

AD-A072 384


STATE UNIV OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY F/G 5/10
ASSESSING GOOD AND BAD LEADERSHIP USING CRITICAL INCIDENTS AND --ETC(U)
JUL 79 L L NEIDER, W A CARPENTER N00014-76-C-0754
TR-8 NL

UNCLASSIFIED

| OF |
AD
A072384



END
DATE
FILMED
9-79
DDC



LEVEL II

12
SC

Assessing Good and Bad Leadership
Using Critical Incidents and Ratings Scales
in Three Organizational Settings:

A Follow-Up Study

Linda L. Neider, William A. Carpenter, and Edwin P. Hollander

State University of New York at Buffalo

Technical Report No. 8

July 1979

DDIC
RECEIVED
AUG 6 1979
RECEIVED
C

Prepared and Distributed under
ONR Contract N00014-76-C-0754
NR 170-824

Edwin P. Hollander, Principal Investigator

Department of Psychology
State University of New York at Buffalo
4230 Ridge Lea Road
Buffalo, New York 14226

DDC FILE COPY

ADA 072384

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for
any purpose of the United States Government.
Approved for public release and unlimited distribution.

79 08 2 081

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)


REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report No. 8	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER 14 TR-9
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Assessing Good and Bad Leadership Using Critical Incidents and Rating Scales in Three Organizational Settings: A Follow-Up Study		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 9 Technical Report
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 Linda L. Neider, M.B.A., Ph.D. William A. Carpenter, B.S. Edwin P. Hollander, Ph.D.		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Dept. of Psychology, State University of N. Y. at Buffalo, 4230 Ridge Lea Road Buffalo, New York 14226		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 15 N00014-76-C-0754
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 452) Arlington, Virginia 22217		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 170-824
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12 26p		12. REPORT DATE 11 July 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 22
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Leadership Critical Incidents Good and Bad Leadership Ratings of Leader Qualities 79 08 2 081		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Critical incidents of good and bad leadership were obtained from 34 male and female supervisors in three different organizational settings: manufacturing (N=11), retail (N=10), and community agencies (N=13). They then gave ratings of each leader on seven relational qualities: Compliance, Directiveness, Involvement, Perceptiveness, Rewardiness, Time Orientation, and Trustworthiness. Incidents were content analyzed by two raters (inter-rater reliability=.79) and these content categories were compared with the mean obtained for each rating scale. The results showed a good deal of congruence between the two techniques, thus generally confirming the findings of an earlier study by Hollander & Neider (1977).		

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 73EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED 403103 mt

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Assessing Good and Bad Leadership
Using Critical Incidents and Rating Scales
in Three Organizational Settings:
A Follow-up Study
 Linda L. Neider, William A. Carpenter,
 and
 Edwin P. Hollander
 State University of New York at Buffalo

Accession For	
NTIS GMA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability _____	
Dist	Available for special
	

For many years, there has been interest in identifying those qualities which differentiate effective from ineffective leaders. A major step in work on leader behavior was achieved by studies done under the aegis of the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University (see Stogdill & Shartle, 1948; Shartle, et al., 1949). A good deal of the early work was conducted in military settings, with the intention of providing information on the actual behavior of leaders in command positions. The vehicle for this was a questionnaire filled out by subordinates for each of nine dimensions of their superior's leader behavior. This eventually led to the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which has been administered in many organizations (see Fleishman, 1953).

There are, however, still some difficulties involved in using rating scales, alone, to assess leader behavior. Perhaps the most pervasive errors linked to these scales have to do with raters' response tendencies

(e.g. central tendency bias), as well as the halo effect. Furthermore, changes in the requirements of what may be effective leadership at any given time can create another source of error in rating scales (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970).

Another attempt to assess leader behaviors was the Critical Incidents Technique, developed by Flanagan (1954) and initially employed to assess bomber pilots in World War II. Unlike rating scales, this technique gives the respondent a chance to think of those qualities of a leadership role which are most salient. Specifically, the respondent is asked to describe a situation in which effective and/or ineffective behavior was displayed in accomplishing aspects of one's job. These incidents are then analyzed to ascertain the crucial categories distinguishing important leader behavior, as perceived by followers.

