The Game of Balancing Leadership Behaviors

A qualitative study to disclose how leaders tailor leadership styles to be effective leaders in different kinds of situations

Author
Inge Rikkink
Student number
S1006045
Supervisor
M.D.T de Jong
S. Janssen
Date
25-06-2014
Subject
Master Thesis Corporate & Organizational Communication

Communication Studies
University of Twente

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

Details of the applicant

Name: Inge Rikkink
Address for correspondence: Van Ghernaerstraat 8, 7631JT, Ootmarsum, The Netherlands
E-mail: i.a.s.rikkink@student.utwente.nl

Title of the research

The Game of Balancing Leadership Behaviors; A qualitative study to disclose how leaders tailor leadership styles to be effective leaders in different kinds of situations

Summary of the research

Leadership is studied very often by different researchers. Many theories are used to describe leadership effectiveness; these numerous theories can be divided into traits theories, behavioral theories and situational theories. In the last years the focus switched to more situational theories of leadership. Researchers argue that the nature of leadership varies according to the context. Although, there is done much research at this concept of leadership, there are still many questions to be answered. One of these questions: 'How do leaders tailor their leadership behavior to be effective leaders in different situations?' is addressed in this study. To answer this question 23 interviews were conducted. Leaders from ten different health care institutions in the Netherlands voluntary participated in the study. In the interviews the leaders were asked to describe critical incidents and their behavior during these incidents. The results of the study indicate that leaders change their leadership behaviors. The most used leadership styles are relation-oriented and task-oriented. Those two leadership behaviors were used by all the participants, change-oriented and passive leadership styles were used to supplement the task- and relation-oriented styles. Leaders reported preferring relation-oriented behavior, but it is not always possible to stay relation-oriented. In some cases a leader deviates from his or her preferred behavior. There are four different categories that give reasons for changing leadership behavior; (1) event-related, (2) depending on personal feelings, (3) depending on subordinates and (4) a power issue. In the event-related category (1) switches are made between relation-oriented and task-oriented behaviors, one of the things that should be noticed is the use of change-oriented behavior when another way of working is introduced. In that case the leader has to give an appealing description of desirable outcomes that can be achieved; therefore he or she has to motivate people to do their work in another way. In the second category; depending on personal feelings (2) the use of passive behavior is standing out. Leaders switch to this kind of behavior when they feel injustice. When it is about subordinates (3) the leaders reported using task-oriented behaviors when dealing with low educated people and relation-oriented behavior when dealing with high educated people. The last category; a power issue (4) is about setting rules and making decisions. In that case leaders reported deviating from their preferred behavior to task-oriented behaviors.

Keywords

Leadership Behavior, Leadership Traits, Critical Incident Technique, Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy.

Host Institution

University of Twente

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The concept of leadership has been studied for many years and by many researchers. It became an important and central part of the literature on management and organizational behavior for several decades (Yukl, 1989). In 2011, Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman and Humphrey stated that leadership is still one of the most discussed and debated topics in the social sciences.

Leadership research has been through many stages. The first theories that were used to describe leadership effectiveness were the trait theories mentioned by Galton (1869). Researchers who used these theories argue that personality variables and stable personal attributes are linked to leader effectiveness (Cavazotte, Moreno & Hickmann, 2012, Hui, van den Berg & Wilderom, 2011 and Zaccaro, Kemp & Bader, 2004). Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman and Humprey (2011) found that conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness are important predictors of leadership effectiveness.

Besides the trait theories another stream of theories to describe leadership effectiveness came up, this was the stream of behavioral theories. Behavioral theories consider the behavior of leaders and how these behaviors predict effectiveness (Rilling and Jordan, 2007). Behavior theories arranged leadership behaviors in different categories; task-oriented behaviors, relations-oriented behaviors, change-oriented behaviors and passive leadership (Derue Nahrgang, Wellman & Humprey, 2011; Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002). Many researchers made somewhat the same distinction when dividing leadership behaviors (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Reddin, 1970; Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991). These researchers all made distinctions between leadership behaviors but they failed to focus on all the leadership behaviors together to explain leadership effectiveness. Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman & Humprey (2011) argued that taking together leadership behaviors was important for research in the future. In this study these four categories will be taken together to contribute to explaining leadership effectiveness.

In the last years researchers argued that trait and behavioral theories cannot fully explain leadership effectiveness (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Therefore they developed a new stream of theories that should explain leadership effectiveness in a better way. These theories are called the situational theories. Researchers argued that there is not one universal leadership trait or behavior that is associated with success in all situations (Manning, 2013). To be successful in different situations a leader must be able to display different leadership behavior. Many researchers used the situational theories to describe leadership effectiveness; they focused on the role of the situation in leadership (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Vroom & Jago, 2007) and on flexible and adaptive leadership (Norton, 2010; Yukl & Mashud, 2010).

Although much research with emphasis on leadership effectiveness is executed, there still are many directions to study. Manning (2013) argued that there is a clear need for further research on effective leadership and tailoring leadership behavior to the situation. This study will address this need for further research.

Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to address the question:

'How do leaders tailor their leadership behavior to be effective leaders in different situations?'

Conducting 23 interviews contributed to answer this research question. Leaders from health care institution in the Netherlands voluntary participated in the study. They were asked to describe critical incidents and to tell about their behavior during those incidents. Analyses of these interviews contributed to answering the research question. The four categories mentioned by Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman & Humprey (2011) and Yukl, Gordon and Taber (2002) were used to classify leadership behaviors. Those four categories and the descriptions of critical incidents helped to elicit how leaders switch between leadership behaviors.

Besides contributing to existing literature and answering remaining questions that are related to leadership effectiveness, this study has also a practical relevance. This study indicates that leaders have to tailor their behaviors to the situation to be effective. Leadership training should focus on tailoring leadership behaviors to different situations and circumstances. When leaders tailor their behaviors the situation they can be more effective and achieve the goals of the organization.

2. Leadership theory

2.1 Describing leadership

Researchers used many different definitions to describe leadership, but they do not agree about one overarching definition. While there is no agreement about one overarching definition, researchers agree about some aspects of leadership. A short study to find the most important aspects of leadership is executed and an own definition is formed.

Seventeen articles about leadership (cited by a minimum of 150 other researchers according to Google Scholar) dating from 1947 till 2007 (see Table 1), show that researchers use 40 different aspects to describe and define the concept of leadership.

Table 1: Articles Used to Define Leadership

Researcher(s)	Year	Cited by Google Scholar
Gibb	1947	261
Stogdill	1948	2191
Zaleznik	1977	1495
Jago	1982	453
Meindl, Erlich & Dukerich	1985	1065
Yukl	1989	953
Kotter	1990	1897
Graham	1991	273
Hart & Quinn	1993	259
Bartlett & Ghosal	1995	275
Barker	1997	318
Mintzberg	1998	310
Farling, Stone & Winston	1999	222
Barker	2001	152
Alvesson & Sveningsson	2003	204
Zaccaro & Banks	2004	178
Vroom & Jago	2007	235

The definitions of leadership, given by the different researchers, were collected and compared and the different aspects researchers used to describe leadership were placed in a table (see Attachment 1). The aspects researchers used in their definitions to describe the concept of leadership were counted and the most important aspects became clear. Synonyms were collected and an overarching term was used to describe these aspects.

Four of the total 40 aspects are used six or more times to define leadership (Table 2). This suggests that these four aspects are the most important aspects to define the concept of leadership.

Table 2: Aspects to Define the Leadership Concept

Aspects	Researchers
Influence	Barker (1997); Farling, Stone & Winston (1999); Gibb (1947); Jago (1982); Meindl et al., (1985); Stogdill (1948); Vroom & Jago (2007); Yukl (1989); Zaleznik (1977).
Motivating	Bartlett & Ghosal (1995); Graham (1991); Hart & Quinn (1993); Kotter (1990); Mintzberg (1998); Vroom & Jago (2007); Zaccaro & Banks (2004).
Common goal	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003); Jago (1982); Meindl et al., (1985); Stogdill (1948); Vroom & Jago (2007); Zacarro & Banks (2004).
Vision	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003); Farling, Stone & Winston (1999); Graham (1991); Hart & Quinn (1993); Kotter (1990); Zaccaro & Banks (2004).

2.1.1 Influence

Influence is about the type and amount of power held by someone (Gregoire & Arendt, 2004). In leadership research much attention is paid to influence. For example Yukl (1989) and Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that influence is one of the things that most definitions of leadership involve.

A leader is in the position of influencing the behaviors of followers, more than followers influence the leader's behavior (Gibb, 1947). Gibb argues that the leader is in the role of initiator of group action, so the leader must influence followers. Thereby it is important that there are people who are following the leader. Jago (1982) argues that it is also necessary that a follower permits himself to be influenced.

Gregoire and Arendt (2004) claim that there are 11 proactive influence tactics that a leader can use to influence subordinates, peers and/or superiors. These 11 influence tactics are rational persuasion, apprising, inspirational appeals, consultation, exchange, collaboration, personal appeals, ingratiation, legitimating tactics, pressure and coalition tactics. Yukl and Tracey (1992) found that consultation, inspirational appeals and rational persuasion are the most effective influence tactics. Pressure, coalition and legitimating tactics were found as ineffective. Yukl and Tracey also argue that ingratiation and exchange tactics are effective for influencing subordinated and peers, but they state that these two influence tactics are ineffective for influencing superiors.

If a person has no influence on people, this person cannot initiate action and stimulate people to accomplish group or organizational objectives. Leadership does not exist without influence.

2.1.2 Motivating

Leadership is "a process of motivating people to work together collaboratively to accomplish great things" (Vroom & Jago, 2007, p.18). Fry (2003) argues that motivating is about establishing a culture wherein values influence people to desire, mobilize and struggle for a shared vision. He claims that a leader can motivate followers by creating a vision of a long-term challenging, desirable, compelling, and different future.

So, motivating is an important aspect of leadership. Kotter (1990) argued that motivating is about appealing on basic, untapped, human needs, values and emotions to keep people moving in the right direction. He claimed that motivation and inspiration are central aspects of leadership. According to Kotter (1990), motivation and inspiration are necessary to produce change in complex organizations. It is important for a leader to overcome barriers that are encountered in a changing organization. This process of overcoming barriers needs a leader who can motivate his or her followers.

For a leader it is important that he or she can motivate others. If a leader cannot motivate his or her followers to change, the idealized future state of the organization cannot be achieved.

2.1.3 Common goal
Northouse (2012) argues that leadership includes attention to common goals. By common is meant that leaders and followers have a mutual purpose. It is the task of the leader to direct his or her energies toward individuals who are trying to achieve something together.

Stogdill (1948) argues that a leader is responsible for the coordination of the activities of members of an organized group, towards the accomplishment of the group objectives (in: Jago, 1982). And Jago (1982) claims that it is important for a leader and a follower to be "at least loosely organized around some common or agreed upon purpose or mission." (p.316)

A leader should inspire his or her followers to work towards a common goal. If there is no common goal, it is very difficult for a leader to control the followers and to get them in the right direction.

2.1.4 Vision
Vision can be defined as a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization. According to Zaccaro and Banks (2001) vision represents the idealized future state of the organization. For leaders having a vision is important when choosing a direction to follow (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Many researchers argue that it is important that a leader is someone with a vision and that her or she can point the way for others (in: Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999).

Hart and Quinn (1993) argue that "without a challenging core mission and set of values understood by all employees, the best technical or economic strategy will go unrealized (1993, p. 546).

Without a vision a leader cannot present his or her followers the idealized future state of the organization. A vision is important to point the way, the set goals and to motivate others to work in the same direction.

2.1.5 Definition of leadership
The four aspects mentioned in the sections before show the most important aspects to describe the concept of leadership. Even though the aspects seem to be independent aspects they are all related to each other. Influencing and motivating are necessary to reach a common goal. And a leader should have a vision; this vision is about the possible and desirable future state of the

organization. But the vision also indicates which common goal should be reached. So the four aspects cannot be seen separately from each other in defining leadership.

