R., & Foster, S. (1977). Direct observational procedures: Methedological issues in naturalistic settings. In A. Ciminero, & K. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of behavioral assessment* (pp. 279-328). New York: John Whiley.

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

38. Klein, H., Alge, B., Wesson, M., & Hollenbeck, J. (1999). Goal Commitment and the Goal-setting Process: Conceptual Clarification and Emperical Synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 885-896.

39. Landis, J., & Koch, G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 159-174.

40. Latham, G., & Lee, T. (1986). Goal setting. *Lexington*, 101-117.

41. Latham, G., & Locke, E. (1991). Self-Regulation through Goal Setting. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 212-247.

42. Latham, G., & Saari, L. (1979). Importance of supportive relationships in goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 151-156.

43. Lee, C., Bobko, P., Early, P., & Locke, E. (1991). An empirical analysis of a goal setting questionnaire. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 467-482.

44. Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. *New York: Harper and Row*.

45. Locke, E. (1968). Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives. *American Institutes Jo~ Research, Washington Office*, 157-189.

46. Locke, E. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 117-124.

47. Locke, E., & Latham, G. (1984). *Goal Setting: A Motivational Technique that Works.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

48. Locke, E., Frederick, E., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 241-251.

49. Matsui, T., Okada, A., & Inoshita, O. (1983). Mechanism of feedback affecting task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Perfromance*, 114-122.

50. Mead, M. (1995). Visual anthropology in a discipline of words. In *Principles of Visual Anthropology* (pp. 3-12). P. Hockings (Eds.): New York: Mouten de Gruyter.

51. Neider, L. (1980). An experimental field investigation utilizing an expectancy theory view of participation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 425-442.

52. Nijhuis, J., Hulsman, S., Wildeorm, C., & Van Den Berg, P. (2009). *Filming and surveying tranformational behavior of Dutch primary school leaders.* Chicago, Illinois: Paper presented to the OB division of the Annual Academy of Management Meetings.

53. Noldus, L., Trienes, R., Hendriksen, A., Jansen, H., & Jansen , R. (2000). The observer video-pro: New software for the collection, management, and presentation of time-structured data from videotapes and digital media files. *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 197-206.

54. Pearce, C., Sims, H., Jr Cox, J., Ball, G., Schnell, E., Smith, K., et al. (2003). Transactors, transformers and beyond: A multi-method development of a theoretical typology of leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 273-307.

55. Peters, L., O'Connor, E., & Eurlberg, J. (1985). Situational constraints: Sources, consequences, and future considerations. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 79-113.

56. Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review on the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 879-903.

57. Shrout, P., & Fleiss, J. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulettin* , 420-428.

58. Silverman, S., Pogson, C., & Cober, A. (2005). When employees at work don't get it: A model for enhancing individual employee change in response to performance feedback. *Academy of Management Executive*, 135-147.

59. Smith, R., McPhail, C., & Pickens, R. (1975). Reactivity to systematic observation with film. *Sociometry*, 536-550.

60. Spiers, J. (2004). Tech tips: Using video management analysis technology in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1-8.

61. Stogdill, R. (1950). Psychological bulltin. *The Ohio State University*, 1-14.

62. Van Der Weide, J. (2007). *An explorative video-study to the behavior of effective middle leaders.* University of Tilburg, the Netherlands: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

63. Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. (1973). Leadership and decision making. *Pittsburgh; Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press*.

64. Willer, B., & Miller, M. (1976). Client involvemenit in goal-setting and its relationship to therapeutic outcome. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 687-690.

65. Wilson, K., & Gallois, C. (1993). *Assertion and its social context* . Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

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

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

68. Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational studies*, 15-32.

69. Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger , R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223-238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America: K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (eds).

8. APPENDIX

Behavior category		Behavior	Definition	Examples
Self-defending	1	Showing disinterest	Not showing any interest, not taking problems seriously, wanting to get rid problems and conflicts	Not actively listening, talking to others while somebody has the speaking term, looking away
	2	Defending one's own position	Protecting the own opinion or ideas, emphasizing the own importance	"We are going to do it in my way." Blaming other people
	3	Providing negative feedback	Criticizing	"I do not like that…" "But we came to the agreement that…"
Steering	4	Disagreeing	Contradicting ideas, opposing team members	"That is not correct" "I do not agree with you"
	5	Agreeing	Saying that someone is right, liking an idea	"That is a good idea" "You are right"
	6	Directing	Telling others what (not) to do, dividing tasks	"I want that" "Kees, I want you to" Interrupting
	7	Task monitoring	Getting back to previously made agreements/ visions/ norms	"We came to the agreement that…"
	8	Structuring the conversation	Giving structure by telling the agenda, start/end time etc.	"The meeting will end at…" "We are going to have a break now"
	9	Informing	Giving factual information	"The final result is …"
	10	Visioning	Giving the own opinion Giving long-term visions	"I think that…" "Within the next years, we want to…"
Supporting	11	Intellectual stimulation	Asking for ideas, inviting people to think along or come up with own ideas, brainstorming	"What do you think is the best way to…?" "What is your opinion about…?"
	12	Individualized consideration	Rewarding, complimenting, encouraging, being friendly, showing empathy	"Good idea, thank you" "You did a great job" "Welcome" "How are you?"
	13	Humor	Making people laugh, saying something with a funny meaning	Laughing, making jokes
	14	Positive feedback	Rewarding, complimenting	"Well done"
	15	Personally informing	Giving non-factual, but private information	"Last weekend, my wife…"

Leader effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1995) & goal-focused leadership (Colbert & Witt, 2009)

Mijn leidinggevende ...	English	Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Enigszins mee oneens	Neutraal	Enigszins mee eens	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens
1. leidt ons team effectief	"Lead a group that is effective" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: LeEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. is effectief in het voldoen aan werk-gerelateerde behoeften	"Is effective in meeting my job-related needs" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: LeEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. behaalt op een effectieve manier de organisatiedoelen	"Is effective in meeting organizational requirements" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: LeEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. vertegenwoordigt het team effectief in de hogere hiërarchie	"Is effective in representing me to higher authority" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: LeEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. verhoogt de ambitie van medewerkers	"Heighten others' desire to succeed" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: ExEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. stimuleert mijn bereidheid om harder te werken	"Increases my willingness to try harder" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: ExEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
7. motiveert mij meer te doen dan wordt verwacht	"Gets me to do more than I expected to do" (Bass & Avolio, 1995: ExEff)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
8. geeft leiding op een goede/bevredigende manier	(Use methods of leadership that are satisfying Bass & Avolio, 1995: Satwithleader)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. werkt samen met anderen op een goede/bevredigende manier	(Work with others in a satisfactory way Bass & Avolio, 1995: Satwithleader)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
10. geeft richting en stelt prioriteiten	"To what extent does [name of supervisor] provide directions and define priorities" (Colbert & Witt, 2009)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
11. verduidelijkt specifieke rollen/taken en verantwoordelijkheden	"To what extent does [name of supervisor] clarify specific roles and responsibilities?" (Colbert & Witt, 2009)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. vertaalt strategieën in begrijpelijke doelen en plannen	"To what extent does [name of supervisor] translate strategies into understandable objectives and plans?" (Colbert & Witt, 2009)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
13. relateert de missie van het team aan de missie van de organisatie	"To what extent does [name of supervisor] link the unit's mission in to the mission of the company overall?" (Colbert & Witt, 2009)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
14. koppelt terug om er zeker van te zijn dat het werk goed wordt uitgevoerd	"To what extent does [name of supervisor] follow up to make sure the job gets done?" (Colbert & Witt, 2009)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O