A natural next step in understanding leadership behavior from this perspective is to combine the use of critical incidents with ratings scales. This was done in an exploratory study by Hollander and Neider (1977). In this study, male and female undergraduates (N = 40 and 34) gave critical incidents of good and bad leadership. Then they rated the leaders involved on five-point scales assessing seven qualities: Compliance, Directiveness, Involvement, Perceptiveness, Rewardingness, Time Orientation and Trustworthiness. Incidents were subsequently content analyzed and compared with the ratings of good vs. bad leadership, as well as by whether the leader was appointed or not.

Among the provocative results of this study was the finding of coexistent differences in the critical incidents and scale ratings for good and bad leaders. While the differences were not surprising in a

general sense, the concordance between the two modes of assessment was quite noteworthy. Good leaders were routinely described as being more sensitive interpersonally than bad leaders. In particular, good leaders were characterized as higher on trustworthiness, involvement, perceptiveness, and encouragement. Conversely, bad leaders were perceived as high on time-orientation, compliance, directiveness, and control. In McGregor's (1960) terminology, one might say that good leaders were generally perceived to be more of the Theory Y persuasion, while bad leaders were evidently more likely to be advocates of Theory X.

Additional findings of significance indicated divergent results for appointed vs. non-appointed leaders for bad leadership, but not for good leadership. Furthermore, there was a trend found for female respondents to give more incidents with females rather than males as bad leaders. On the other hand, male respondents very rarely mentioned females as leaders, in either the good or bad categories.

Objectives of the Study

There are essentially two major objectives to the present investigation. The first is to attempt a replication of the results from the Hollander and Neider (1977) study. As noted above, that study found a good deal of congruence between the findings utilizing the Critical Incidents Technique and rating scales. In particular, this exploratory work indicated that different relational qualities appeared to correspond to good and bad leaders, respectively, for both assessment devices.

The second major objective of the current study is to test the generalizability of the findings. Specifically, it would be useful to

ascertain whether the previous study's results are global characteristics that followers perceive as uniquely associated with a good vs. bad leaders or characteristics specific to the populations under study. For example, there is the classic contention that those qualities which make someone an effective leader in one situation are not necessarily the same qualities needed for effective leadership in another situation (Stogdill, 1948; Fiedler, 1967). One might expect, therefore, that those characteristics associated with good vs. bad leadership, derived from a student population, may be quite different from those obtained from for example, retail employees. However, this is clearly an empirical question.

Method of Study

The research to be reported here is a further attempt to study leadership as viewed by followers. The technique used is to gather critical incidents and content analyze them to identify relational qualities making for leadership perceived to be good or bad. In addition, rating scales are applied to gather information on relational qualities of the leader. Information is also obtained about the leader's source of authority, as a basis for legitimacy, and about respondent's and the leader's sex.

In all, there were 34 respondents drawn from three organizational settings, i.e., a chain of retail stores, a men's clothing manufacturing firm, and ten community service agencies.

The first group was composed of ten randomly selected department managers in a retail store chain; three were males and seven were females. The second group was made up of thirteen section supervisors, five males and eight females, from a garment manufacturing firm. The third group, eight males and two females, was drawn from directors of community service agencies, ranging from homes for the mentally retarded to heads of mental health agencies. All participants were from Western New York State, except for some community service agency directors who came from the Central part of the state. The median age of the respondents was 34 years, with a range from 27 to 62 years.

Although other respondents were sent questionnaires, supervisors from the garment manufacturing firm had to be interviewed individually because of some language difficulties due to the fact that they were not native speakers of English.

All respondents were presented with a form, read to them in the cases noted, which asked for his or her age and sex, and then stated:

This is a study of leadership from the standpoint of personal experience. It is anonymous in that you will only be identified by a number and by your sex and age.