Using the four most cited aspects of leadership a definition of leadership can be made. This definition of leadership will be used in this study.

Leadership is having a vision and influencing and motivating followers to work towards the common goal.

2.2 Theories of leadership

The many definitions of leadership and the many ways of looking at leadership have resulted in "disparate approaches to conceptualizing, measuring, investigating and critiquing leadership" (Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio & Johnson, 2011, p. 1165). Over the past 100 years researchers argued for numerous theories of leadership and leadership effectiveness. These numerous theories can be divided into three categories: trait theories, behavioral theories and situational theories (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

2.2.1 Trait theories

The first theories of leadership were trait approaches, mentioned first by Galton (1869). He considered leader traits to be immutable properties that were present at the birth of a future leader. The perspective of traits as purely heritable qualities shifted to a focus on relatively enduring qualities that distinguish leaders from nonleaders (Kirkpatrich & Locke, 1991). The trait approaches included for example accuracy in work, knowledge of human nature and moral habits. Rilling and Jordan (2007) now claim that in trait theories "leaders are viewed as endowed with superior qualities that distinguish them from their followers and enable them to lead" (p. 195). Zaccaro, Kemp and Bader (2004) argue that leader traits are personal characteristics that are relatively stable and coherent. These personal characteristics help a leader to perform in a consistent pattern across different groups and organizational situations. Personality, temperament, motives, cognitive abilities, skills and expertise are reflected by the personal characteristics.

These days, studies have linked personality variables and other stable personal attributes to leader effectiveness. These findings provide an empirical foundation for the argument that traits really do matter in the prediction of leadership effectiveness (e.g. Cavazotte, Moreno & Hickmann, 2012; Hui, van den Berg & Wilderom, 2011; Zaccaro, Kemp & Bader, 2004). By studying leader traits researchers focus on gender, intelligence and the Big Five personality traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman and Humphrey (2011) concluded that the traits of conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness are particularly important predictors of success in leadership positions.

2.2.2 Behavioral theories

Besides the trait theories there is a research stream on behavioral theories. Behavioral theories are theories wherein "leaders exhibit behaviors and leadership styles in relations to the situation and follower's needs" (Rilling and Jordan, 2007, p. 195). This direction of leadership theories considers the behaviors of leaders and how these behaviors predict leadership effectiveness. Researchers describe leadership effectiveness by referring to the behavior of the

leaders. In their research Derue, Nahrgang, Wellmann and Humprey (2011) made a combination of leadership behavior and leadership traits. They found that leader behavior have bigger impact on leadership effectiveness than leader traits have. They also suggest that although having certain traits may predispose individuals to certain behaviors, behaviors are the more important predictor of leadership effectiveness. According to Gregoire and Arendt (2004) the ideal leader is one who has high concern for people and high concern for the work that needs to be done.

Within the behavioral paradigm one consistent theme is that behaviors can fit into a few categories: task-oriented, relational-oriented, change-oriented and passive leadership (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman & Humprey, 2011; Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002). Many other researchers made somewhat the same distinction. Blake and Mouton (1964) used the terms 'concern for production' and 'concern for people' to distinguish leadership behavior. Reddin (1970) made the distinction between task-oriented and relationship-oriented behavior and Ekvall and Arvonen (1991) called for a distinction between 'employee-centered', 'production-centered' and 'change-centered' leadership behavior.

Many researchers used the four above mentioned categories to arrange leader behaviors. Blake and Mouton's (1964) managerial grid for example is based on the behavioral paradigm. "The managerial grid theory is predicted on the assumption that leadership effectiveness is based on two predilections – concern for production and concern for people." (Bernardin & Alvares, 1976, p. 84) However, research often focuses on a single behavioral perspective. Judge and Piccolo (2004) for example, focused only on transformational leadership (change-oriented), while Judge, Piccolo and Ilies (2004) focused on initiating structure and consideration (task-oriented and relational-oriented). Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman & Humprey (2011) argue that it is important to not only focus on one of the categories, but to take the categories together and to see how these categories influence leadership effectiveness. Therefore, the four categories are explained below.

Task-oriented behaviors
According to Blake and Mouton (1982) a task-oriented leader focuses on task achievement. Task-oriented leadership is about the organization of work, definition of responsibilities and the distribution of tasks. Fey, Adaeva and Vitkovskaia (2001) argue that task-orientation is about the leader who organizes, defines relationships, sets goals and emphasizes deadlines to ensure tasks get completed. Tabernero, Chambel, Curral and Arana (2009) claim that a task-oriented leader defines the roles of his or her followers, focuses on goal achievement and establishes well-defined patterns of communication. They also claim that task-oriented leaders induced greater group efficacy, a more positive and less negative affective state among members of the group, and that groups who perceive their leaders as more task-oriented achieve higher levels of task accomplishment.

Ehrhart and Klein (2001) summed up the adjectives followers used to describe task-oriented leaders, these objectives are: efficient, respected, realistic, explicit, technically perfect, hard worker, good people skills, goal-oriented, organized, and tough, task-committed, stern and successful.

Task-oriented leader behavior is present in many models of leadership under different names. For example 'initiating structure' (Ohio Leadership Studies, Halphin & Winer, 1957), 'concern for production' (Blake & Mouton, 1964's Managerial Grid), and 'task orientation' (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1982 – situational leadership life cycle model).

Relational-oriented behaviors

Blake and Mouton (1982) describe relational-oriented leaders as leaders who show respect, loyalty and affective commitment. Bass (1990) argues that a relational-oriented leader shows concern and respect for their followers, looks out for their welfare and expresses appreciation and support. Tabernero, Chambel, Curral and Arana (2009) claim that relational-oriented behavior has a strong effect on follower satisfaction, and Judge, Piccolo & Ilies (2004) argue that relational-oriented is related to leader effectiveness. A leader who behaves relationship-oriented generates greater cohesion between members of the group. Tabernero, Chambel, Curral and Arana (2009) also claim that a leader which focuses on relationships sets more long-term objectives and for this reason they have an effect on emergent states. Fey, Adaeva and Vitkovskaia (2001) argue that the first priority for a relation-oriented leader is to establish rapport, trust, and good communication with subordinates.

Ehrhart and Klein (2001) also summed up the adjectives followers used to describe relationship-oriented leaders, these objectives are: friendly, trusted, reliable, accountable, flexible, caring, kind, thoughtful, personal, real, understanding, conscientious, sympathetic, trusting, supportive, generous, friendly, a good soundboard, considerate and worker-friendly.

The relation-oriented dimension of leadership is also present in many other models of leadership. The dimension is often called 'consideration', 'concern for people' and 'employee orientation' (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; House, 1974).

Change-oriented behaviors

Ekvall and Arvonen (1991) argue that change-oriented leadership is about a supervisor who creates vision, accepts new ideas, makes quick decisions and encourages cooperation. They argue that change-oriented leadership is about a leader who is not overcautious and does not stress plans that must be followed. Skogstad and Einarsen (1999) argue that the change-oriented leader is a visionary, charismatic and creative leader. This leader sets new goals and identifies new methods for accomplishing them. Ekvall (1991), Ekvall and Arvonen (1991, 1994) claim also that a change-centered leader encourages discussions about future possibilities, promotes new ideas for change and growth, and stimulates new projects, products and ways of doing things. Two well-known change-oriented leadership theories are transformational and charismatic leadership.

Ehrhart and Klein (2001) summed up the adjectives used to describe charismatic leaders. These adjectives are: encouraging, success-oriented, inclusive, team-oriented, an achiever, empowering, goal-oriented, clever, creative, successful, free, a survivor, adaptive, open-minded, innovative, daring, committed and energized.

Passive leadership

A passive leader is a leader who is taking action only when mistakes are brought to a leader's attention. Laissez-faire leadership is one form of passive leadership. This form reflects a total disengagement from followers, with a nominal leader providing no positive or negative reinforcement or feedback. Another kind of passive leadership is management by exception. The leader who uses this kind of leadership is only engaging with followers when they make mistakes, for the purpose of correcting their actions (Jackson, Meyer & Wang, 2013).

Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) argue that a leader behaves passively if he or she reacts only after problems have become serious to take corrective action, and if the leader avoids making decisions at all. Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) found eight descriptions of behavior that are related to the behavior of a passive leader (p. 450). These descriptions are: (1) 'reacts to problems, if serious', (2) 'reacts to failure', (3) 'if not broke, don't fix', (4) 'reacts to problems, if chronic', (5) 'avoids involvement', (6) 'absent when needed', (7) 'avoids deciding' and, (8) 'delays responding'.

Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy

Yukl, Gordon and Taber (2002) developed the Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy, in this taxonomy the three above mentioned leadership behaviors (task, relation and change) are integrated. The "hierarchical taxonomy includes most of the specific behaviors found to be relevant for effective leadership" (Yukl, Gordon and Taber, 2002, p. 29).

The behaviors of each metacategory and descriptions of the specific leadership behavior are shown in Table 3. An extensive description of the metacategories and the descriptions of the specific leadership behavior can be found in Attachment 2.

Table 3: Description of the Metacategories and Definitions (Yukl, Gordon and Taber ,2002)

Metacategory	Specific Leadership Behavior	Definition
Task behavior	Short-term planning	Determining how to use personnel and resources to accomplish a task efficiently, and determining how to schedule and coordinate unit activities efficiently.
	Clarifying roles	Assigning tasks and explaining job responsibilities, task objectives, and performance expectations.
	Monitoring operations	Checking on the progress and quality of the work, and evaluating individual and unit performance.
Relations behavior	Consulting	Checking with people before making decisions that affect them, encouraging participation in decision making, and using the ideas and suggestions of others.
	Supporting	Acting considerate, showing sympathy and support when someone is upset of anxious and providing encouragement and support when there is a difficult, stressful task.
	Recognizing	Providing praise and recognition for effective performance, significant achievements, special contributions, and performance improvements.
	Developing	Providing coaching and advise, providing opportunities for skill development, and helping people learn how to improve their skills.
	Empowering	Allowing substantial responsibility and discretion in work activities, and trusting people to solve problems and make decisions without getting prior approval.
Change behavior	Envisioning change	Presenting an appealing description of desirable outcomes that can be achieved by the unit, describing a proposed change with great enthusiasm and conviction.
	Taking risks for change	Taking personal risks and making sacrifices to encourage and promote desirable change in the organization.
	Encouraging innovative thinking	Challenging people to question their assumptions about the work and consider better ways to do it.
	External monitoring	Analyzing information about events, trends, and changes in the external environment to identify threats and opportunities for the organizational unit.

2.2.3 Situational theories

Before using situational theories, studies primarily tried to understand leadership by examining individual's traits and skills. But Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that trait and behavioral theories cannot fully explain leadership effectiveness. Fiedler (1967) was the first who argued that in leadership research we have to deal with both leader traits and situational variables and Perrow (1970) also pleaded for a theory that not only paid attention to traits and behaviors but also to the situation. He argued that effective and ineffective organizational leadership is not dependent of the characteristics of people who lead the organization but that the cause resides in structural features (in: Vroom & Jago, 2007). He claimed that the behavior of leaders is constrained by the situations they face. Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that a leadership style that is effective in one situation can be ineffective in a different situation. And Stogdill (1948) claimed that "persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations" (p.65).

In the stream of situational theories two models that explain leadership effectiveness are used very often; the contingency model and the path-goal theory. These model en theories are discussed in the next sections.

Contingency model

Fiedler (1967) developed the contingency model, which postulates that the performance of groups is contingent upon the interactions of leadership style and situational favorableness (Fiedler, 1971). The contingency model was one of the first models that discussed the inconsistent findings regarding leader traits and behaviors. Fiedler argued that the effectiveness of a leader is based on two factors; a leader's attributes referred to as task or relational motivational orientation and a leader's situational control. This differentiation between the two factors is somewhat the same as the distinction supporters of the behavioral theories used. By using the contingency model it was possible for Fiedler to claim that task-motivational oriented leaders will be more successful in high- and low-control situations compared to relationship oriented leaders (Ayman, Chermers & Fiedler, 1995).

