

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Relationship among Managerial Behaviors, Locus of Control and Organizational Success in Private Sector Organisations in Ghana

Isaac Kosi

Lecturer, Department of Management Studies, School of Business, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Abstract:

Managerial leadership is real and vastly consequential phenomenon, and perhaps the single most important variable in the human science since it is about performance of teams, group and organizations. This survey study sought to find out about the relationship among managerial behaviours, locus of control (personality) and group success in the private sector organizations in Ghana. It was conjectured that managerial personality would predict group success, and managerial behaviours would have significant relationship with group success as well as significantly mediate personality – group success relationship. The participating managers numbering 265 were tasked to complete questionnaires on personality and group success while their subordinates also numbering 795 also responded to the managerial behaviour rating for each manager. The results showed that personality was a better predictor of group success than managerial behaviours. Furthermore, managerial behaviours had small predictive power hence their mediating effect was inconsequential. This study is therefore akin to researches that espouse the validity and usefulness of personality (locus of control) as a predictive variable of group success and/or organization success.

Keywords: *Managerial behaviour, locus of control, personality*

1. Introduction

For more than half a century, experts have been labouring to understand managerial leadership, particularly the paths by which successful leaders exercise their influence over individuals and organizations and the impact of managerial leadership on performance (Fernandez, 2003). Managers play significant role in their organizations and the development of their national economy. They, therefore, create the vital link between people's performance, organizational effectiveness and economic progress (Analoui, Cusworth & Labbaf, 1996). According to Eddy, Lorenzet and Mastrangelo (2004), one theme that runs among much of this research is the idea that leadership (managerial) behaviour and actions are important determinants of organizational effectiveness.

Organizational phenomena are more likely to be viewed as a product of structural differences. However, psychological approach to organizational phenomena views it as behavioural which is a function of the personality and capabilities of specific individuals (Miller, Kets de Vries & Toulouse, 1982). In psychological literature, there is ample evidence that locus of control is a fundamental and stable personality trait with clear behavioural consequences (Boone & De Brabander, 1993). In pursuit of the organizational objectives, managers tend to exhibit some behaviours based on their personality orientation. It is for this reason that it has been posited that the psychological profile of managers/leaders could directly affect the performance of their organizations (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) because individuals vary in terms of the volume of personal responsibility they take for their behaviour and its consequence. Julian Rotter (1966), a personality researcher identified a dimension of personality he labelled as Locus of Control (LOC) to explain these individual difference. He proposed that people tend to attribute the cause of their behaviour primarily to either themselves or environmental factors. This personality trait produces distinctly different behaviour patterns (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2001). In addition, Hellriegels, Woodman and Slocum (1992) also believe that people's conceptualization LOC represent a personality dimension of some importance for understanding behaviour in organizations and other setting. The days of employing people within organizations for their vertical skills alone are gone, as personality factors play significant role in recruitment. In Ghana, unemployment rate is very high as work organizations have in recurrent times laid off workers which have been a result of multiple factors. But one notable and explicable reason for such layoffs which has plagued the economic landscape (placing most public sector firms on divestiture) of the country especially the public sector is the ineffectiveness of organizations. For instance, the Ghana Water Company limited retrenched 1,524 of its workers (*Daily Graphic* November 16, 2005; 3). To some individuals in Ghana, management is the problem. One of such individuals was the former Minister of Water Resources, Works and Housing who asserted that "the major problem which had haunted Ghana Water Company limited (GWCL) is managerial. It was for this reason that GWCL entered into a management contract....." (*Daily Graphic* November 16, 2005; p3). It is about time that we start using psychometric measures in the recruitment processes in Ghana in particular and Africa in general. Hence, as most organizations decline and ebb in today's world of globalization, organizations require managers with personality type that makes them recognize that the success and effectiveness of their organizations depends on their belief. And for that matter, the behavioural patterns they exhibit in the organization.

Wexley and Yukl (1984) argue that a group will be ineffective if the manager is either too passive or domineering. In congruence, Cole (2003) believes that individual managers are likely to be predisposed to behaving in one dominant role, even though they may show some tendencies toward others. According to Cole, the dominant role is closely linked to a particular reasoning ability and personality characteristics. Most researchers have argued that managerial effectiveness is determined by the extent to which a manager's group or

organizational unit perform its tasks and attains its objectives (Cole, 2003; Muchinsky, 2000; Wexley & Yukl, 1984). Therefore, managers strive to direct all levels of their organization to focus on the right priorities, one of the qualities, which has for a long time been attributed to successful leaders and managers, is internal locus of control. For the group to function and achieve their objectives, a manager/leader is required to influence, direct, motivate and coordinate the activities of the unit. Most managers tend to exhibit their technical knowledge on the job but some are unable to take decisions (exhibit behaviours) that would bring about the needed transformation within the work unit/organization. Most researchers have attributed this to the personality of those managers (Cole, 2003; Hambrick and Mason, 1984; Spector, 1986; Spector, 1988; Yousef, 2000 etc).

The present study examines the relationship among managerial behaviours, locus of control and organizational success (performance). Specifically, this study sought to determine the predictive power of managerial behaviour on organizational success within private organizations in Ghana, determine the predictive power of locus of control on organizational success in Ghanaian organizations and to find out if choice of managerial behaviours has a mediating effect on the relationship between personality (locus of control) and organizational success. From the above, the research questions does managerial personality (locus of control) predict group success (performance)?, do managerial behaviours predict group success (performance)? And is the predictive power of managerial personality upon group performance (success) reduced when the relation of managerial personality with managerial behaviours is included in the personality-success model?