Please think of a group or organization to which you belong, or did belong, and describe a situation you experienced where good leadership was displayed. Try to be as clear as possible in describing the conditions and behaviors involved.

An identical form was then provided with the term "bad" substituted for "good." Earlier pilot research, alternating the good form before the bad, indicated no order effects. Therefore the good-bad order was employed in gathering the data to be reported here.

Respondents then rated good and bad leaders with the set of rating scales shown in Appendix A. These scales were initially prepared by giving attention to variables mentioned in the literature as being associated with effective vs. ineffective leadership. After pilot runs, with further pruning and editing, these seven were used in the previous study by Hollander and Neider (1977).

The set of rating scales is still an exploratory instrument, designed to measure dimensions of leader-follower relations, and not a finished product. The seven characteristics it includes are: Compliance, Directiveness, Involvement, Perceptiveness, Rewardingness, Time Orientation, and Trustworthiness. Except for the operative terms "good" or "bad," the same form is used for both. At the end of each form respondents were asked to indicate whether the primary actor in the incident was appointed or elected. There was also a place to check neither, with an explanatory comment. Ultimately, this provided the basis for making a discrimination between appointed and non-appointed leaders.

Results and Discussion

Despite the difference in samples, the results of the analyses from this study were generally consistent with the earlier study by

Hollander and Neider (1977), particularly with respect to the ratings accorded to good and bad leadership. Unlike the previous study, there were an insufficient number of leaders described who were not appointed; therefore, the appointed vs. non-appointed leader comparison could not be made. Indeed, with the exception of two respondents in the good leadership category, and one in bad leadership, all of the critical incidents dealt with appointed leaders who were hired into the role.

In the previous study, it should be noted that a sex-linked finding was obtained, insofar as female respondents gave many more incidents with females (N = 20) rather than males (N = 11) as poor leaders. Two separate 2 x 2 analyses were performed in this study, with respondent sex x leader sex for good and for bad leadership. Neither showed statistically significant results, although this may be explainable to some degree by the small sample size utilized here.

Paralleling analyses from the previous study, the content analysis of the critical incidents was done on the basis of noting the frequency with which twelve categories of leader behavior emerged from close readings of the descriptions. Examples of each of the twelve categories can be seen in Appendix B. Two content coders independently assessed each of the descriptions of good and bad leadership with respect to the twelve categories, and a .79 interrater reliability was obtained.

Table 1 shows the frequencies and their respective rank orders, for the twelve content categories, with regard to good and bad

Categories	Retail (N=10)		Community (N=11)		Manufacturing (N=13)		Overall (N=34)	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
1. Control	(1) 11.0	(2) 5.5	(3) 7	(6) 3	(4) 5.5	(1) 11	(8) 8	(9) 6
2. Organization	(1) 11.0	(0)	(10) 2	(5) 4.5	(2) 10	(2) 7.5	(13) 6	(7) 7
3. Efficiency	(3) 6.0	(0)	(4) 6	(3) 8.5	(5) 4	(3) 5	(12) 7	(6) 9
4. Communicating	(5) 3.5	(3) 3	(11) 1	(7) 1.5	(12) 1	(5) 3	(28) 1	(15) 3
5. Smoothness	(7) 1	(6) 2	(7) 4	(4) 6.5	(11) 2	(11) 1	(25) 2	(21) 1
6. Encouragement	(2) 8.5	(0)	(2) 8.5	(1) 11	(2) 10	(2) 7.5	(6) 9.5	(3) 11
7. Expertise	(5) 3.5	(2) 5.5	(5) 5	(3) 8.5	(3) 7.5	(1) 11	(13) 5	(6) 9
8. Accessibility	(6) 2	(2) 5.5	(2) 8.5	(2) 10	(6) 3	(6) 2	(14) 4	(10) 5
9. Cohesiveness	(3) 6.0	(1) 8	(0)	(4) 6.5	(3) 7.5	(1) 11	(6) 9.5	(6) 9
10. Participation	(3) 6.0	(2) 5.5	(9) 3	(7) 1.5	(4) 5.5	(2) 7.5	(16) 3	(11) 4
11. Fairness	(2) 8.5	(7) 1	(1) 10	(5) 4.5	(2) 10	(4) 4	(5) 11	(16) 2
12. Likability	(1) 11.0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1) 12	(2) 7.5	(2) 12	(2) 12