Waters (2012) argued that the contingency theory uses the orientation of an individual to predict in which situation the leader will be effectives. Thereby, Waters (2012) claimed that it is important to keep in mind that the contingency theory stresses that leaders will not be effective in all situations. Kriger and Seng (2005) also argued that if the orientation of a leader is a good match for the situation, it is likely that the leader will be effective. If there is not a good match, it is likely that the leader fails. Finkelstein, Hambrick and Cannella (2008) argue that a leader should not be expected to lead in every situation. They claim for an organization that tries to place leaders in optimal situations.

Manning (2013) claims that "much popular thinking on leadership assumes that there is some 'essence' of effective leadership, that there are 'universal' leadership traits and/or behaviors associated with success in all situations" (p. 343). He argues that the nature of relationships varies according to the context. These findings of Manning (2013) support a 'contingency' view of leadership. Zaccaro (2007) argues that there is a need for more research into the role of the situation; he mentions that the role of the situation for the leaders needs more clarity.

Zaccaro (2007) claims that "leaders need to be able to display an array of different approaches and styles to leadership" (p. 9), but the question that remain is: is a leader indeed capable to display significant behavioral variability? And, does the leader have an expansive behavioral repertoire and can he effectively apply the appropriate responses to different situations? Yukl and Mashud (2010) supplement this by saying that it is also important to examine the pattern of leadership behaviors used by a leader, and not only focusing on each type of leadership behavior separately.

Path-goal theory
Besides the contingency model the path-goal theory is an often used theory in describing the effectiveness of leadership. The path-goal theory concerns relationships between superiors and subordinated in their day-to-day functioning (House, 1996). The path-goal theory shows that leaders' behavior properly matched to the situations results in job satisfaction, acceptance of the leaders occurs and efforts to performance and performance to reward expectations (House & Mitchell, 1974). The path-goal theory comes from Vroom's expectancy theory of motivation. Vroom (1964) suggests that "people are more likely to engage in specific behavior if they perceive a high probability that the behavior will lead to a valued outcome" (in: Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio & Johnson, 2011, p. 1170).

The path-goals theory does not explain the effects of leaders on groups or work but it explains the effects of leaders on superiors or subordinates (House, 1996). The focus on superiors and subordinates makes the path-goal theory different from the contingency model. Where the path-goal theory focuses on the leadership effectiveness according to subordinates and superiors, the contingency model focuses on leadership effectiveness in situations.

Other situational theories
Many other researchers argued for other approaches to define leadership effectiveness. Pettigrew (1992) for example argued for a more 'processual' and 'contextualist' view of leadership, he claims that greater attention should be paid to how leadership emerges and evolves in social or organizational settings. Denis, Langley and Rouleau (2010) argue for a more 'distributed' view of leadership. In this perspective leadership is not seen as a result of single individuals but more as a collective process where individuals negotiate their position with respect to others. Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) propose a practitioner-oriented situational leadership theory. In their theory leadership effectiveness is based on the interaction between leader behaviors and the followers' levels of maturity. They argue that it is important for a leader to adapt his or her style to the level of maturity of a follower. Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) argue that for followers in a phase of low maturity the leader should use more task-oriented behavior and when followers become more mature it is important to use a more relationship-oriented style.

2.3 Conclusion

In the last decades the concept of leadership gained much attention. Many researchers tried to explain leadership effectiveness. They used different kinds of theories to describe and explain leadership, these theories range from trait theories to behavioral theories to situational theories. Researchers, for example Manning (2013) argued that traits and behaviors could not fully explain leadership effectiveness, so a shift to situational theories is important.

In an attempt to provide a better explanation of leadership, much attention is paid to situational theories in the last few years. These theories emphasized the importance of the context in describing leadership effectiveness. The influence of situational variables has become clear in the many studies conducted by different researchers. Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that situation variables play three distinct roles in the leadership process: (1) organizational effectiveness is affected by situational factors not under leader control, (2) situations shape how leaders behave and (3) situations influence the consequences of leader behavior. Vroom (2000) argues that the situation is very important. He found in his study that the situation accounts for about three times as much variance as do individual traits. And Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that leaders must tailor their actions to fit the demands of each situation. According to Manning the situation is a very important aspect. Fiedler (1967), Waters (2012), Finkelstein, Hambrich and Cannella (2008) and Zaccaro (2007) also argue for more attention to the situation in describing leadership effectiveness.

All theories that researchers used to describe leadership contribute to a better understanding of this topic. But those theories also have their limitations and they all could not fully explain leadership. Yukl and Mashud (2010) argued that it is important to not only focus on single types of leadership behavior but to take an overarching approach that examines all types of leadership behavior together.

In this study the influence of the situation and the use of different kinds of leadership behaviors will be the main focus. With this study the call of Manning (2013) for more research on tailoring leadership behavior will be addressed. In previous studies it has been proven that the Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy of Yukl, Gordon and Taber (2002) is a reliable method for determining the patterns of behavior of leaders (Agnew and Flin, 2013). This taxonomy will be used to address the question whether leaders do and can display significant behaviors and how they apply these behaviors in different kinds of situations.

With answering these questions this study contributes to the existing literature on leadership. A better understanding of the concept of leadership and tailoring leadership behaviors to the situation will be the result.

3. Research method

In this study, a qualitative approach was used to elicit how and why leaders change their behaviors according the situation. The data was collected by using the critical incident technique during interviews.

3.1 Interview design

In this study 23 semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain data about leadership behavior and leader's perceptions of their role as a leader. Interviews are the most familiar strategies for collecting data, conducting interviews helps to delve deeply into social and personal matters (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Wainwright (1997) argues that interviews help to get an in-depth understanding of the experiences of respondents. And according to Rubin and Rubin (1995) social research is useful to figure out what events mean, how people adapt and how they view what has happened to them and around them. Interviews provide much more detailed information then other data collection methods such as surveys (Boyce & Neale, 2006). The aim of the study was to get a deeper understanding of changing leadership behaviors, so the use of interviews was very suitable.

3.1.1 The critical incident technique

The interview schedule was developed from Agnew and Flin's (2013) interview and Flanagan's critical incident technique (1954). The critical incident technique is appropriate for gathering important facts concerning behavior in situations (Flanagan, 1954). The critical incident technique is a technique that allows participants to tell about incidents that are most relevant to them (Gremler, 2004). This ensures that the participant is not forced into a given framework. During the interview respondents were asked to recall specific events, by describing the events they could use their own language (Stauss and Weinlich, 1997). According to Grove and Fisk (1997) the critical incident technique can give an in-depth record of events and Gabbott and Hogg (1996) argue that this technique provides a rich set of data. Thus, the use of the critical incident technique is very useful to get insight in experiences of the participants and in the way leaders change their behaviors. Chell (1998) gave the following definition of the CIT method:

"*The critical incident technique is a qualitative interview procedure which facilitates the investigation of significant occurrences (events, incidents, processes or issues) identified by the respondents, the way they are managed, and the outcomes in terms of perceived effects. The objective is to gain understanding of the incident from the perspective of the individual, taking into account cognitive, affective and behavioral elements.*" (p. 56).

When asking participants to describe a critical incident the definition of a critical incident was made clear. In this study the definition of Kaulio (2008), a critical incident is "an event that deviates from the expectation of the actor" (p. 340) was used. Thereby it was made clear that the critical incident could either be negative or positive.

3.1.2 Interview questions

To start the interview participants were asked to tell about the company they work for, the amount of people they manage and their years of experience in a leader-position. The actual

part of the interview consisted of six open-ended questions. After answering the short introduction questions participants were first asked to describe what their normal activities are during a typical work day (Q1). After this question about a typical workday the leader was asked to describe a critical incident (either positive or negative) (Q2). Before asking the second question participants were told about critical incidents. The definition of a critical incident used in these interviews was*:*

'A critical incident is an incident that deviates from your expectation. This can be either positive or negative incidents. By describing the critical incidents it is important to take in mind the following things. It is an incident you can remember very well, the incident influences your behavior as a leader and the incident took place during your function in this health care organization.'

In the interview participants were asked multiple times to remember critical incidents, even at the end of the interview participants were asked if they could remember another incident. This question was asked until the participants told that they did not remember another incident.

During the interview and during describing the critical incidents the interviewer checked if the participant told about a few important points. These points were:

- When did this incident happen?
- What were the circumstances leading up to this incident?
- How did you behave in this incident?
- What were the consequences of this incident and your behavior?
- How did you feel about your behavior in this incident?
- How did your followers react on your behavior?

When the participants did not include all the above points in their answers the interviewer asked the participant to describe the critical incident in more detail. After describing the critical incidents the participants were asked about what leadership behaviors they think are effective and ineffective (Q3 and Q4). The questions were followed by asking the participants to tell about their general feeling about changing leadership behavior (Q5) and what the limitations of the changed behaviors are (Q6). These questions were asked to get information about a leader's attitude towards changing behavior (see Attachment 3 for a complete interview design in Dutch).

3.2 Participants

This study focused on leaders working in health care institutions. A total of 23 leaders volunteered to participate in the study. The participants were recruited from ten different health care institutions in the Netherlands, from home care services to nursing homes and to maternity care institutions.

Different persons in leadership positions in health care organizations were contacted with the question if they would participate in the study. By the process of snowball sampling the other participants were contacted and asked to participate. There were two criteria for participants to participate in the study. The first criterion was that participants were in a managing position

in a health care organization in the Netherlands. The second criterion was that the participants should manage a minimum of 20 persons of staff.

The total range of participants consisted of 16 (70%) female and seven (30%) male participants. In 2012, 88% of people working in health care organization were women and only 12% were men (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2014). The division between men and women in this study is not exactly the same as the division between men and women in health care settings in the Netherlands, but it is a pretty good reflection.

The participants managed between 21 and 225 persons of staff, the average number of staff a participant managed was 64. Both participants who managed small numbers of staff and participants who managed large numbers of staff participated in the study. This ensures a good sense of the reality.

Participants were asked to tell how many years they were leader in the current organization. This ranged from two to more than twenty years of leading experience, the average was 7,7 years.

3.3 Procedure
The participants were contacted by email or by phone to arrange an interview time and location. They met the interviewer in their work environment, preferably in their office or in a small meeting room. Each participant was informed that the purpose of the interview was to gather information about differentiating between leadership styles. The participants were asked for their permission to tape record the session, besides that, they were assured that their contributions would remain anonymous. All participants agreed to the recording. The interview sessions lasted about 30 minutes till an hour (see Attachment 4 and 5 for the Informed Consent Form and the Research Introduction).

3.4 Data analysis
After all the interviews were conducted the recorded interviews were transcribed. These transcriptions were first open coded; the descriptions of critical incidents were given a code. Eight different codes of the descriptions are ascribed to the total range of interviews (see Table 4). After the first coding process the interviews are coded according to the coding scheme developed from the Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy (Yukl, Gordon and Taber, 2002) supplemented with the passive leadership style (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999).

Table 4: Coding Scheme

	Code	Description
Critical incidents	Out-org	This incident is related to something outside the organization
	Client	This incident is related to a client
	Colleague	This incident is related to a colleague or employee
	Training	This incident is related to a study
	Organ	This incident is related to the organization
	Govern	This incident is related to the government
	Private	This incident is related to a private situation
	Volunteers	This incident is related to volunteers
Hierarchical Leadership Taxonomy	Task-sho	Deciding what to do, how to do it, who will do it, and when it will be done
	Task-cla	Communication of plans, policies, and role expectations
	Task-mon	Gathering information about the operations of the manager's organizational unit
	Rel-con	Involving followers in making important decisions
	Rel-sup	Showing consideration, acceptance and concern for the needs and feelings of other people
	Rel-rec	Giving praise and showing appreciation to others for effective performance
	Rel-dev	Coaching, showing someone a better way to do a task
	Rel-emp	Delegating and providing more autonomy and discretion to subordinates
	Chang-env	Articulating an inspiring vision of a better future
	Chang-tak	Taking personal risks
	Chang-enc	Encouraging innovative thinking
	Chang-ext	Monitor the external environment and identify threats and opportunities for the organization
Passive behavior	Pass-ser	Reacts to problems, if serious
	Pass-miss	Reacts to failure
	Pass-kap	If not broke, don't fix
	Pass-chro	Reacts to problems, if chronic
	Pass-betr	Avoids involvement
	Pass-afw	Absent when needed
	Pass-bes	Avoids deciding
	Pass-vert	Delays responding

3.4.1 Reliability

Reliability of the coding process was tested by two checks. The critical incidents mentioned by the participants were coded by an independent judge, familiar with the critical incident technique. This judge was asked to place 10% of the critical incidents into categories; this was an open coding process. The discrepancies that arose were resolved through discussion. An agreement about a total of eight overarching categories was made. The eight categories contain all the mentioned critical incidents.