2. Literature Review

Organizations and the managerial leadership of organizations, it is frequently claimed, are moving into a new era of post-modernity and globalization in which most previous formulae for managerial leadership effectiveness and successful organizational performance are likely to be found wanting (Gronn, 1997). The success and/or effectiveness of organizations; to a very large extent, depend on functional and behavioural ability as well as the personality competence of managers. This invariably helps to build and sustain effective and productive organization(s) which is a pre-requisite for achieving socio-economic goals and development (Analoui, Cusworth & Labbaf, 1996). According to Mintzberg (1973), an effective manager is the one who is aware of the kinds of behaviour and actions which lead to organizational results and who chooses to engage in those appropriate to the environment, the particular managerial job, the situation and his own personal preferences.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Herron and Robinson (1993) Personality–Success Mediation Model

The present study is based on Herron and Robinson (1993) Personality-Success Mediating Model incorporated with Yukl, Gordon and Taber (2002) Hierarchical Taxonomy to examine managerial behaviours among managers. According to Herron and Robinson's model, motivation and behaviour mediate the relationship between personality and success. Taking this work also as a reference, Hollenbeck and Whitener (1988) developed a model explaining the effects of the manager's personality on company performance, the influence of which is mediated by motivation and moderated by capability. Yukl Gordon and Taber (2002) developed the Hierarchical taxonomy with three meta-categories (task, relations and change behaviours). Using a confirmatory factor analysis, they found strong support for the behavioural description questionnaire (the hierarchical taxonomy of managerial behaviour). According to Shay, Tracey and Peterson (2001), attempts to define and redefine effective managerial leadership behaviours have led to the development of several specific and narrowly-defined sets of managerial behaviours or practices. Shay et al. (2001) further point out that one of the most useful explanations was provided by Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl, Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Yukl, 1998) and Yukl, Gorgon & Taber, 2002, who presented an integrative taxonomy that was based on research from a variety of studies that used both empirical and theoretical approaches for determining the content and range of effective managerial behaviours. It is crucial to develop competent managers who can be entrusted with the responsibilities of these organizations (Analoui et al., 1996). The field of managerial leadership research indicates that managerial leadership is one of key driving forces for improving firm performance (Chew, Spangler & Zhu, 2005). A recent trend in the study of competence in organizations is to focus upon the role of managerial competencies and individual level factors (Hodgkinson & Sparrow, 2002). Such factors have been established to have a bearing on actor's capabilities to acquire strategic competence. It would be a difficult task to present a complete list of all these factors, but it may be agreed upon that locus of control ... represent some of the major ones (Selart, 2005).

2.2. Managerial Behaviours

Managerial leadership is one of the key driving forces for improving firm performance. One of the most important determinants of managerial effectiveness is success in influencing people (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1989) in organizations. Leadership (manager) is studied because it is significant for community development, organizational learning, business effectiveness, project quality, and stakeholder satisfaction (Strang, 2005). Over the past 50 years, leaders and managers have been studied from a variety of perspectives (Shay et al., 2001). However, "there is no general agreement on the best way to define leadership, but most definitions imply that it is, at least in parts process of exerting influence over other persons" (Wexley & Yukl, 1984; p.159) to ensure the success of the organization. Managerial behaviours examined are categorized as: task-oriented, relation-oriented and change –oriented.

2.2.1. Task-Oriented Behaviour and Organisational Performance (Success)

Task behaviour is the extent to which leaders organize, define roles and explain activities to their groups (Aldag & Stearns, 1987). According to Yukl et al (2002), specific task behaviours of leaders include short-term planning, clarifying responsibilities and performance objectives, and monitoring operations. The difficulty of the task performed by an organization's members can be a major constraint on organizational performance (Fernandez, 2003). However, managerial task-oriented behaviour if well exhibited could help organization members comprehend the task to be done and the results expected. Planning, scheduling and coordinating of work for subordinates, providing training and instructions, setting a strategic direction for employees to work towards, setting performance goals for subordinates, assigning tasks to

subordinates, etc are some of the task-oriented behaviours of effective managerial leadership (Shin, 1998; Yukl, 1998). Problem solving and decision-making is another task-oriented behaviour that managers exhibit on the job. It is one of the primary responsibilities of managers (Boachie-Mensah, 2000; Kreitner & Kinicki, 2001). Problem solving is the process of determining the one and only one course of action that fits the situation (Boachie-Mensah, 2000). On the other hand, decision-making is also a process of choosing one alternative from among a set of potential feasible alternatives (Fleet, 1991).

- Hypothesis 1: Manager's task-oriented behaviours (short-term planning, decisive problem solving, clarifying responsibilities and performance objectiveness and monitoring operations and performance) will relate positively with and significantly predict performance.