Table 1: Rank order, and frequencies in parentheses, of 12 content categories for good-bad leadership in three different settings, and collapsed across settings.

leadership in the three settings. As will be seen in this table, Smoothness and Communicating are among the four most frequently mentioned categories, common across all three settings, with respect to good leadership. For the respondents in the retail and manufacturing settings, Accessibility is commonly associated with good leadership, and was also mentioned highly.

Some categories were related differentially to leadership in the three settings. For example, Organization and Participation were cited second and third most often as behaviors associated with good leadership in the responses from those in community service organizations. On the other hand, Expertise was uniquely cited as important for good leadership by those in the retail store chain. Furthermore, Efficiency was mentioned most in connection with good leadership by those in the manufacturing setting.

On the whole, the behaviors seen to typify good leadership in this study were substantially different from those cited by college students as important. In the earlier study, Organization was found to be ranked first followed by Expertise, Encouragement and Control.

Furthermore, some categories were differentially related to good leadership in the three settings. For example, Organization and Participation were cited second and third, most frequently as behaviors linked with good leadership in the sample from community organizations. Expertise was uniquely cited as important for good leadership in the retail settings. Efficiency was associated more with good leadership in the manufacturing setting.

This divergence in the findings for the different groups of respondents, by setting, argues strongly for the use of such an assessment technique when one is interested in a typology of leadership in various settings.

The findings with regard to the content analyses of the critical incidents for bad leadership again showed differences across the three settings. In the case of bad leadership, bear in mind that it is the lack of various behaviors which account for the high frequencies found. As can be seen in Table 1, for instance, Communicating ranked among the top three categories in the frequency of mention across all three settings. This indicates that poor leaders tend to be poorer in communicating information perceived as important to their subordinates.

Analogously to good leadership, there appear to be various behaviors whose absence seems to be associated with bad leadership in the settings involved. In retail settings, a lack of Fairness is mentioned most frequently as a behavior category associated with poor leaders, while in Community service settings, it is lack of Participation which is mentioned most frequently.

In the manufacturing setting, lack of Interpersonal Smoothness was mentioned most frequently as a characteristic of poor leaders. Interestingly, it was mentioned second in frequency for good leadership among those respondents from the retail setting.

There is somewhat more congruence in the content codings of bad leadership between this study and the previous one. In the earlier study, a lack

of Smoothness emerged as the most frequently mentioned behavior, followed by Organization, Expertise, and Fairness. The lack of Smoothness and Fairness were again most frequently associated with bad leadership.

Interestingly, the correlation between good and bad leadership for all twelve content categories across all settings, was .262. This corresponds almost identically to the correlation of .266 obtained in the earlier study, and indicates again a relatively nonsignificant relationship between descriptions of good and bad leadership.

Table 2 shows the means and ranks for each of the seven rating scales for good vs. bad leadership across settings. The overall correlation between good and bad leadership was $-.387$ ($p < .02$) indicating a rather strong inverse relationship between the two dimensions. This result meshes well with the previous finding of a $-.643$ correlation between the content category frequencies for good and bad leadership. Indeed, in the present study, t-tests differentiated significantly between good and bad leadership for each of the seven behavioral categories utilized to comprise the rating scales. Specifically, the results were: Compliance ($t = -2.82$, $p < .008$); Involvement ($t = -9.02$, $p < .0001$); Perceptiveness ($t = -12.87$, $p < .0001$); Rewardness ($t = -9.45$, $p < .0001$); Time Orientation ($t = -2.65$, $p < .01$); Trustworthiness ($t = -9.46$, $p < .0001$).