The second check for reliability was asking another independent judge code 20% of the interviews according the coding scheme I used.

First the reliability of the coded critical incidents (outside organization, client, colleague, training, organization, government, private and volunteers) was calculated. After coding the critical incidents the Cohen's Kappa of the behavior categories together (task-oriented, relationship-oriented, change-oriented and passive behavior) was calculated. This was followed by calculating the Cohen's Kappa of the single behavior categories (see Table 5)

Table 5: Cohen's Kappa

Category	Cohen's Kappa
Critical incidents	0.79
Behavior Categories	0.64
Task-oriented behavior	0.86
Relationship-oriented behavior	0.63
Change-oriented behavior	0.78
Passive behavior	0.82

The reliability was measured by using Cohen's Kappa. According to Blackmann and Koval (2000) a kappa between 0.6 and 0.8 implies substantial agreement and a reliable coding process. All the coded categories had a Cohen's Kappa above the 0.6; this means that the coding process was reliable. By discussing about non agreements the coding scheme was sharpened.

4. Results

4.1 Leadership behaviors

A total of 497 individual behaviors from the 23 interviews were analyzed. Table 6 demonstrates the frequencies of the reported different behaviors. Relations-oriented behaviors were found to be the most frequently reported by the participants, followed by task-oriented, with fewer change-oriented and passive behaviors.

Table 6: Frequencies and Percentages of Leadership Behaviors Reported by the Participants

Meta categories	Behaviors	Number of leaders	Frequencies	Percentages
Relations-oriented	Consulting	21	101	20%
	Supporting	22	67	13%
	Empowering	16	58	12%
	Developing	16	46	9%
	Recognizing	7	13	3%
Total			*285*	*57%*
Task-oriented	Clarifying roles	21	63	13%
	Short-term planing	20	59	12%
	Monitoring-operations	20	50	10%
Total			*172*	*35%*
Change-oriented	Envisioning change	5	11	2%
	Innovative thinking	6	7	1%
	External monitoring	4	4	1%
	Taking risks for change	1	1	0%
Total			*23*	*5%*
Passive	Reacts to problems, if serious	4	7	1%
	Avoids involvement	3	5	1%
	Avoids deciding	3	5	1%
	Reacts to failure[*]	-	-	-
	If not broke, don't fix[*]	-	-	-
	Reacts to problems, if chronic[*]	-	-	-
	Absent when needed[*]	-	-	-
	Delays responding[*]	-	-	-
Total			*17*	*3%*
Overall total			*497*	*100%*

*Note: * Behavior is not reported by the participants*

4.1.1 Relations-oriented behaviors

Table 6 shows that leaders mostly reported using relations-oriented behavior. Overall, participants mostly used relations-oriented behaviors, in the form of consulting behaviors. In twenty percent of the reported behaviors participants checked with people before making decisions that affect them, encourage participation in decision making and use the ideas and suggestions of others. Participants told about asking for feedback and talking with employees about how work should be organized, how employees think about rules and how to solve things.

> *"I am starting with asking how they think about that. […] also in the work meetings we have. And by asking them individually about the clients." (L17)*

The second most reported behavior is supporting behavior. This means that participants are acting considerate and showing empathy and support when someone is upset or anxious. They provide encouragement and support when there is a difficult stressful task. An example is a situation with an employee who is sick. The participant told about working together and supporting the employee in her reintegration. Another example of supporting behavior was told by a participant who felt sorry for an employee that came in the debt repayment and a bailiff order was issued.

> *"I told her, very honestly. I feel sorry for you. [...] that is a part of... yes concern for."(L5)*

Empowering is the third relations-oriented category that is reported in more than 10% of the cases. When using this kind of behavior leaders give their employees more autonomy. One of the participants argued that employees need some autonomy and responsibility. He argued that it is not important to ask him and consult about every case.

> *"I mean, if a glass is broken, you do not have to call me to ask if you can buy a new glass. [...] You just have to restock, that's necessary. [...] That part of responsibility, we do not make rules about that." (L22)*

Developing and recognizing behaviors are less often reported by the participants in the study. Therefore behaviors will not be discussed in detail.

4.1.2 Task-oriented behaviors

After the use of relation-oriented behaviors the use of task-oriented behavior is very popular among participants, in particular clarifying roles. This means that the participant is assigning tasks and explaining job responsibilities, task objectives and performance expectations. Participants used this kind of behavior for example in situations to be clear, to tell employees or clients about the rules and the expectations. One of the participants told about misbehavior of an employee and the consequences of that behavior.

> *"So I gave a clear signal and I picked it up with HR. We gave her an official warning." (L3)*

The fact that the participant gave the employee an official warning indicated that she was clarifying the employee's role and her job responsibilities. The participant told what she expected from the employee and she explained the employee how to behave.

Another participant told about the pressure he felt when a colleague went on holiday. The participant had a lot of tasks and he could not do all the tasks by himself.

> *"I am especially busy with delegating, telling people what to do and setting priorities." (L15)*

Besides clarifying roles participants often used short-term planning behaviors. Participants reported using this kind of behavior for making decisions, planning and deciding what kind of employees they should hire.

> *"That is always a game, which qualified staff do I hire when there is a vacancy and what do I want from the staff?" (L12)*

The third kind of task-oriented behavior, monitoring operations was reported in ten percent of the cases. This indicates that this kind of behavior is also used very often. Monitoring operations is about gathering information about the operations of the manager's organizational unit.

> *"Behind the scenes. Numbers come by. Well, I am writing plans and we must comply with certain requirements for the care agency. Client productivity and client time must be met, that are the things I am busy with."(L10)*

4.1.3 Change-oriented en passive behaviors

The two other kinds of behaviors, change-oriented en passive behavior are reported by a small amount of participants. These kinds of behaviors are less often used by the leaders; therefore they will not be discussed in detail.

4.2 The use of different styles

The interviews show that leaders do change their leadership styles, none of the participants used only one style. The total range of participants reported always using task- and relation-oriented behaviors. Besides the use of task- and relation-oriented behaviors participants sometimes reported using change-oriented and passive styles. More than a quarter of all the participants reported using all the four styles. Table 7 shows the number of styles leaders reported to use.

Table 7: Number of Leadership Styles Reported by the Participants

Number of styles	Percentage
2 styles	43%
3 styles	30%
4 styles	26%

Although task- and relations-oriented behaviors were mentioned by all 23 participants, five participants (22%) reported change-oriented, two participants (9%) reported engaging in passive behaviors and six (26%) participants reported using all of the four behaviors (Table 8).

Table 8: Reported Leadership Styles

Leadership styles	Percentage
Only Task-oriented & Relation-oriented	43%
Task-oriented, Relation-oriented & Change-oriented	22%
Task-oriented, Relation-oriented & Passive	9%
Task-oriented, Relation-oriented, Change-oriented & Passive	26%

4.3 Changing leadership styles

Almost all the participants described some behavior styles they preferred most. Words that describe the preferred behavior are: accessibility, coaching, compromising, giving responsibilities, involving people and solution-oriented working. All these words describe behavior that can be arranged in the relation-oriented category. This means that participants preferred to behave relation-oriented.

> *"Everybody wants to be a coaching leader, to the minutest detail. But that is not always possible." (L6)*

As participant 6 argues, for a leader it is not always possible to use the style and behavior they prefer. There are many reasons for changing leadership behavior; these reasons for deviating from preferred behavior could be divided into four distinct categories (Table 9).

Table 9: Reasons for Deviating from Preferred Behavior

Category	Section	Definition
Event-related	*4.3.1*	The kind of behavior a participant uses depends on the event that is going on
Personal feelings	*4.3.2*	The kind of behavior a participant uses depends on how the participant is feeling
Subordinates	*4.3.3*	The kind of behavior a participant uses depends on the capabilities and educational level of the subordinate
Power issue	*4.3.4*	The kind of behavior a participant uses depends on the question whether or not the use of power is necessary

In the next sections these four categories will be discussed.

4.3.1 Event-related

Table 10 presents an overview of use of different styles during different events. The participants mostly described events in which colleagues and/or employees and the organization are involved. One of the participants described an event that was related to something outside the organization, during describing this event he did not report any kind of used behavior.

Table 10: Use of Different Styles During Different Events

	Frequency	Task	Relation	Passive	Change	Total
Organization	40	28%	52%	9%	11%	100%
Colleague/employee	39	39%	57%	4%	-	100%
Client	9	33%	64%	-	3%	100%
Government	4	17%	67%	-	17%	100%
Private	2	-	17%	83%	0%	100%
Volunteers	1	50%	50%	-	-	100%
Training	1	-	100%	-	-	100%
Outside organization	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Events that are related to the organization and to colleagues and/or employees are reported in most of the times, while events that are related to the government, private situations,

volunteers, training and something outside the organization are reported less often. When reporting government related events participants mostly told about new regulations and retrenchments introduced by the government. Private situations were about not feeling well and a sick husband who died. The event that was related to a volunteer had to do with a music-evening, the voluntary worker did not agree with the introduction of a new organ. Another participant told about the training he followed to learn a new style of working. And the last less reported event was about something outside the organization; the felling of trees.

In the view of the limited reported behaviors in these categories, these less often reported events were not relevant to describe in detail and to include in the results. The three most described situations (organization, colleague/employee and client) are explained below.

Organization
Almost every participant told about an event that was related to the organization. They described for example situations in which new systems or new rules were introduced, a new director came, appointments were made or wherein a merger took place. Participant 13 told about a merger that opened his eyes. He used to focus on numbers, tasks, operations and bed occupancy; a task-oriented focus. The merger required many checks, which made him think this was not what he wanted. After the merger he started meeting people and his focus changed. Now he is trying to let people realize that they are becoming crazy together. He tried to show people that thinking in frameworks and in structures is crazy and that following new directions is much more important.

> *"My behavior? Literally showing that I am leaning back. […] Through the freedom of letting things go, you get much more energy. And therefore you can see things you did not see before." (L13)*

This description of the merger shows that a merger can be an eye-opener and therefore can stimulate people to change their behavior. This example of the merger is not the only organization-related event that is described by participants. The events which are related to the organization could be divided into four kinds of events (Table 11).

Table 11: Organization Related Events Divided into Four Kinds of Events

Event	Example of an event
Other way of working	*We are changing to the EPD which means automatically that a few functions will disappear.(L19)*
Policy of the organization	*We recently got a new policy; people that had a year contract three times cannot stay in the organization anymore. (L23)*
Retrenchments	*And finally, when we had to ask for 'meerzorg', that 'meerzorg' was rejected. That meant that we had to give up eight hours a week. (L17)*
The coming and going of employees and directors	*Last year we had three different directors. That automatically affects you as manager. (L2)*

When looking at the use of behavior styles during events that are related to the organization a few things are standing out. Relation-oriented behavior is in the organizational related events

the most used style (54%). Besides relation-oriented behavior task-oriented behavior is also used a lot (26%).

By splitting up the organizational related events in the four categories a few more things became clear. For example the use of change-oriented behavior, this kind of behavior is used especially during events where another way of working is introduced. One of the participants reported that he is always asking for feedback and that he always takes care of people's whishes. In the case of a change in the work shifts he became more change-oriented, he referred at the changing world and the fact that it is necessary for the organization to change too.