2.2.2. Relationship-Oriented Behaviour and Organisational Performance

It is apparent that influencing a group toward a common goal is in itself task-oriented. However, researchers have come to realize that in order to get group members to work toward that common goal; managers/leaders must also pay attention to the group members — be relationship-oriented (Brearley, 2000; George, 2000; House, 1971; Recardo, 2000). Hymowitz, (1989) (as cited in Robbins & Langton, 2001) found that the single biggest reason why managers fail is due to their poor interpersonal skills. It is essential that managers/supervisors understand the significance of building a positive relationship with their respective subordinates (Truckenbrodt, 2000). A more flexible leader is one who is capable of showing a wider range of situation-appropriate behavioural responses, both positive and negative (Paulhus & Martin, 1988). Behavioural flexibility requires the leader to display openness and tolerance in the face of social uncertainty and ambiguity (Zaccaro, 2002), and relies on the leader demonstrating a range of social performance skills such as negotiation, conflict management, coaching, and persuasion (Zaccaro, 1999). According to Yukl (1998), effective leadership behaviours include: being considerate, supportive, friendly, and helpful; showing trust and confidence in subordinates and communicating appreciation for their ideas and input (Recardo, 2000; Shin, 1998); empowering employees and allowing them to make decisions on how they will complete their work (Recardo, 2000; Yukl, 1998); looking out for the welfare of the group, and recognizing and rewarding good performance (Shin, 1998). A study by Egwakhe (2014) confirmed the relationship between leaders people focus behaviour and workers' performance and structurally identified allowing group decision making as the best predictor of workers' performance.

- Hypothesis 2: Manager's relations-oriented behaviours (supporting, developing, recognizing, consulting and empowering) will relate positively with and significantly predict group performance.

2.2.3. Change-Oriented Behaviours and Effectiveness (Success)

Change is one of the most common phenomena in this universe. It is not change which is new to business and industry, but it is the speed of change that is challenging for contemporary organizations (Chauhan, Pathak, & Upinder 2005). As a consequence of globalization, application of new technologies, coping with a turbulent environment, etc., organizations face with ongoing processes of transformation (Alcover, Barrase Gil & Rico, 2005). Leaders often play a variety of seminal roles in the process of planned change, from articulating a vision of the need for change to actions that facilitate the implementation of change (Kotter, 1995) and there is growing evidence that these behaviours are related to effectiveness (performance) of leaders (Lowe et al, 1996). One of the most important activities of executives is to monitor the external environment and identify threats and opportunities for the organization. This change-oriented behaviour is also called "environmental scanning." Most leaders of business organizations need to be sensitive to a wide range of information, including the concerns of customers and clients, the availability of suppliers and vendors, the actions of competitors, market trends, economic conditions, government policies, and technological developments (Yukl et al., 2002). In Semarco (2004) study, entrepreneur's change-oriented managerial behaviour of encouraging innovative thinking was found to significantly relate positively but less powerfully predict firm performance and Littrell & Valentin, (2005) asserted that managerial leadership is crucial for successfully implementation of change in organizations, especially during times of turbulence and dramatic and sudden change in the environment.

- Hypothesis 3: Manager's change-oriented behaviour (external monitoring, envisioning change, encouraging innovative thinking and taking personal risk to implement change) will relate positively with and significantly predict group performance.

2.2.4. Locus of Control and Organisational Performance (Success)

Locus of control is an important personality characteristic (Halikias & Panayotopoulou, 2003). Managers and leaders with internal locus of control and the groups led by them have also been found to be more likely to achieve higher performance (Arnold, 1985; Anderson, 1977). Research in the 1980s indicate that locus of control is perceptual variable which holds promise of predicting small business success (Brockhaus, 1986; Gilad, 1982). Individual differences in locus of control have significant and varied effect in organizations and have become an important variable for explaining behaviour (which leads to effective performance and eventually to organizational success or effectiveness) in organizational life (Beukman, 2005). Empirical findings support the view that small firms headed by Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) with an internal locus of control perform better than those with external CEOs (Boone et al., 2000), because internal locus of control is closely related to the concept of high need for achievement (Gouatarbes, 2006). On the contrary, earlier researches cited in Entrialgo, Fernández and Vázquez, (2000) indicate that managers do not influence the performance and effectiveness of their organizations (Hannan and Freeman, 1977; Lieberson & O'Connor, 1972; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). However, managers in work organizations plan, motivate, direct and control subordinates by exhibiting and demonstrating some behavioural patterns to ensure that groups and organizations achieve stated objectives. Organizations would therefore require managers who have the firm belief that their action and inactions would lead to organizational success or otherwise. This is based on the premise that persons (managers) with internal locus of control have great amount of perceptual alertness (Gilad, 1982) which differentiates between successful and unsuccessful managers (Klein & Wasserstein, 2000). Evidence suggest that leaders, who are supportive, provide appropriate model, clarify their vision, foster common goal among their work group, but do not convey overly ambitious expectations are likely to generate high levels of employee satisfaction (Bommer, MacKenzie & Podsakoff, 1996) which is likely to lead to group success/effectiveness. Most managers have been described as people with a high internal

locus of control (Entrialgo et al., 2000)) and are more future oriented, plan proactively, more flexible and adaptive as well as innovative to problem-solving than those who dismiss them as bad luck or uncontrollable (weLead, 2001). Graves (1982) concluded that leader behavior was unrelated to leader effectiveness. Kraus (1988) found that a leader who emphasized consideration behaviour was more effective, more charismatic, and more responsible for group success in proportion to the degree to which the leader's behaviour matched the participant's schema of an effective leader. Results also indicated that a leader who emphasized initiating structure behaviour was attributed responsibility for an alleged group success in proportion to those leadership perceptions were a function for the observer's leadership schemata.