Overall, both the findings from the content-coded critical incidents and the rating scales for good leadership seem to show overt similarities in behaviors identified as relevant. The categories generated from both techniques shared the common feature of being interpersonal in nature

Rating Scale	GOOD LEADERSHIP							
	Retail (N = 10)		Mfging. (N = 13)		Community (N = 11)		Overall (N = 34)	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Compliance	3.20	6	3.08	7	2.73	7	3.00	7
Directiveness	3.70	4.5	3.85	6	3.18	6	3.59	5
Involvement	4.30	2	4.15	3	4.55	2	4.32	2
Perceptiveness	4.50	1	4.39	2	4.64	1	4.50	1
Rewardingness	3.70	4.5	4.08	4.5	3.73	4	3.85	4
Time Orientation	2.80	7	4.08	4.5	3.27	5	3.44	6
Trustworthiness	4.10	3	4.46	1	4.27	3	4.29	3

Rating Scale	BAD LEADERSHIP							
	Retail (N = 10)		Mfging. (N = 13)		Community (N = 11)		Overall (N = 34)	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Compliance	2.10	3	2.31	2.5	1.91	4	2.12	3
Directiveness	2.90	1	2.31	2.5	2.82	1	2.65	1
Involvement	1.90	4	1.54	5	1.46	5	1.62	5
Perceptiveness	1.30	5	1.31	7	1.36	6	1.32	6
Rewardingness	1.20	6	1.46	6	1.09	7	1.27	7
Time Orientation	2.70	2	2.39	1	2.18	2	2.41	2
Trustworthiness	1.10	7	1.77	4	2.00	3	1.65	4

Table 2: Ranks and Means obtained for the seven five-point rating scales for good and bad leadership in three different settings and collapsed across all settings.

(e.g. Perceptiveness, Involvement, Trustworthy, from the rating scales, and Communicating, Smoothness, and Participation from the content categories).

On the other hand, at first glance, there does not seem to be as much congruence between the ratings and critical incidents for bad leadership behaviors.

In this case, results from the rating scales indicated that bad leaders were characterized most by lacks in two task-related behaviors, Orientation and Directiveness. But in the content coding, the interpersonal categories were mentioned frequently for bad leaders, i.e., Smoothness, Fairness, and Communicating. If one looks again at the ranks in Table 2, it will also be seen that poor leaders are ranked lowest on such interpersonal characteristics as Rewardingness, Perceptiveness, and Involvement. In general, therefore, the rating scales and content categories from the critical incidents do show high correspondence for bad leadership.

The intercorrelation results for the seven rating scales are shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5 for retail, community and manufacturing settings, respectively. Table 6 shows the overall correlational matrix collapsed across the three settings. For the most part, Table 6 indicates that the correlations are congruent with the earlier study's results. For good leadership, Involvement and Perceptiveness are again positively related ($p < .001$), while Involvement is negatively related to Directiveness and Time Orientation. When the individual correlational matrices

GOOD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	-.036	.135	-.020	-.262	-.130	.396
Directiveness		1.00	.124	.527	.392	.244	-.322
Involvement			1.00	.069	-.059	-.500	.089
Perceptiveness				1.00	.484	.018	.527
Rewardingness					1.00	.576*	.194
Time Orientation						1.00	-.229
Trustworthiness							1.00

*p < .05

BAD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	.082	.369	.360	.552	.149	.351
Directiveness		1.00	-.250	-.175	-.606*	-.197	-.326
Involvement			1.00	.495	.466	.487	.762**
Perceptiveness				1.00	.396	.566	.282
Rewardingness					1.00	.421	.606*
Time Orientation						1.00	.579*
Trustworthiness							1.00

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Table 3: Intercorrelations of seven rating scales
assessing good and bad leadership in a retail

setting (N = 10).