> *"In the past we only had dayshifts and evening shifts. There was no sleeping shift. I started two years ago with sleeping shifts because the care demands it. […] I said, guys the world is changing and you have to go along with it." (L8).*

Participants use change-oriented styles to convince people of the benefits of the changes. They show the positive aspects of the changes and tell the employees or clients that the change is necessary to deal with the changing environment. Changes in the way of working provide much resistance. But participants argue that motivating and showing the changes help to get people in the right direction. Participant 11 told about a change in the way the work is filled in, with the goal that this way of working is better suited to the wishes of the clients. This participant told that he preferred to get agreement, to talk with employees and to discuss with them, but in the case of this change in the way of working he used a more change-oriented style. He presented an appealing description of the outcomes that could be achieved by the change.

> *"Not just dropping and saying 'figure it out'. But step by step explaining why this change has benefits for the clients." […] Motivating, motivating, motivating, and being honest." (L11)*

The participants also argue that it is very important to be positive. Negativity takes a lot of energy and it is not helpful. So, for a leader it is important to motivate and to show how the process is changing. A focus on the positive sides and being honest and clear is very important in a changing work environment.

The use of task-oriented behavior is above average for situations that are related to the policy of the organization and the coming and going of employees and directors. Participants argue that it is important to explain clearly what the rules are and how the rules should be followed. A participant told about safety and the use of firework on a location.

> *"I prefer to use a coaching style, I just like that. […] But finally, some employees need the clarity. I can give an example. […] We made strict rules, all the fireworks in the barn in a closed cabinet. […] Other employees said 'but the client wanted to have the fireworks in his room.' […] No, we made a decision. That is it."(L21)*

Without task-related behavior it is more difficult to make the rules clear and to stand above the employees.

> *"As a leader it is sometimes important to say, guys I do really understand you [...] but that you also tell them it is going the way I decided" (L4)*

Although a relation-oriented style is preferred, participants used change-oriented and task-oriented styles to be a better leader during organization related events.

Colleagues/employees

Events where colleagues and employees are involved are also very common. Even though these events all are related to colleagues and/or employees, there are very big differences between the events. Participants describe for example events where employees do not agree with the policy, where employees do not function very well or events in which employees ask for support.

> *"Yesterday somebody came into my office and had to tell me something in private. By sharing this information she could go on with her work."(L18)*

In the case of events with colleagues and employees it is clear that relation-oriented behavior is the most used style (54%), task-oriented behavior is the second most used style (41%). The other 5% of the behavior that participants used is passive.

The events in which the participants talk about colleagues and/or employees could be divided into six kinds of events (Table 12):

Table 12: Colleague/Employee Related Events Divided into Six Kinds of Events

Event	Example of an event
Employees who do not function very well	*She worked about 1,5 years for me and on that last day it was her 24th absenteeism mention. (L16)*
An incident between employees	*I have a new team. That is not going well. I could not gain some control, where is it about. So I began to talk to them. (L23)*
A hard (home-)situation	*She gave me a folder of the police and said 'this is my declaration against my ex-husband' (L5)*
Employees who do not agree with a procedure	*There was one employee who did not accept the rejection. She put everything in action [...] and threatened with going to the newspaper. (L23)*
Asking feedback from employees	*Then I said: 'you are the expert, you did the 'OOP' for safety, tell me what you would like to change on the location'. (L21)*
A lot of work pressure for the leader	*A colleague went on a holiday. And at that moment there is a great appeal to me and I reacted very differently. (L7)*

Splitting up the colleague/employee related events in the six sub-categories it becomes clear that task-oriented behavior is very much used during events where employees do not function very well and during events where the participant feels much pressure.

In the case of employees who do not function very well, participants describe events like absenteeism, bad secretary, official warnings, stealing and an employee who is an alcoholic. One of the participants told about an employee who stole from a client. The participant told that she always tried to look at the capabilities of her employees and that she loved to give her employees the space to do things by themselves. She reported using empowering behavior,

but in the case of an employee who stole from a client she reported using more task-oriented styles.

> *"In that case I try to find someone of HR who can come to our office. [....] After that we are figuring out how to handle it. I called the employee [...] I said I want you to come to the office now, I have to tell you something. [...] Yes if it is a bad news conversation I do not tell an extensive story, in that case I am quite directly."(L5)*

Participants use task-oriented behavior to point out the rules and to delegate some work. Delegating work is especially important for participants who feel much pressure. A high work load and colleagues who went on holiday will make people feel pressure.

> *"During that moment I can use businesslike behavior. Really to the point. [...] Imagine that someone calls, normally I will take the time for a phone call, but in that case I can cut of the call very quickly." (L7)*

During events where employees do not agree with a procedure, when asking feedback or when talking about a hard (home-) event participants used relation-oriented styles. The use of relation-oriented styles is the most evident is hard (home-) events and in events wherein participants ask feedback. In those events more than 75% of the used behavior is relation-oriented. Because of the fact that relation-oriented behavior is reported mostly as preferred behavior in these cases the leader does not change his or her behavior.

Participants change their behavior only in the colleague/employee related events where people do not function well and when the participant feels much pressure. In those cases a switch is made between relation-oriented and task-oriented behavior.

Clients
Participants described lesser events with clients, but these events will help to get a clear understanding of the use of different leadership styles. Participants described different events. For example events in which clients come by, events in which clients destroyed stuff and an event in which a client wants to die.

> *"There is a client; I do not have her in my cluster anymore. But yes, she actually doesn't see the positive things in life anymore. She did a number of suicide attempts." (L15)*

When looking at the events with clients, task-oriented and relation-oriented behavior are well distributed. But dividing the client related events into two different categories reveals a difference between task-oriented and relation-oriented behavior. The difference in behavior becomes clear when splitting up the events in dealing with employees and dealing with clients.

A difference can be found in behavior between events when the participant has to deal with employees and when the participant has to deal with clients. When the participant talked about dealing with employees during client related events the participant used the preferred behavior, namely, relation-oriented behavior. During these events it is important to support

employees and to let them know you are there for them. This is for example the case during the event mentioned before, in which a client did not see the positive things in life anymore. One of the employees found her after a suicide attempt.

> *"And then I am the leader which is available for the team day and night. Yes, it was between Christmas and New Year and everybody wants to support you, except in that period. [...] So, I shut down my vacation and I told my team I am there for you." (L15)*

Participants also used relation-oriented styles to help employees with questions about clients and when they did not know how to handle a client.

Dealing with a client asks for more task-oriented behavior. Participants described events in which clients destroyed something and wherein parents of a client set impracticable requirements. One of the participants described an event in which a person drunk a lot. During the interview the participant told that she really focuses on the relation.

> *"I am investing in building a relation [...] I have conversations with people about their lives, what they did in their life and how they are as a person" (L3)*

But this relation-oriented approach was not used during events in which she has to deal with clients. In that case she switches to a more task-oriented behavior.

> *"I had an alcoholic in my department [...] I said, this is not going to happen. [...] Only addiction care is not going to work. You always have to look at what a person is going to do during the day. So I made the rule, if you are going to live on this department, you will get day structure. [...] It does not matter what, but you are doing something during the day." (L3)*

Making the rules, ensuring a day structure and telling clients what she expects from them can be arranged in the task-oriented behavior category. So, when talking about dealing with a client participants reported switching to task-oriented behavior.

4.3.2 Personal feelings

Besides deviating from preferred behavior because of differences in events, participants also changed their behavior dependent on personal feelings. The change of behavior is partly dependent on the personal situation, home-situation and how the leader feels.

The personal feelings of the participants could also be divided in three categories, see Table 13 for the overview.

Table 13: Different Categories of Personal Feelings

Personal Feeling	Example of a personal feeling
Not feeling well	*I am having a headache or it is very busy at home. I am not totally available today, help me for a while. (L3)*
Not having the energy	*At a given moment I did not had the energy anymore. I became short-tempered. (L15)*
Injustice	*Then you are unfairly threatened [...] that has impact on my attitude. (L23)*

Not feeling well

When a participant is feeling sick or not well he or she acts differently. A bad night rest and headaches ensure that the leader behaves different from his or her preferred style.

> *"Maybe when I am not feeling good, when I had a bad night's rest or… in that case I am more inclined to cut people off or to react in a different way"* (L1)

This participant argued that she reacted in a different way. Her normal way to react is explaining and clarifying things. In the case that she does not feel well she changes to more task-oriented behavior instead of relation-oriented.

One of the participants told about a deceased partner, her husband died 3,5 years ago. The home-situation made her feeling tired. Managing became a tough job. She was irritated earlier and she was able to let things go. Her leadership style was especially coaching and understanding, but her real decisively behavior was gone. The fact that she was not feeling well made her using a relation-oriented approach while she overlooked to use more task-oriented behavior.

A hard home-situation and not feeling well can make a leader out of balance, so this can be a reason for deviate from preferred behavior.

> *"If you are not stable it is hard to manage."* (L21)

Not having the energy

A building process and the pressure that comes with it can make a leader feeling tired. A few participants told about the building of a new department. Besides their tasks as leader they also had to participate in the team that regulated the process. That proved to be very difficult.

> *"Actually, as a manager you cannot combine the regulation of the new building process with controlling a team."* (L23)

This impossible task made the participants listless. They became short-tempered and told employees not to whine. Preferred behavior like solution-oriented working could not be maintained and participants reacted more negative to employees.

> *"I did not have the energy anymore. And then you are about to be short-tempered. […] I could not enhance things like solution-oriented working and yes, I was reacting more negatively to employees than preferred."* (L15)

In the rest of the interview she told that informal behavior was very important for her. Talking to employees when they are in trouble, asking how they are doing and a message on their birthday. She preferred to use relation-oriented behavior, but in the case of the building process and being listless, she could not maintain the relation-oriented behavior. A switch to more task-oriented behavior was made.

Injustice

Situations in which participants feel unfairly threatened can make them deviate from their preferred behavior. The participants mentioned situations in which employees became angry

and treated the participant unfairly. One of the participants argued that he became aloof and could not be objective anymore because employees treated him unfairly.

> *"I stayed on the sideline, while I normally prefer to be with the people […] At a given time the same process was repeating, at that moment I stayed in my executive role. I asked people from outside, they led the process" (L9)*

Asking people from outside the organization to lead the process can be interpreted as avoiding involvement (passive behavior). This participant switched to a more passive behavior style when he felt injustice. The preferred, relations-oriented behavior was not suitable anymore.

Another participant told about the incident with an employee whose contract was not extended, the employee became upset and angry. The partner of the employee was also interfering and the participant was harassed. This made her feeling unsafe and therefore se asked HR to take this case away from her.

> *"I went to my supervisor and told her to take this away from me. […] I was feeling unsafe and that had a big impact." (L23)*

In this case of injustice the participants also asked to take things away from her. This also indicates a more passive behavior style, while she normally preferred to use the relation-oriented style.

These examples show that the state of mind can influence the way of behaving as a leader. Leaders react very differently in situations wherein they do not feel good, when they feel much pressure or injustice. Leaders became more passive in their leadership styles.

4.3.3 Subordinates
Many participants told that the use of leadership styles is very dependent on the employee. Some employees need a more directive leadership style while others work better with a leader who is giving them freedom.

Most participants agree that it is important to adapt behavior to the people you manage. They argue that as a leader you always have to look at the people 'underneath' you, what their competencies are and what you are expecting from them. Giving people their own responsibilities, make them responsible for a part of their work or a project.

> *"I really believe that everybody benefits from a leader that gives responsibilities on their level" (L10)*

The amount of responsibility a person gets is dependent of their education level and their capabilities. This means that it is important for a leader to know his or her employees and to adapt his or her styles to the employee.

One of the participants clearly tells about the difference between educational levels of employees. She works with HBO+ educated people and with MBO educated people, during her workday she constantly has to change her behavior to be a good leader. The MBO educated people benefit from strict rules and clear assignments. But she cannot give the same

structured assignments to the HBO+ educated people; they would not take those structured assignments serious. The HBO+ need a really different leadership style, more coaching and discussing.