The seminal research on the relationship between leaders' characteristics and organizational effectiveness was initially conducted by Lieberman and O'Connor (1972). This work is considered as a major source of empirical support of the notion that managers have limited influence on organizational effectiveness because they are constrained by situational factors. On the contrary, Thomas (1988) provides evidence that individual managers/leaders do make a difference in organizational effectiveness. Thomas' study was designed to overcome the methodological problems of earlier studies. Another study by Roth (1995) found that CEO characteristics like locus of control have important influence on firm performance. CEOs who believe that the consequences of their behaviour stem from their own efforts (internal orientation), favour innovation strategies, long-term planning, leading the market, and taking risks (Miller and Toulouse, 1986) and are more capable of processing dynamic information (Chan & Wang, 1995). Similarly, as cited in Selart (2005), Phares (1962) found that persons with internal locus of control want to have control over their environment, they learn better, and they perform better in general, when it comes to tasks requiring skill. According to Phares, the belief in their competence will lead to high self-confidence among internals and it was also found that internals do not appreciate outside help or support, they rather rely on themselves. In contrast, a person with external locus of control will adapt to the group's influences and feel that success is obtained only when consulting others. O'Brien (1984) suggests that internals are better suited for professional and managerial jobs, which are of complex nature and demand higher levels of initiative and independent actions (Spector, 1982). Research has shown that managers/leaders with internal locus of control tend to engage in more active search for and efficient processing of task-relevant information (Spector, 1988), this enables them to provide their subordinates with the needed task instructions to enable them perform effectively and efficiently that invariably leads to business success. A more recent study by Adeyemi-Bello (2003) examined the relationship between leaders' locus of control and value orientation to the performance, found that the interaction between a leader's value orientation and locus of control may have important performance implications which is consistent with research that indicates that effective managers/leaders typically have internally consistent sets of attributes. The study failed to control some variables such as managers' age, experience, gender and size of the firm which have been found to influence performance. Another study that examined the link between managerial leadership and organizational effectiveness is that of Alexander, Carson & Smith (1984). Using the salaries paid to 50 senior ministers of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Conference of the United Methodist church over a 20-year period, they were able to conclude that a spectrum of effective and ineffective leadership existed within these organizations. One of the deficiencies of the Alexander et al.'s (1984) study is that they failed to identify the effective leaders based on their demographic or personality variables. The importance of this type of effectiveness demarcation is highlighted by the suggestions that managerial selection and success potential could be enhanced by focusing on such a research stream (Govindarajan and Gupta, 1984). It has been suggested that the psychological variables are a determinant of organizational success due to their influence on other variables such as innovation, proactive behaviour or risk taking (Entrialgo Fernández and Vázquez 2000). However, a study to analyze the effect of the manager's personality, as well as the process by which this is produced on company success by Entrialgo et al. (2000), found that internal locus of control does not influence business success significantly. Similarly, Box et al. (1993; 1994) also found that internal locus of control of entrepreneur does not correlate significantly with firm performance (average annual increase in employment, average annual increase in revenue and average annual increase in profit). The statistical analysis of the study was limited to Product-Moment correlation. Though research in this field of study has been mixed, a vigorous statistical test is needed to examine the relationship for further understanding and the predictability of internal locus of control on business success or effectiveness. Greenberger and Strasser (1986) opined that decreases in personal control results in variety of negative consequences for individual (manager) and organization. According to Govindarajan (1984), internal manager's belief in the controlling value of their own behaviour as the significant determinant of task outcome. With such orientation, managers would always show those behavioural tendencies that would lead their unit/organization success. Additionally, assuming outcomes are not predetermined, internal managers will acquire task relevant information and use it to control outcomes. External managers, however, who do not expect outcomes to be attributed to their own effort, would not spend considerable effort in gathering and using task relevant information (Roth, 1989). Studies (Gilad, 1982; Dingee, Smollen & Timmons, 1985) have alluded to the importance of the ability to recognize opportunity as paramount in an entrepreneur. In addition, Perry (1990), states that an internal locus of control is one of the psychological characteristics most often used as predictive of entrepreneurship.

- Hypothesis 4: Managers' locus of control will relate positively with and significantly predict group success (performance) (thus managers who have high locus of control would impact more on the performance of their group)

3. Methodology

This cross-sectional in nature and correctional survey design was adopted for the study. In a correlational design, measurement of the independent and dependent variables are taken at the same point in time and the researcher does not control the introduction of independent variable, and the conditions under which the independent variable is experienced.

3.1. Population and Sample

The target population was managers and their sub-ordinates of private organizations in Ghana. The Greater Accra region and Eastern region was randomly selected from a list of ten regions written and placed in a box was picked without replacement, out of which a total of 300 managers were selected from a list of companies obtained from the Registrar of Companies and National Board for Small Scale Industries (NBSSI). The 300 potential participating managers and 900 prospective participating employees (subordinates) were involved in the study. But in all, 265 managers and 795 employees responded to the questionnaires administered (return rate of 80%).

3.2. Data Collection

In collecting data, self-administered questionnaires were used to gather information from the managers and their subordinates. The justifications for using self administered questionnaires was to allow respondents to answer at their own time in order not interrupt their work. In answering the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to indicate their responses to the questions on a seven point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The questionnaire was in four sections. Sections A to C captured information about the respondents (managers) demographics, personality (locus of control) and organizational success (performance). Section D captured information about managers' behavioural patterns which were responded to by managers' subordinates.