GOOD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	.209	-.134	.204	-.064	-.458	-.227
Directiveness		1.00	.531	.384	.020	-.472	.309
Involvement			1.00	.655*	-.375	-.599*	.689*
Perceptiveness				1.00	-.156	-.641*	.186
Rewardingness					1.00	.175	-.203
Time Orientation						1.00	.030
Trustworthiness							1.00

* p < .05

BAD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	.174	.683*	.236	.297	.017	.111
Directiveness		1.00	-.361	-.189	-.129	.666*	-.155
Involvement			1.00	.301	.229	-.482	.171
Perceptiveness				1.00	.879***	-.100	.549
Rewardingness					1.00	-.037	.472
Time Orientation						1.00	.348
Trustworthiness							1.00

* p < .05; *** p < .001

Table 4: Intercorrelations of seven rating scales

assessing good and bad leadership in a
community agency setting (N = 13).

GOOD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	-.096	.191	.200	-.005	-.006	.356
Directiveness	1.00	1.00	-.705**	-.690**	-.241	.540*	-.402
Involvement	1.00	1.00	1.00	.799***	.394	-.505	.266
Perceptiveness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.334	-.376	.536*
Rewardingness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-.287	.309
Time Orientation	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-.068
Trustworthiness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

BAD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	-.487	.664**	.490	.476	-.550*	.180
Directiveness	1.00	1.00	-.532	-.225	-.165	.915***	-.225
Involvement	1.00	1.00	1.00	.772**	.723**	-.465	.465
Perceptiveness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.909***	-.127	.090
Rewardingness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-.010	.193
Time Orientation	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-.122
Trustworthiness	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 5: Intercorrelations of seven rating scales

assessing good and bad leadership in a

manufacturing setting (N = 11).

GOOD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	.023	.078	.128	-.086	-.171	.209
Directiveness		1.00	-.327	-.189	.100	.177	-.218
Involvement			1.00	.660***	.110	-.462**	.232
Perceptiveness				1.00	.254	-.335*	.406**
Rewardingness					1.00	.217	.203
Time Orientation						1.00	.023
Trustworthiness							1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

BAD LEADERSHIP

	Compliance	Directiveness	Involvement	Perceptiveness	Rewardingness	Time Orientation	Trustworthiness
Compliance	1.00	-.118	.584***	.364*	.442**	-.169	.193
Directiveness		1.00	-.374*	-.192	-.315	.409**	-.253
Involvement			1.00	.563***	.522**	-.203	.388*
Perceptiveness				1.00	.752***	.107	.246
Rewardingness					1.00	.119	.351*
Time Orientation						1.00	.148
Trustworthiness							1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 6: Intercorrelations of seven rating scales

assessing good and bad leadership

across all three settings (N = 34)

are analyzed across settings, however, the overall results are not necessarily duplicated. There is still a rather strong positive relationship between Involvement and Perceptiveness for the manufacturing and community settings. However, there is not a similar significant relationship found in the retail setting. Furthermore, Involvement is positively related to Directiveness in community service ($r = .531$) and retail ($r = .124$) settings, although in neither instance is the relationship statistically significant.

As was again the case in the earlier study, there are many more significant correlations in the matrix for bad leadership vs. good leadership. A very strong positive relationship emerges, for example, between Perceptiveness and Involvement ($r = .563$, $p < .001$), Rewardiness ($r = .752$, $p < .001$) and between Compliance and Involvement ($r = .584$, $p < .001$). Again such relationships seem to be variable across settings as shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

Conclusions and Implications

Once again, a considerable amount of congruence was found in assessing good and bad leadership with the content analysis of critical incidents and the use of rating scales. The rating scales appeared to give more general findings which were less situation-specific. As was the case in the earlier study by Hollander and Neider (1977), good leadership was characterized by such relational qualities as Perceptiveness, Trustworthiness, and Involvement across all three settings. Similarly, bad leaders seem to be high on such perceived characteristics as Time Orientation, Directiveness and Compliance. In general, critical incidents

do seem to yield more information about situational aspects of good or bad leadership.

There are a number of provocative empirical questions that should be raised. One has to do with the relationship between the rating scale developed here and other more generally utilized questionnaires assessing leader behavior such as the LBDQ.