> *"That means literally, on a day, when I am walking from there (MBO educated people) to there (HBO+ educated) I have to change my style. There (MBO), I have to give structured assignments […] and there (HBO) I use a more coaching style." (L16)*

This participant is switching between task-oriented behaviors for the MBO educated people, to relation-oriented behaviors for the HBO educated people.

Participants argue that as a leader you have to deal with different people who all need a different approach. If all the people are treated in the same way, that does not work. One of the participants argued that it can be compared to how they treat clients. Not all the 'PDD-nossers' need the same treatment and not all the people with a handicap should be treated the same. This is also true for employees.

> *"There are HBO educated people in my group and people who only finished primary school. There is a huge difference in educational level. […] You cannot give the employees who only finished primary school total freedom. […] I do not mind to tell ` one of them exactly what to do, while empowering the other." (L5)*

Both the participants who told about the educational differences between employees argue that HBO educated people can handle much more freedom and ask for relation-oriented behavior, the lower educated people need clarity, rules and thus a more task-oriented approach.

4.3.4 Power issue
Almost all participants indicate that it is sometimes necessary to change their leadership style to make things clear. Everybody has his or her own preferred style but it is important to deviate from that style to make decisions and to make clear that some things are not possible.

This means that participants sometimes should use the task-oriented style more than they would like. But making decisions, without asking people how they think about it can be very useful.

There are many situations mentioned in which participant changed their leadership style to make things clear. For example by official and formal occasions, to give feedback, in a bad news talks, in the case you cannot trust an employee anymore and when you have to fire somebody.

Besides using task-oriented behavior to present the rules and make things clear, task-oriented behavior can also help to provide the team with calmness.

> *"I noticed that playing the boss, making decisions is sometimes necessary because it helps to provide the team with calmness. […] So it remains fluctuating between coaching and playing the boss."(L21)*

5. Conclusion and discussion

Although the concept of leadership has attracted much discussion, many questions are still open. Much research focused only on one kind of leadership behavior and researchers did not integrate the whole range of leadership behaviors in one study. This study makes a significant contribution by integrating the whole range of leadership behaviors and by answering the question how leaders tailor the different behaviors to be effective.

5.1 Conclusion

The objective of the study was to answer the research question 'How do leaders tailor their leadership behavior to be effective leaders in different situations?' Conducting interviews contributed to answer this question.

The study made clear that relation-oriented behavior is the most used behavior by leaders. Besides the use of relation-oriented behavior leaders also use much task-oriented behavior. Change-oriented and passive behaviors are used lesser. The interviews reveal that leaders indeed do change their leadership behaviors during their work as a leader. They all use task-oriented and relation-oriented behavior, 26% of the participants used all four leadership behaviors.

In the interviews four categories with reasons to change leadership behavior were found, see Table 14.

Table 14: Reasons for Changing Leadership Behaviors

Category	Sub-category	Effect on behavior
Event-related	Organization	Switching to change-oriented and task-oriented behaviors
	Colleagues/employees	Switching to task-oriented behaviors
	Client	Switching to task-oriented behaviors
Personal Feelings	Not feeling well	No clear and unequivocal direction
	Not having the energy	Switching to task-oriented behaviors
	Injustice	Switching to passive behaviors
Subordinates	Low educated people	Switching to task-oriented behaviors
	High educated people	Switching to relation-oriented behaviors (or using preferred style of behavior)
Power issue	To set rules and make decisions	Switching to task-oriented behaviors

When looking at the event-related category, a few things come up. Organizational related situation ask mostly for relation-oriented behavior, except for promoting another way of working. In that case; leaders switch mostly to change-oriented leadership behavior. If the leader wants to make things clear to employees he or she uses task-oriented behavior and when dealing with hard-home situations and asking for feedback a relation-oriented style is used. When it is about a situation in which a client is involved the leader also switches between relation-oriented and task-oriented behavior. A separation can be made between dealing with employees and dealing with clients. When dealing with an employee the leader

uses more relation-oriented behavior whereas, when a leader is dealing with a client the leader uses task-oriented behavior.

The second reason for changing behavior is depending on personal feelings. The interviews reveal that the state of mind of a leader can influence his or her behavior. There is not one unequivocal direction when it is about changing leadership styles in relation to personal feelings. Not having the energy mostly causes a switch to more task-oriented behavior while feeling injustices causes the switch to more passive behavior.

Third, the category subordinates, means that a leader has to change his or her behavior to get a connection with the employee. No one is the same, which is also true for employees, so every employee needs a leadership style that is adapted to the employee. It is important to look at the educational level of the employees and at the competencies. Participants argue that an employee who is lower educated needs a more task-oriented leadership style while employees who are higher educated need a more relation-oriented style.

The last reason for changing leadership behavior is a power issue. Participants argue that they deviate from their preferred behavior to point out the rules, to make decisions, to be formal, to give feedback and to fire someone. Demonstrating power is mostly done by using task-oriented leadership behavior.

5.2 Relation to previous theories

This study revealed that relation-oriented behavior is the kind of behavior that leaders preferred to use and logically use in the most of the time. These findings are consistent with the findings of Larsson and Vinberg (2010). They also found that leaders use task-oriented behavior when organizing work activities to improve efficiency and assigning work to groups or individuals. Agnew and Flin (2013) also found in their study that task and relations focused behaviors were used more frequently than change oriented behaviors.

Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) argued that leadership effectiveness is based on the interaction between leader behaviors and the followers' levels of maturity. In their study they argued that a leader has to adapt his or her style to the level of maturity of a follower. This study revealed that leaders do adapt their style of the level of maturity, which means that the results of this study are in line with the results of the studies of Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982).

The results of this study are also in line with the results of the study of Manning (2013). He found that, 'in order to be effective, leaders need to tailor their behavior to the specific situation' (p. 343). This study shows that leaders indeed do tailor their behavior to the specific situation; leaders change their behaviors to be effective.

The study answers the question asked by Zaccaro (2007). He pleaded for more research at the display of an array of different approach and styles. Zaccaro asked if a leader is capable to display significant behavioral variability and if a leader could effectively apply appropriate responses to different situations. This study answers the questions of Zaccaro (2007) by revealing that leaders indeed display behavioral variability. Leaders do not use one single

kind of behavior but they can (effectively) apply responses to different situations. The question whether or not the application of responses is effective is not addressed in this study. Further research should focus on that question.

Another contribution of this study is related to Yukl & Mashud's (2010) suggestion to examine the pattern of leadership behaviors used by a leader. This study focused on the use of behavioral categories together. There was not a focus on each type of leadership behavior separately. The study reveals that there can be found a pattern in leadership behaviors used by a leader. Leaders prefer to use a relation-oriented leadership style but besides that, they often use task-oriented behavior. Those two kinds of leadership behavior are used by all the participants in this study, which means that relation-oriented and task-oriented behaviors are the norm and that other kinds of behavior are supplementing.

Agnew and Flin (2013) argue that when dealing with pressure, a leader uses more task-oriented behavior. That is not in line with this study, but Agnew and Flin did not include the category passive behavior in their research. They mention the fact that in case of increased amount of paperwork the leader reduced time spent in the clinical area. This could also indicate a more passive related style. Future research should focus on these different findings.

The fact that leaders do change their leadership behaviors to be effective in different kinds of situations is in contrast with much popular thinking on leadership. Researchers as Bass (1985) and Bennis and Nanus (1985) claim that there is one "essence" of effective leadership and that one kind of behavior is related to leadership effectiveness in all kinds of situations. This study reveals that leaders do not use one single kind of behavior, but that they tailor different kinds of behavior to be effective.

Waters (2012) also claims that leaders will not be effective in all situations, other researchers like Finkelstein, Hambrick and Cannella (2008) and Kriger and Seng (2005) made the same conclusion. This study challenges this view by claiming that leaders can change their behaviors and can be effective in different situations. But, the focus of the study was on tailoring leadership behaviors, not especially on the effectiveness of tailoring the behaviors. There is a clear need for research that focuses on the effectiveness of tailoring behaviors. This study reveals that leaders change their behavior because they think another kind of behavior is more effective, but the effect of changing behaviors on the organization and one the employees is not measured.

5.3 Limitations

This study was subject to a number of limitations. First, the data were collected from ten different health care organizations in the Netherlands. Although many different health care organizations were involved, generalization can be difficult, so the results of the study cannot be generalized to the whole Dutch healthcare. It is important to treat the findings with caution. The sample of this study was relatively small and therefore susceptible to error. There is a need for further research on this topic, especially with larger samples.

The fact that leaders participated in this study voluntary can have influenced the results of the study. Leaders might be more concerned with changing leadership styles and how they

behave as a leader. The participants were told about the purpose of the study before participation confirmation; they might be more favorable towards their leadership styles.

5.4 Future research

In the sections above a few directions for future research are mentioned. But there are still many gaps that can be answered.

In this study the focus was on healthcare organizations in the Netherlands, no attention is paid to the different kinds of healthcare organizations. There were participants from organizations that provide healthcare at home, there were participants that worked in retirement homes, there was a participant that worked for a maternal health organization and there was a participant that worked in a hospital. Due to the small sample of participant it was not possible to compare between the different kinds of organizations. I could imagine that a leader in a retirement home is managing different than a leader of a maternal health organization. It would be useful to focus on these differences in the future.

Another direction for future research is the background of the participants. In this study participants were not asked about their background, but one of the interviews revealed that the participant acted differently because he had another background. He told that his background made him more businesslike. Other participants told that businesspeople are really different from care-people. A comparison between different organizations could show if there are really difference due to the background of people.

This study focused on the broader concepts of task-oriented, relation-oriented, change-oriented and passive leadership styles. These broader concepts all include smaller parts that divide the kinds of behavior. In future research there should be more focus on the smaller parts of the kinds of behavior. It could be possible that studies which focus on the smaller parts reveal different results.

The last direction for future research is a focus on employees instead of the focus on leaders. In this study the focus was on the behavior of leaders and their interpretation of that behavior, leaders were asked about how followers reacted to their behavior but the leaders argued that they could not speak for others. So, it seems very important to find out how followers react to a leader who is changing his or her behavior. This can also help leaders to change their behavior in the most effective ways.

5.5 Practical relevance

Besides the fact that the results of this study contribute to the existing literature on leadership, the results do also have a practical relevance. This study reveals that leaders change their leadership styles to be effective leaders in different situations. Leadership training and development courses can focus on that result. It is not necessary to focus on one single leadership behavior when training leaders but it is important for a leader to display all the kinds of leadership behaviors to be effective. So, when training leaders, all the kinds of leadership behaviors should be explained and leaders must be motivated to deviate from preferred behavior.

References

Agnew, C. & Flin, R. (2013). Senior charge nurses' leadership behaviours in relation to hospital ward safety: A mixed method study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies.*

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261-295. Doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4.

Alvesson, M. & Sveningsson, S. (2003). Managers doing leadership: The extra-ordinarization of the mundane. *Human Relations, 56*(12), 1435-1459. doi: 10.1177/00187267035612001.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72,* 441-462.

Ayman, R., Chemers, M.M. & Fiedler, F. (1995). The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: its levels of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 147-167.

Barker, R. (1997). How can we train leaders if we don't know what leadership is? *Human Relations, 50,* 343-362.

Barker, R. (2001) The nature of leadership. *Human Relations, 54,* 469-493.

Bartlett, C. & Ghoshal, S. (1995). Changing the role of top management beyond systems to people. *Harvard Business Review,* 132(3).

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

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

Bernardin, H.J. & Alvares, K.M. (1976). The managerial grid as a predictor of conflict resolution method and managerial effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 84-92.

Blake R.R. & Mouton J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, TX: Gulf.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1982). Management by grid principles or situationalism: Which? *Group and Organizational Studies, 7,* 207-210,

Blackmann, N. J.M. & Koval, J.J. (2000). Interval estimation for Cohen's kappa as a measure of agreement. *Statistics in medicine, 19*(5), 723-741.