The study intended to predict performance of 2005 financial year. To ensure objectivity, two indicators were employed to assess the success of participating managers and their organizations. One was the after tax profit of the organizations for the year 2005. The other was Kathuria and Porth (2003) subjective success measure which according to them can be used to measure success in the absence of objective measure like profit. The internal consistency reliability of the scale for this study was .51. Although the internal consistency reliability of the scale is below the .70 alpha level recommended by Pallant (2001) as the lowest boundary for acceptable estimate for internal consistency reliability estimate, Pallant (2001; pp 85) however, states that "with short scales (e. g., scales with less than ten items) it is common to find quite low Cronbrach values (e. g., .50)". The performance measure was accessed as the after tax profit (objective indicator) of the businesses during the 2005 financial year. This indicator was then z-standardized. The present study combined with subjective measure of Kathuria & Porth (2003) subjective performance (success) measure. The subjective scores were also averaged and z-standardized. The two z-standardized indicators were combined into mean score for the success measure. The Managerial Practice Survey (Yukl et al., 2002) version is a 60 item questionnaire made up of 15 sub-scales, and each sub-scale is also made up of 4 items. Out of the total number, thirteen was used to appraise managers' behaviours which are classified into three meta-categories (task-oriented, relation-oriented and change-oriented behaviours by Yukl et al., 2002)). Yukl et al. (2002) found that the internal consistency reliability for the sub-scales surpassed $\alpha=.70$. The lowest alpha value for the sub-scales in Yukl et al. (2002) study was .77 while most of the values were larger than .80. In the present study, the lowest alpha score for the sub-scales was .72 when the internal consistency reliability was found with the Cronbrach alpha statistic. The internal consistency reliability for each of the 3 subscales were task-oriented behaviours, .86; relationship-oriented behaviours, .85 and change-oriented behaviours, .85 as well as the overall Managerial Practice Survey was .94.

4. Results and Discussion

In analyzing the data, study adopted the quantitative technique using the SPSS package. The data analysis was done in two ways. Firstly, descriptive - the mean, standard deviations, correlation matrix and internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha) were calculated for each variable in the study. Secondly, a series of multiple (hierarchical) regression analyses were used to examine each of the hypotheses to infer conclusions from the relationships amongst the variables. The study statistically controlled variables such as previous performance, sex, age, experience and educational levels of managers.

4.1. Preliminary Analysis

Analyses of the demographic characteristics of respondents (managers and subordinates) showed that, 66% of them were males while 34% were females respectively. The managers had a mean age of 41 years and a standard deviation of 6 and the subordinates also had a mean age of 28 years with a standard deviation of 5. In terms of experience, managers had a mean of 8.4 and standard deviation of 2.9. Furthermore with regard to education levels, 47.2% and 13.5% of managers and subordinates were graduates, 30.6% and 27.8% respectively. In addition, 18% of managers and 32.1% of subordinates hold O & A level certificate whereas, 18% of the subordinate are SSCE holders. Lastly, 9% of managers and 7.9% of subordinates have completed middle school.

4.2. Correlation Matrix and Internal Consistency Estimates

The study focused on the relationship between and among managerial behaviours, managerial personality (locus of control) and group performance (group success). Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, correlational matrix and internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha) for the variables used in the analyses. The correlations indicate that managerial personality (McShane & Steven, 1995) was significantly related to group performance measured as Mean Z-Standardized success: $r_{(265)} = .35$, $p < .01$. This result indicated that the more managerial personality (high locus of control) of a participant, the more probable that his/her group will be successful. The relation between group performance and managerial behaviours was mixed as shown in this study. From Table 2, significant relation between group performance (measured as Mean Z-Standardized success) and task-oriented behaviours: only Clarifying responsibilities $r_{(265)} = -.11$, $p < .05$ and Short-term planning $r_{(265)} = -.13$, $p < .05$ were found to be significant. The relationship between group performance (Mean Z-Standardized success 2005) and relations-oriented behaviours: only recognizing was significant $r_{(265)} = .17$, $p < .01$ was found also to be significant. With regard to the relationship between group performance (measured as Mean Z-Standardized success 2005) and change-oriented behaviours: monitoring environment $r_{(265)} = -.16$, $p < .01$; envisioning Change $r_{(265)} = -.17$, $p < .01$ and taking personal risk $r_{(265)} = -.24$, $p < .01$ were found to be significant.

As shown in Table 2, two of the other variables (variables controlled for in this study) correlated significantly with group performance (2005) measured as Mean Z-Standardized success (2005). Researchers have espoused that it is critical that other variables that may affect performance are taken into account (Thomas, 1988 cited in Welbourne, et al., 1998). Therefore, aligned with this assertion, group performance was predicted using managerial personality, managerial behaviours (i.e., task-oriented, relations-oriented and change-oriented behaviours) while controlling for 'sex', 'age', 'experience', 'educational level' and 'group performance (2004): Z-Standardized success (2004)' in the subsequent analyses where multiple (hierarchical) regression was used.

The correlations indicate that managerial personality (loc) was significantly positively related with group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) $r_{(265)} = .35$, $p < .01$. The result indicated that the more managerial personality factor a manager has the more likely he/she will make his/her group will succeed (thus managers with high locus of control is more likely to positively impact