In conclusion, although it is apparent, the results reported here are limited in their generalizability by the small samples utilized. On the other hand, the fact that there were notable differences between the respondents from the three settings is impressive, especially in light of the small number from each. Another noteworthy finding is that there was such correspondence between the results obtained about good and bad leadership with the students in the earlier study and the supervisors, managers, and directors who took part in this one. Clearly, there is some common element of resonance being tapped by these techniques, even with the diversity observed.

References

- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., and Weick, K. E.
Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Flanagan, J. C. The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin,
1954, 51, 327-358.
- Fleishman, E. A. Leadership climate, human relations training, and
supervisory behavior. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 205-222.
- Hollander, E. P. and Neider, L. L. An exploratory study using critical
incidents and rating scales to compare good and bad leadership.
Technical Report No. 5, ONR Contract N00014-76-C-0754. State
University of New York at Buffalo, Department of Psychology,
July 1977.
- McGregor, D. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill,
1960.
- Shartle, C. L., Stogdill, R. M., and Campbell, D. T. Studies in Naval
Leadership. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personnel Research
Board, 1949.
- Stogdill, R. M. and Shartle, C. L. Methods for determining patterns of
leadership behavior in relation to organization structure and
objectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32, 286-291.
- Stogdill, R. M. Personal factors associated with leadership. Journal of
Psychology, 1948, 25, 35-71.

Here are some characteristics which people might show in their relationships with others. Look them over carefully, and think about how they apply to the person who was the primary actor ("the leader") in the situation of bad leadership you just described. Please rate the primary actor on how much he or she showed these qualities, by circling one number for each scale below the description.

1) Compliance is the degree to which a person goes along with others, especially when they are in the majority. Someone who is not considered compliant would be more assertive and independent in responding to what others demand of him or her.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

2) Directiveness is shown when an individual takes the initiative in structuring the way a group task is performed. A person high on directiveness gives structure to the task, e.g., by indicating the order of doing activities. Someone rated low on directiveness would encourage participation in deciding how a task should be done.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

3) Involvement is the degree to which a person shows responsiveness to others. Someone high on involvement would be interested in what another individual says/ or does, e.g., he or she would respond almost immediately to the questions or comments offered by someone else. A person rated low on involvement would be characterized by a lack of interest in others and in interpersonal relationships.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

4) Perceptiveness is the degree to which an individual shows awareness of and consideration for other people's interests, needs, and attitudes. An individual who is low on perceptiveness would be someone seen as insensitive to the feelings of others.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

5) Rewardingness is shown when an individual readily responds to and encourages another person. Someone who is low on rewardingness would rarely praise a person for his or her accomplishments.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

6) Time Orientation is shown when an individual is concerned about how time is allocated, e.g., he or she would insist on punctuality for self and others. Someone who is not time-oriented would be much more interested in the "experience" taking place rather than the amount of time involved.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

7) Trustworthiness is characteristic of someone seen as reliable, and who "can be counted on." An untrustworthy individual is a person who is unreliable, and who might behave in a way which contradicts his or her stated opinions.

A Great Deal 5 4 3 2 1 0 Not at All

PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS: Was the primary actor a Male___ or a Female___?

Was the primary actor appointed___ or elected___ to his or her position, or neither___? If neither, please explain on the back of this sheet.

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX B

Examples of Content Categories

1. Control
 - "pressures were applied"
 - "suppressing any tangents of thought"
2. Organization
 - "organized the meeting"
 - "...he had no specific framework or course plan"
3. Efficiency
 - "things always ran smoothly"
 - "she was slow in her actions"
4. Communicating
 - "communicates often in a relaxed...manner"
 - "wouldn't give me the information I asked for"
5. Smoothness
 - "was kind, sympathetic and helpful..."
 - "arrogant"
6. Encouragement
 - "he always had a compliment for you"
 - "he rarely encouraged us"
7. Expertise
 - "...had a great knowledge of his particular field..."
 - "he is very confused..."
8. Accessibility
 - "...will shirk any contact with their employees"
 - "...usually available for discussion"
9. Cohesiveness
 - "...organized people to work with him toward common goals"
 - "...members had a sense of 'belonging'"
10. Participation
 - "invited all questions..."
 - "wasn't afraid to answer questions, listen to suggestions..."
11. Fairness
 - "unbiased"
 - "had different standards for different boys"
12. Likability
 - "he was well liked..."
 - "...was very easy going and well liked"