Boyce, C. & Neale, P. (2006). Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input. *Pathfinder International Tool Series.*

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

Cavazotte, F., Moreno, V. & Hickmann, M. (2012). Effects of leader intelligence, personality and emotional intelligence on transformational leadership and managerial performance.*The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(3), 443-455.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2014). Beroepsbevoling; naar bedrijf en persoonskenmerken. *Retrieved on 11-6-2014 from: statline.cbs.nl*

Chell, E. (1998). Critical incident technique. In: Symon G, editor. Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research. *London: Sage.*

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*(6), 653-665.

Denis, J-L, Langley, A. & Rouleau, L. (2010). The Practice of Leadership in the Messy World of Organizations. *Leadership, 6*(1), 67-88.

Derue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.D., Wellman, N. & Humphrey, S.E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64,* 7-52.

DiCicco-Bloom, B. & Crabtree, B.F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40*, 314-321.

Ehrhart, M.G., & Klein, K.J. (2001). Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: the influence of follower values and personality. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 153-179.

Ekvall, G. (1991). Change-centred leadership: Empirical evidence of a third dimension of leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 12,* 18-23.

Ekvall, G. & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two-dimensional model. S*candinavian Journal of Management*, *7*(1), 17-26.

Ekvall, G. & Arvonen, J. (1994). Leadership profiles, situation and effectiveness. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 3*, 139-161.

Fagiano, D. (1997). Managers vs. leaders: A corporate fable. *Management Review, 10,* 5-6.

Farling, M.L., Stone, G. & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 6*(1/2), 49-72. doi:10.1177/10719199900600104.

Fey, C.F., Adaeva, M. & Vitkovskaia, A. (2001). Developing a model of leadership styles: what works best in Russia? *International Business Review, 10*, 615-643.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F.E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 76,* 128-148.

Finkelstein, S, Hambrick, D.C. & Cannella, A.A. (2008). *Strategic Leadership: Theory and Research on Executives, Top Management Team, and Boards.* Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Flanagan, J.C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4).

Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 693-727.\

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary Genius.* New York: Appleton.

Gabbott, M. & Hogg, G. (1996). The Glory of Stories: Using Critical Incidents to Understand Service Evaluation in the Primary Healthcare Context. *Journal of Marketing Management, 7*(6), 19-23.

Gibb, C.A. (1947). The principles and traits of leadership. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 42*, 267-284.

Graham, J.W. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(2), 105-119.

Gregoire, M.B. & Arendt, S.W. (2004). Leadership: Reflections over the past 100 years. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 104*(3), 395-403.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1996). *On becoming a servant leader.* (D.M. Frick & L.C. Spears, Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.

Gremler, D.D. (2004). The critical incident technique in service research. *Journal of Service Research, 7*(1), 65-89. Doi: 10.1177/1094670504266138.

Grove, S.J. & Fisk, R.P. (1997). The Impact of Other Customers on Service Experiences: A Critical Incident Examination of 'Getting Along'. *Journal of Retailing, 73*(Spring),   63-85.

Halpin, A.W. & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: its description and measurement* (pp. 39-51). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Hart, S.L. & Quinn, R.E. (1993). Roles executive play: CEOs, Behavioral complexity, and firm performance. *Human Relations, 46*(5), 543-574.

Hernandez, M., Eberly, M.B., Avolio, B.J. & Johnson, M.D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22,* 1165-1185.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 323-353.

House, R.J. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 556-571.

House, R.J. & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 3,* 81-97.

Hui, YH., van den Berg, P.T. & Wilderom, C.P.M. (2011). Transformational leadership as a mediator between emotional intelligence and team outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(4), 591-603.

Jackson, T.A., Meyer, J.P. & Wang, X-H. (2013). Leadership, Commitment, and Culture: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 20*(1), 84-106. Doi: 10.1177/1548051812466919

Jago, A.G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science, 28*(3), 315-336.

Judge, T.A. & Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 755-768.

Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 36-51.

Kaulio, M.A. (2008). Project leadership in multi-project settings: Findings from a critical incident study. *International Journal of Project Management, 26,* 338-347. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2007.06.005

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 48-60.

Kotter, J. (1990). *Force for change; How leadership differs from management.* New York: Free Press.

Kriger, M. & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadrship with inner meaning: a contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 771-806.

Larsson, J. & Vinberg, S. (2010). Leadership behavior in successful organizations. *Total Quality Management, 21*(3), 317-334.

Manning, T. (2013). A "contingent" view of leadership: 360 degree assessments of leadership behaviours in different contexts. *Industrial, and Commercial Training, 45*(6), 343-351.

Meindl, J., Ehrlich, s. & Dukerich, J. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 78-102.

Mintzberg, H. (1998). Covert leadership: Notes on managing professionals. *Harvard Business Review, 140*(7).

Northouse, P.G. (2012). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Sage Publications.

Norton, L.W. (2010). Flexible leadership: an integrative perspective. *Consulting Psychological Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 143-150. Doi: 10.1037/a0019990.

Perrow, C. (1970). *Organization analysis: A sociological view.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1992). On Studying Managerial Elites. *Strategic Management Journal, 1*, 163-182.

Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rilling, c. & Jordan, D. (2007). Important Co-leader Skills and traits on extended outdoor trips as perceived by leaders. *Leisure Studies, 26*(2), 193-212. Doi: 10.1080/02614360500337524.

Rubin, H.S. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Skogstad, A. & Einarsen, S. (1999). The importance of a change-centred leadership style in four organizational cultures. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 15*, 289-306.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology,* 35-71.

Stauss, B. & Weinlich, B. (1997). Process-Oriented Measurement of Service Quality: Applying the Sequential Incident Tchnique. *European Journal of Marketing, 31*(1), 33-55.

Tabernero, C., Chambel, M.J., Curral, L. & Arana, J.M. (2009). The role of task-oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership on normative contract and group performance. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37*(10), 1391-1404. Doi: 10.2224.sbp.2009.37.10.1391.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation.* New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V.H. (2000). Leadership and the decision-making process. *Organizational Dynamics, 28*(4), 82-94.

Vroom, V.H. & Jago, A.G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 17-24.

Waters, R.D. (2012). The role of stewardship in leadership. *Journal of Communication Management, 17*(4), 324-340.

Wainwright, D. (1997). Can Sociological Research Be Qualitative, Critical and Valid? *The Qualitative Report, 3*(2).

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251-289.

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, 9*(1), 15-32.

Yukl, G. & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 81-93. Doi:10.1037/a0019835.

Yukl, G. & Tracey, J.B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(4), 525-535.

Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychological Association, 62*(1), 6-16.

Zaccaro, S.J. & Banks, D. (2004). Leader visioning and adaptability: Bridging the gap between research and practice on developing the ability to manage change. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 367-380. Doi: 10.1002.hrm.20030

Zaccaro, S.J., Kemp, C. & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In. J. Antonakis, A.T. Cianciolo, and R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders (*pp. 3-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders. *Harvard Business Review, 55,* 67-78.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Definitions of leadership

Researcher	Definition
Gibb (1947)	The ten now become one group and the group focus is the men (A) who offered the solution. He is the leader at the moment. He is in the position of influencing their behavior more than they influence his. He is in the role of initiator of group action, which at this point consists of discussion. (p. 270) Leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which, by the successful interplay of relevant individual differences controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause. Any person may be called a leader 'during the time when and in so far as, his will, felling and insight direct and control others in the pursuit of a cause which he presents. (p. 272)
Stogdill (1948)	Leadership is both a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of noncoercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence (Stogdill, 1948)
Zaleznik (1977)	Leadership inevitably requires using power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people. (p. 64)
Jago (1982)	Leadership is both a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of noncoercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence. (Stogdill, 1948 in Jago, 1982, p. 315) Leadership is expressed or displayed through interaction between people and necessarily implies its complement "followership". For one to influence, another must permit himself to be influenced. Moreover, leader and follower(s) must be at least loosely organized around some common or agreed upon purpose or mission.(p. 316) Perhaps the most important feature of the above definition is that it does not restrict the role of leader to one formally designated member of a group or, for that matter, to any single group member. Leadership is an evolving, dynamic process. At times, leaders become followers and followers become leaders. (p. 316)
Meindl, Erlich & Dukerich (1985)	The romanticized concepts of leadership suggests that leaders do or should have the ability to control and influence the fates of the organization in their charge. (p. 96) It may be that the romance and the mystery surrounding leadership concepts are critical for sustaining follower-ship and that they contribute significantly to the responsiveness of individuals to the needs and goals of the collective organization (p. 100)
Yukl (1989)	Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on

	organizational culture. Most definitions of leadership involve an influence process, but the numerous definitions of leadership that have been proposed appear to have little else in common. (p. 252) Thus, leadership is defined broadly in this article to include influencing task objectives and strategies, influencing commitment and compliance task behavior to achieve these objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of an organization.(p. 253)
Kotter (1990)	One centrally important aspect of leadership is direction setting, which people frequently confuse with planning or long-range planning. (Preface, p. 9) I argue that planning is a managerial process that is not the same as, nor ever a substitute for, the direction-setting aspect of leadership, a process that produces vision and strategies, not plans. (Preface, p. 9) A second core aspect of leadership is alignment: the process of getting people to understand, accept, and line up in the chosen direction. (Preface, p. 9) In efforts to produce change in complex organizations, sizeable barriers of some sort are always encountered. Overcoming these barriers often takes herculean effort, which only comes from highly energized people. This is why motivation and inspiration are central aspects of leadership. (Preface, p. 9) Leadership within a complex organization achieves this function through three subprocesses… […] 1. Establishing direction – developing a vision of the future, often the distant future, along with strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision. 2. Aligning people – communicating the direction to those whose cooperation may be needed so as to create coalitions that understand the vision and that are committed to its achievement 3. Motivating and inspiring – keeping people moving in the right direction despite major political, bureaucratic, and resource barriers to change by appealing to very basic, but often untapped, human needs, values and emotions. (p. 5)
Graham (1991)	The ideal leader is visionary, practical, and inspirational, i.e., one who knows where to go, how to get there, and can motivate others to make the trip. (p. 105)
Hart & Quinn (1993)	On the one hand, effective leaders are portrayed as visionary, innovative, dynamic, charismatic, transformational, participative, empowering, and motivating. On the other hand, successful leaders are described as being powerful, assertive, decisive, expert, analytical, stable, consistent, and demandig (many researchers, in Hart & Quinn, 1993, p.543/544). This paper develops a model of executive leadership consisting of four competing roles: Vision Setter, Motivator, Analyzer and Task Master (p. 543) Most recently, the strategic management literature has begun to

	recognize the importance of vision to the realization of corporate strategies (Itami, 1987; Hamel & Prahalad, 1989; Westley & Mintzberg, 1989, Campell & Yeung, 1991). Indeed, the literature suggests that without a challenging core mission and set of values understood by all employees, the best technical or economic strategy will go unrealized. In summary, theory and research in this domain emphasize three roles for the executive leader: (1) recognizing the need for departure from the status quo, (2) creating and articulating a compelling vision or "agenda for change" and (3) institutionalizing the vision through consistent personal example and organizational design. (p. 546).
Bartlett & Ghosal (1995)	Among these it seems that the basic role of leaders when exercising leadership is the release of the 'human spirit' to shape creativity, inspiration and motivation
Barker (1997)	Leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers (Burns, 1978, p. 425). "Successful leaders and managers must use power – to influence others, to monitor results, and to sanction performance" (Winter, 1991, p. 77). The function of leadership is to create change while the function of manamgent is to create stability' and 'leadership creates new patterns of action and new belief systems'. (p. 349)
Mintzberg (1998)	Along with controlling and coordinating, directing is one of the oldest and most common words used to describe managerial work (p. 143). Perhaps we need a greater appreciation in all managerial work of this kind of covert leadership: Not leadership actions in and of themselves – motivating, coaching, and all that – but rather unobtrusive actions that infuse all the other things a manager does. (p. 144) Connecting to important outsiders – what is called linking- is an important aspect of all managerial work. (p. 146)
Farling, Stone & Winston (1999)	The authors of this paper present a model of servant leadership based on the variables of vision, influence, credibility, trust and service. (p. 49) Greenleaf (1996) defines a leader "as one who goes ahead to guide the way, a leader, as I will use the term, may be a mother in her home, any person who wields influence, or the head of a vast organization (p. 287). In summary, Greenleaf's definition of servant leadership is very similar to Burn's definition of transformational leadership. Both Burns and Greenleaf focus on others in the leader-follower process. The literature identifies the following variables in the servant leader-followers transformational model: (in Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999, p 51).
Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	'The function of leadership is to create change while the function of manamgent is to create stability' and 'leadership creates new patterns

of action and new belief systems' (Barker, 1997: 349). (p. 1436)

The leadership-management distinction further emphasizes the more grandiose aspects of leadership, reserving this term for the more dynamic, inspirational aspects of what people in authority may do. (p. 1436).