the performance of his/her units and/or organization). However, the relation between group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) and managerial behaviours were found to be mixed. Thus some managerial behaviours were significantly positively related while others were not. As shown in Table 2, the results for group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) and task-oriented behaviour are clarifying responsibilities and group performance $r_{(265)} = .08$, short-term planning $r_{(265)} = -.03$, $p < .05$, monitoring operations $r_{(265)} = .01$ and decisive problem solving $r_{(265)} = -.31$. The relationship between group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores and relations-oriented behaviours were supporting $r_{(265)} = .07$, developing $r_{(265)} = .00$, recognizing $r_{(265)} = .17$, $p < .01$, consulting $r_{(265)} = .09$ and empowering $r_{(265)} = .09$. With regard to the relationship between group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) and change-oriented behaviour also are external monitoring of the environment $r_{(265)} = -.16$, $p < .01$, encouraging innovative thinking $r_{(265)} = -.04$ and taking personal risk $r_{(265)} = -.24$, $p < .01$. It also be observed from Table 2 that other variables controlled for in this study correlated with group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) but age and experience were not significant.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Mean Z-Standardized success (2005)	.00	.73																				
2. Z-Standardized success (2004)	.00	1.00	.18**																			
3. Locus of control	134	.47	.35**	-.23**																		
4. Sex	4078	555	-.12*	.07	-.05																	
5. Age	836	286	.08	-.08	-.01																	
6. Experience	422	.87	.01	-.04	.02	.07	.68**															
7. Education	5262	641	.12*	-.09	.27**	-.04	-.02	.14*														
8 Clarifying responsibilities	2095	228	.08	-.11*	.16**	-.11*	.02	.02	.09	(.77)												
9 Supporting	2027	222	.07	-.01	.12*	-.00	.10	.09	.12*	.61**	(.72)											
10 Monitoring environment	1902	263	-.16**	.01	-.22**	.01	-.08	-.08	-.10	.44**	.28**	(.78)										
11 Recognizing	2018	218	.17**	-.08	.16**	-.07	.04	.09	.11*	.44**	.38**	.27**	(.76)									
12 Short-term planning	1915	263	-.13*	.09	-.27**	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.17**	.49**	.32**	.58**	.28**	(.82)								
13 Innovative thinking	1980	204	-.08	.08	.17**	-.06	-.08	.04	-.04	.19**	.23**	.18**	.36**	.42**	(.76)							
14 Developing	2014	201	.00	-.06	-.08	-.08	-.06	.00	.02	.24**	.17**	.35**	.26**	.36**	.519**	(.73)						
15 Consulting	2007	252	.09	-.01	.08	.05	-.08	-.02	-.08	.20**	.16**	.16**	.24**	.22**	.178**	.46**	(.76)					
16 Monitoring operations	1987	194	.10	-.08	.10	-.07	.02	.14*	.10*	.29**	.19**	.12*	.09	.23**	.153**	.26**	.34**	(.79)				
17 Envisioning change	1780	217	-.17**	.11*	-.25**	.04	-.06	-.08	-.17**	.15**	.10*	.27**	-.01	.36**	.234**	.24**	.16**	.41**	(.78)			
18 Empowering	2013	222	.09	-.06	.05	-.01	-.05	.00	.05	.22**	.20**	.13*	.41**	.20**	.27**	.33**	.39**	.36**	.34**	(.81)		
19 Taking risk	1755	296	-.24**	.13*	-.32**	.09	-.10*	-.01	-.09	.08	-.05	.37**	-.07	.33**	.150**	.27**	.23**	.28**	.54**	.22**	(.87)	
20 Decisive Problem solving	1884	206	-.08	-.08	-.07	-.00	-.08	-.08	.08	.30**	.21**	.27**	.17**	.35**	.19**	.34**	.32**	.46**	.43**	.47**	.49**	(.82)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed) * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed). N=265 Cronbach's alpha (α) in brackets

Table 1: Correlation Matrix and Internal Consistency Estimates of variables

4.3. Task-oriented Behaviour and Organizational Success (Performance)

In testing Hypothesis 1, organizational success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) was regressed on task-oriented behaviours and control variables using hierarchical multiple regression (Enter Method). The results are shown in Table 1 below.

Variables	R-Square	Changed R-square	Standardized Beta (β)	F
Control Variables	.07**	.07**		4.13**
Sex			-.13	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.05	
Education			.15	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.21	
All Variables	.13**	.05**		4.05**
Sex			-.13	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.06	
Education			.14	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.21**	
Short-term planning			-.23**	
Problem solving			-.05	
Clarifying responsibilities			.18*	
Monitoring Operations			.12	

Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression of group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) on task-oriented managerial behaviours and control variable.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Using hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Enter Method), a significant model emerged ($F_{(9, 255)} = 4.05, p < .01$) as presented in Table 2. The R^2 was .13 indicating that the model as a whole explained 13% of the variance with the task-oriented behaviour variables explaining additional 5% (Changed $R^2 = .05$) of the variance when sex, age, experience, education level and group performance in 2004 were statistically controlled. The contribution of task-oriented behaviour variables to the model though small (Changed $R^2 = .05$) was statistically significant, Changed $F_{(4, 255)} = 43.44, p < .05$. The results indicate that task-oriented behaviour thus clarifying responsibilities ($\beta = .18, p < .05$) was significantly positively related to group performance, but going by Cohen (1988) suggestion the strength of the relationship is small. Short-term planning ($\beta = -.23, p < .01$) was significantly negatively related to group performance. However, only two of the task-oriented managerial behaviour (clarifying responsibilities and Short-term planning) was significant predictor of group performance, thus made a significant contribution to the model. Problem solving and monitoring operations were not significant predictors in the model. Of the controlled variables only group performance in 2004 ($\beta = .24, p < .01$) was significantly positively related to group performance in 2005. The findings of the current study did not support the hypothesis that Managers' task-oriented behaviour (short-term planning) will relate positively with group performance (group success) which is in contrast to Shuman and Seeger (1986), Semarco (2004), and Shay et al (2001). Nonetheless, it was significantly negatively related to and the highest predictor of group performance (2005). The result of the study is similar to Frese et al. (2000) where reactive (planning) strategy was negatively related to success. Decisive problem solving, which is one of the managerial task-oriented behaviours was also found not be related to group success (performance) in the current study which is in contrast to Semarco (2004), Boyatzis (1982) and Yukl et al. (1990). This finding supports the findings of Bauer and Green (1998), Kim and Yukl (1995) and Yukl et al (1990) who reported that managerial leadership clarifying behaviour relate positively with managerial effectiveness. the present study's finding is similar to Shay et al. (2001) which found that monitoring operations and performance was not a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness.