Army Research Institute (2 copies)
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Chief, Psychological Research Branch
U. S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/62)
400 7th St., S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20590

Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor
Commandant of the Marine Corps
(Code RD-1)
Washington, D. C. 20380

Chief of Naval Personnel
Assistant for Research Liaison
(Pers-Or)
Washington, D. C. 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers-6)
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel
for Human Goals
Washington, D. C. 20370

Cdr. Paul D. Nelson, MSC, USN
Head, Human Performance Division
(Code 44)
Navy Medical R&D Command
Bethesda, Maryland

Navy Personnel R&D Center (5 copies)
Code 10
San Diego, California 92152

Commanding Officer
Naval Training Equipment Center
Technical Library
Orlando, Florida 32813

Officer in Charge (Code L5)
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab.
Naval Aerospace Medical Center
Pensacola, Florida 32512

Capt. Bruce G. Stone, U.S.N.
(Code N-33)
Director, Education & Training
Research and Program Development
Chief of Naval Education and
Training Staff
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, Florida 32508

Navy Materiel Command
Employee Development Office, Code SA-65
Rm. 150 Jefferson Plaza, Bldg. #2
1429 Joff Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 20360

HumRRO (ATTN: Library)
300 N. Washington St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Director of Research
HumRRO Division #4 (Infantry)
P. O. Box 2086
Fort Benning, Georgia 31905

Journal Supplement Abstract Service
APA
1200 17th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 N. Edgewood St.
Arlington, Virginia 22207

Capt. Charles Baldwin, U.S.N.
Bureau of Naval Personnel
(Pers-65)
Washington, D. C. 20370

Ms. Elsa A. Porter
Clearinghouse on Productivity &
Organizational Effectiveness
U. S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, D. C. 20415

Dr. Thomas Gordon
Effectiveness Training Inc.
531 Stevens Ave.
Solana Beach, Cal. 92075

Personnel Research and Development
Center
United States Civil Service Commission
Bureau of Policies and Standards
Washington, D. C. 20415

Department of the Air Force
Air Force Institute of Technology (AU)
AFIT/SLGR (LT Col Umstot)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Ohio 45433

Headquarters, Forces Command
AFPE-HR
Ft. McPherson
Georgia 30330

Eugene F. Stone
Dept. of Administrative Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Technical Report Distribution List

Office of Naval Research (3 copies)
(Code 452)
800 N. Quincey St.
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Director, U. S. Naval Research
Laboratory (6 copies)
Washington, D. C. 20390
ATTN: Technical Information Division

Defense Documentation Center (12 copies)
Building 5
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Library, Code 2029 (6 copies)
U. S. Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20390

Science & Technology Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
495 Summer St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
1030 E. Green St.
Pasadena, California 91106

Research Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
536 S. Clark St.
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Dr. Arthur Blalwes
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

Dr. Fred E. Fiedler
Dept. of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Dr. Rudi Klaus
Syracuse University
Public Admin. Dept.--
Maxwell School
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dr. Arie Lewin
Duke University
Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Dr. Morgan W. McCall, Jr.
Center for Creative Leadership
5000 Laurinda Drive
P.O. Box P-1
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Dr. Terence R. Mitchell
School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. Manuel Ramirez
Systems and Evaluations
232 Swanton Blvd.
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Dr. Richard Steers
Graduate School of Management
and Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Victor H. Vroom
School of Organizational Management
Yale University
56 Hillhouse Ave.
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Paul Wall
Division of Behavioral Science
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Military Assistant for Human Resources
CAD (E&LS) ODDR&E
Pentagon 3D129
Washington, D. C. 20301

AFOSR (NL)
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Air University Library/LSE-8110
Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112