Contemporary writing usually frames leadership in visionary and heroic terms, it is the leader's ability to address the many through the use of charisma, symbols and other strongly emotional devices, the ambition being to arouse and encourage people to embark upon organizational projects. Leadership is about the manager/leader being active and powerful. The leader acts, the follower responds (p. 1438)

Leadership commonly involves visions, cooperation, networking, teamwork, creativity and inspiration. (p. 1438)

Mintzberg (1998) characterizes leadership of knowledge workers as 'inspirational' and 'supportive' and Kotter (1990) emphasizes the formulation of 'vision' as central. Similarly, Fagiano (1997) suggests that leaders 'help others do the things they know need to be done in order to achieve the common vision'. Leadership is also often understood as producing change and releasing innovation and development. (p. 1439)

Among these it seems that the basic role of leaders when exercising leadership is the release of the 'human spirit' to shape creativity, inspiration and motivation (Bartlett & Ghosal, 1995). (p. 1439)

Leadership is related to grand ideas, visions and engaging speeches that encourage people to take part in great missions. Leadership is connected to radical change and inspiring ideas that facilitate people to rethink old ideas (Meindl et al, 1985, in Alvesson & Sveningsson p. 1448).

Zaccaro & Banks (2004)	The construction of organizational vision and the ability to manage the change engendered by visions represents core organizational competencies that foster competitive advantage for organizations.(p. 367) As a results, managers at all organizational levels must be more innovative and creative in developing solutions. (p. 367). Strategic flexibility rests on several factors, but two of the most critical include (a) *the ability to manage change*, as part of the human capital retained among organizational managers and (b) *the ability of mamangers to develop an organizational vision* that is effectively translated into a cascading strategic plan. (p. 367) For an organization to maximize competitive advantage, then, managers need to articulate a vision with a corresponding strategic plan and have the ability to manage the changes called for by such plans (Hitt et al., 1998; Ireland & Hitt, 1999). (p. 368) A number of leadership theories and models speak to the importance of visioning and managing change for organizational effectiveness.

	For example, Bass's work (1985, 1996) argues that a key task for organizational leaders is to motivate and galvanize their subordinates to "perform beyond expectations". They accomplish this task by encouraging subordinates to commit to and work on behalf of an organization vision. (p. 368) Leaders motivate change by the management and manipulation of organizational meaning and symbols that are associated with an organizational vision. Vision represents an idealized future state of the organization (Zaccaro & Banks, 2001 in Zaccaro & Banks, 2004, p. 371).
Vroom & Jago (2007)	Virtually all definitions of leadership share the view that leadership involves the process of influence. One thing that all leaders have in common is one or more followers. If no one is following, one cannot be leading. (p. 17) We see leadership as a process of motivating people to work together collaboratively to accomplish great things. Note a few implications of this definition: 1. Leadership is a process, not a property of a person 2. The process involves a particular form of influence, called motivating 3. The nature of the incentives, extrinsic or intrinsic, is not part of the definition 4. The consequences of the influence is collaboration in pursuit of a common goal 5. The 'great things' are in the minds of both leader and followers and are not necessarily viewed as desirable by all other parties. (p. 18)

Aspects	Researchers	Frequency
Influence	Gibb (1947); Stogdill (1948); Zaleznik (1977); Jago (1982	9
Motivate	Kotter (1990); Graham (1991); Hart & Quinn (1993); B	7
Common goal	Stogdill (1948); Jago (1982); Meindl et al., (1985); Alves	6
Vision	Kotter (1990); Graham (1991); Hart & Quinn (1993); Fa	6
Inspiration	Kotter (1990); Graham (1991); Bartlett & Ghosal (1995	4
Control	Gibb (1947); Meindl et al., (1985); Mintzberg (1998)	3
Innovative	Hart & Quinn (1993); Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003);	3
Powerful	Hart & Quinn (1993); Barker (1997); Alvesson & Sven	3
Creative	Bartlett & Ghosal (1995); Alvesson & Sveningsson (200	3
Create change	Barker (1997); Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003); Zaccar	3
Cooperation	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003); Vroom & Jago (2007);	3
Directing	Gibb (1947); Mintzberg (1998)	2
Followership	Jago (1982); Meindl et al., (1985)	2
Dynamic	Hart & Quinn (1993); Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	2
Charismatic	Hart & Quinn (1993); Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	2
Initiator	Gibb (1947)	1
Interaction	Jago (1982)	1
Strategies	Kotter (1990)	1
Alignment	Kotter (1990)	1
Practical	Graham (1991)	1
Transformational	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Participative	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Empowering	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Assertive	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Decisive	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Analytical	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Stable	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Consistent	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Demanding	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Task master	Hart & Quinn (1993)	1
Mobilizing	Barker (1997)	1
Coordinate	Mintzberg (1998)	1
Coaching	Mintzberg (1998)	1
Credibility	Farling, Stone & Winston (1999)	1
Trust	Farling, Stone & Winston (1999)	1
Service	Farling, Stone & Winston (1999)	1
Being active	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	1
Networking	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	1
Teamwork	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	1
Development	Alvesson & Sveningsson (2003)	1

Attachment 2 – Description of metacategories

Task behaviors:

* Short term planning

Deciding what to do, how to do it, who will do it, and when it will be done. It is difficult to observe. Nevertheless, there are some observable aspects such as writing plans, preparing written budgets, developing written schedules, and meeting with others to determine how to accomplish a task.

* Clarifying responsibilities

Communication of plans, policies, and role expectations. To guide and and coordinate work activity and make sure people know what to do and how to do it. Setting specific task objectives, encourage a search for efficient ways to do the work, and facilitate evaluation of performance by providing a benchmark against which to compare it.

* Monitoring operations and performance

Gathering information about the operations of the manager's organizational unit, including the progress of the work, the performance of individual subordinates, the quality of products or services, and the success of projects or programs. Observation of work operations, reading written reports, watching computer screen displays of performance data, inspecting the quality of samples of the work, holding progress review meetings whit individual or group.

Relations behaviors:

* Supporting

Showing consideration, acceptance, and concern for the needs and feelings of other people.

* Developing

Coaching. Showing someone a better way to do a task, asking questions that help someone learn how to perform a task better, helping someone learn from a mistake, and explaining how to solve a complex problem rather than just providing a solution. Providing opportunities to develop skills and confidence and facilitating skill learning.

* Recognizing

Giving praise and showing appreciation to others for effective performance, significant achievements and important contributions to the organization. Often given along with tangible rewards.

* Consulting

Involving followers in making important decisions.

* Empowering

Delegating and providing more autonomy and discretion to subordinates.

Change behaviors:

* External monitoring

Monitor the external environment and identify threats and opportunities for the organization. Environmental scanning. Reading government reports and industry publications, attending professional and trade meetings, talking to customers and suppliers, examining the products and reports of competitors, conducting market research and developing an external network of information sources.

* Envisioning change

Articulating an inspiring vision of a better future.

* Encouraging innovative thinking

* Taking personal risks

Attachment 3 – Interview design

Interview

- Kunt u wat vertellen over het bedrijf waarvoor u werkt?
- Aan hoeveel mensen geeft u leiding?
- Hoelang bevindt u zich al in een leiderschapspositie?

Q1: Wat zijn uw normale bezigheden gedurende een typische werkdag?

In de volgende deel gaan we het hebben over concrete gebeurtenissen. Het gaat hierbij om gebeurtenissen die afwijken van uw verwachting. De gebeurtenissen kunnen zowel positief als negatief zijn.

Bij het beschrijven van een concrete gebeurtenis wil ik graag dat u het volgende in gedachten houdt.
- U kunt zich de gebeurtenis goed herinneren
- De gebeurtenis heeft (op welke wijze dan ook) invloed gehad op uw gedrag als leidinggevende

Q2: Kunt u een concrete gebeurtenis beschrijven?
- Wanneer vond deze gebeurtenis plaats?
- Wat waren de omstandigheden waaronder de gebeurtenis plaats vond?
- Hoe beschrijft u uw gedrag tijdens deze gebeurtenis?
- Wat waren de consequenties van de gebeurtenis en uw gedrag?
- Wat vindt u van uw gedrag tijdens deze gebeurtenis? Hoe voelt u zich daarover?
- Hoe reageerden uw volgers (de mensen onder u) op uw gedrag?

Q3: Welk leiderschapsgedrag is volgens u effectief?

Q4: Welk leiderschapsgedrag is volgens u niet effectief?

Q5: Wat vindt u in het algemeen van het veranderen van leiderschapsgedrag/stijlen? Hoe voelt u zich daarbij?

Q6: Wat zijn de beperkingen van het veranderen van leiderschapsgedrag volgens u?

We zijn aan het eind gekomen van het interview. Ik wil u hartelijk bedanken voor uw deelname. Mocht u geïnteresseerd zijn in de uitkomens van het onderzoek dan hoor ik dat graag. Ik zend u dan na afronding van het onderzoek een samenvatting toe.

Attachment 4 – Informed Consent

Onderzoek naar leiderschapsstijlen in verschillende situaties

Verantoordelijke onderzoeker: Inge Rikkink

In te vullen door de deelnemer

Ik verklaar op een voor mij duidelijke wijze te zijn ingelicht over de aard, methode, doel en belasting van het onderzoek. Ik weet dat de gegevens en resultaten van het onderzoek alleen anoniem en vertrouwelijk aan derden bekend gemaakt zullen worden. Mijn vragen zijn naar tevredenheid beantwoord.

Ik begrijp dat de geluidsopname van dit interview uitsluitend voor analyse en/of wetenschappelijke presentatie zal worden gebruikt.

Ik stem geheel vrijwillig in met deelname aan dit onderzoek. Ik behoud me daarbij het recht voor om op elk moment zonder opgaaf van redenen mijn deelname aan dit onderzoek te beëindigen.

Naam deelnemer: ....

Datum: .... Handtekening deelnemer: ....

In te vullen door de uitvoerende onderzoeker

Ik heb een mondelinge en schriftelijke toelichting gegevens op het onderzoek. Ik zal resterende vragen over het onderzoek naar vermogen beantwoorden. De deelnemer zal van een eventuele voortijdige beëindiging van deelname aan dit onderzoek geen nadelige gevolgen ondervinden.

Naam onderzoeker: ....

Datum: .... Handtekening onderzoeker:..

52

Onderzoeksintroductie

Op het moment ben ik bezig met een onderzoek naar verschillen in het gedrag van leidinggevenden in verschillende situaties. Daarvoor interview ik leidinggevenden in verschillende kennisintensieve organisaties.

U bent een van die leidinggevenden. Zometeen starten we met het werkelijke interview. Ik neem het interview op met een taperecorder, dit doe ik alleen om straks het interview precies uit te kunnen schrijven. Op die manier is het mogelijk om de interviews goed te analyseren en juiste conclusies te trekken. Ik wil u er op wijzen dat uw antwoorden te allen tijde anoniem worden behandeld. Dit interview zal dus niet naar u terug te leiden zijn.

Mocht u nog vragen hebben over het interview of de procedure dan kunt u deze vragen altijd aan mij stellen.

Voordat wij beginnen met het interview is het van belang dat u een toestemmingsverklaringformulier invult. Dit formulier ontvangt u nu van mij.

Hierna starten we met het interview.