4.4. Relations-oriented Behaviour and Group Success (Performance)

To test Hypothesis 2, organizational success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) was regressed on relations-oriented behaviours and control variables using hierarchical multiple regression (Enter Method). The results are shown in Table 2 below.

Variables	R-Square	Changed R-square	Standardized Beta (β)	F
Control Variables	.07**	.07**		4.13**
Sex			-.13	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.05	
Education			.15	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.21	
All Variables	.11**	.03**		3.01**
Sex			-.11	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.07	
Education			.08	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.24**	
Supporting			-.01	
Developing			-.08	
Recognizing			.15*	
Consulting			.09	
Empowering			.02	

Table 3: Hierarchical multiple regression of group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) on relations-oriented managerial behaviours and control variable.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

From Table 3, a significant model emerged ($F_{(10, 254)} = 3.01, p < .01$) when the multiple regression analysis (Enter Method) was performed. The R^2 was .11 indicating that the model as a whole explained 11% of the variance with the relations-oriented behaviour variables explaining additional 3% (Changed $R^2 = .03$) of it being explained the relations-oriented behaviours when sex, age, experience, education level and group performance in 2004 were statistically controlled. The relations-oriented behaviour variables and performance in 2005 was not statistically significant, (Change $F_{(5, 254)} = 1.83$). The only relations-oriented behaviour variable that made a significant contribution to and was a predictor in the model was recognizing ($\beta = .15, p < .05$). Consulting, supporting, empowering and developing were not significant predictors in the model as indicated in table 2. Therefore, Hypothesis 2c: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (recognizing) will relate positively with group performance (group success) was supported. However, Hypothesis 2a: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (recognizing) will relate positively with group performance (group success). Hypothesis 2b: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (supporting) will relate positively with group performance (group success). Hypothesis 2d: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (consulting) will relate positively with group performance (group success) and Hypothesis 2e: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (empowering) will relate positively with group performance (group success) were not supported by the present study. With regard to the controlled variables, only group performance in 2004 ($\beta = .21, p < .01$) was significantly positively related to group performance in 2005.

The outcome of this study is similar to Semarco (2004) which found that supporting was not a significant predictor of performance (entrepreneur success), thus supporting did not relate with firm performance. The present study's findings differed from the findings of Shay et al. (2001). Although a manager's supportive behaviour may be effective when combined with other relevant leadership behaviours (Yukl et al., 2002), it is however, suggested that future studies look at the level of supportive behaviours by comparing successful and less successful managers in line with Yukl (1998) position where effective leaders were expected to have optimum level of affiliation motivation. Developing, which is one of the managerial relationship-oriented behaviours did not relate with group success (performance) in the present study which is in contrast to Semarco (2004), and Bradford and Cohen (1984). Recognizing behaviour among managers in the present study was found to significantly predict group performance but less powerfully when other variables were controlled for. Thus managers' relations-oriented behaviour of recognizing related positively with group performance (group success) and supports Anderson, Crowell and Wikoff (1983) who found that praise by the supervisor increased subordinate performance significantly. Shay et al. (2001) also found that recognition of subordinate positively correlated with managerial effectiveness, however, when the predictive power was examined, recognition was found not to be a strong predictor of managerial effectiveness. The study's finding is akin to Semarco (2004) who reported that consulting as an entrepreneur relation-oriented managerial behaviour was not a significant predictor of firm performance.

4.5. Change-oriented Behaviour and Group Success (Performance)

In other to test Hypothesis 3, organizational success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) was regressed on change-oriented behaviours and control variables using hierarchical multiple regression (Enter Method). The result is presented in Table 4 below.

Variables	R-Square	Changed R-square	Standardized Beta (β)	F
Control Variables	.07**	.07**		4.13**
Sex			-.13	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.05	
Education			.15	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.21**	
All Variables	.14**	.06**		4.44**
Sex			-.11	
Age			.03	
Experience			-.02	
Education			.11	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.23**	
Monitoring the environment			-.06	
Envisioning change			-.05	
Encouraging innovative thinking			.01	
Taking personal risk			-.20*	

Table 4: Hierarchical multiple regression of performance measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success on change-oriented managerial behaviours and control variable

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4 above indicates that a significant model emerged ($F_{(9, 255)} = 4.44$, $p < .01$) when the multiple regression analysis (Enter Method) was performed. The R^2 was .14 signifying that the model as whole explained 14% of the total variance with additional 6% (Changed $R^2 = .06$) of it being explained by change-oriented managerial behaviour variables when sex, age, experience, education level and group performance in 2004 were statistically controlled. The contribution of change-oriented behaviour variables and performance in 2005 (Changed $R^2 = .06$) was statistically significant, (Change $F_{(4, 255)} = 4.56$, $p < .01$). Change-oriented behaviours such as taking personal risk ($\beta = .20$, $p < .05$) was significantly negatively related to group performance (2005). The result indicates that taking personal risk is significant predictor in the model. But monitoring the environment, explaining need for change and encouraging innovative thinking as shown by the results in table 3 above, were not to be significant predictors in the model. Thus Hypothesis 3a: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (external monitoring) will relate positively with group performance (group success). Hypothesis 3b: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (explaining need for change) will relate positively with group performance (group success). Hypothesis 3d: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (consulting) will relate positively with group performance (group success) and Hypothesis 3e: Managers' relations-oriented behaviour (encouraging innovative thinking) will relate positively with group performance (group success) were not supported by the present study. Group performance in 2004 ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$) was the only controlled variable that was significantly and positively related to group performance in the year of study (2005).

This study's finding contrast the results of Bourgeois (1985) who studied 20 companies and found that profitability was greater when executives had an accurate perception of the amount of industry volatility in markets and technology. Similarly, the present result does not support the findings of Grinyer, Mayes, and McKiernan (1990) that the leaders of high-performing companies did more external monitoring (e.g., environmental scanning, consultation with key customers) than leaders of low-performing companies and were quicker to recognize and exploit opportunities revealed by it.

Table 4: Hierarchical multiple regression of group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) on managerial behaviours.

4.6. Locus of Control and Group Success (Performance)

To test hypothesis 1, group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) was regressed on managerial locus of control (personality) and control variables using hierarchical multiple regression (Enter Method). The results are shown in Table 4 below.

Variables	R ²	ΔR ²	Beta (β)	F
Control Variables	.07**	.07**		4.13**
Sex			-.13	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.05	
Education			.15	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.21**	
All Variables	.21**	.13**		11.25**
Sex			-.17	
Age			.08	
Experience			-.04	
Education			-.05	
Z-Standardized Objective Success (2004)			.28**	
Managerial personality (locus of control)			.39**	

Table 5: Hierarchical multiple regression of organizational success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized organizational success on managerial locus of control (personality) and control variable

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3 above indicates that a significant model emerged ($F_{(1, 258)} = 11.24, p < .01$) when the researcher used hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Enter Method). The R² was .21 meaning the model as a whole explained 21% of the variance with managerial locus of control (personality) variable explaining additional 13% (Changed R² = .13) of the variances when sex, age, experience, education level and group performance in 2004 were statistically controlled. Although relatively small (Changed R² = .13), the contribution of the managerial personality was statistically significant, (Changed $F_{(6, 258)} = 43.44, p < .01$). As regards the individual variables contribution to the model, the results show managerial personality ($\beta = .39, P < .01$) was significantly positively related to group success (performance) in 2005. Thus managerial personality was a significant predictor of group success (performance). This shows that the strength of the prediction of managerial personality is small in line with Cohen (1988) suggestions. That is Hypothesis 1: Managers' locus of control will relate positively with group performance (group success) was supported. With regard to controlled variables, only group performance in 2004 was significantly positively related to group performance in 2005 ($\beta = .28, P < .01$).

4.7. The Locus of Control Personality and Managerial Behaviour

The predictive power of managerial personality on managerial behaviours utilized by managers was examined using hierarchical multiple regression (Enter Method). Table 7 below shows the results

Variables	R ²	ΔR ²	Beta (β)	F
Control Variables	.23**	.16**		3.82**
Sex			-.08	
Age			.04	
Experience			-.05	
Education			.03	
Z-Standardized (2004)			.27**	
Short-term planning			-.09	
Problem solving			.04	
Clarifying responsibilities			.06	
Monitoring Operations			.22**	
Consulting			.05	
Supporting			-.03	
Empowering			-.05	
Developing			.07	
Recognizing			.17	
Monitoring the environment			-.01	
Envisioning change			-.08	
Encouraging innovative thinking			-.06	
Taking personal risk			-.05	
All Variables	.27**	.05**		4.59**

Table 6: Hierarchical multiple regression of group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) on managerial personality: control variable and managerial behaviours

Sex			-.08	
Age			.06	
Experience			-.05	
Education			-.00	
Z-Standardized (2004)			.31**	
Short-term planning			-.05	
Problem solving			.04	
Clarifying responsibilities			.02	
Monitoring Operations			.17*	
Consulting			.03	
Supporting			-.03	
Empowering			.05	
Developing			.04	
Recognizing			.13	
Monitoring the environment			-.05	
Envisioning change			-.07	
Encouraging innovative thinking			-.01	
Taking personal risk			-.14	
Locus of control			.26**	

Table 6: Hierarchical multiple regression of group success (performance) measured as the Mean Z-Standardized success scores (2005) on managerial personality: control variable and managerial behaviours

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Using the hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Enter Method), Table 6 above showed that a significant model emerged ($F_{(20, 244)} = 4.59$, $p < .01$). The R^2 was .27 which meant that the model as a whole explained 27% of the total variance with 5% (Changed $R^2 = .05$) of it being explained by managerial personality (locus of control) variable. In the above model, sex, age, experience, education and group performance in 2004 as well as managerial behaviours were statistically controlled for. The explanation of the variance of the managerial personality variable (Change $R^2 = .05$) was statistically significant, Changed $F_{(1, 244)} = 15.09$, $p < .01$. The managerial personality ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$) was observed to be significantly positively related to group performance in 2005. Therefore, the results indicated that managerial personality is a significant predictor of managerial group performance. Of all the controlled variables, group performance in 2004 ($\beta = .31$, $p < .01$) and monitoring Operations ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$) were the variables that were significantly and positively related to the group performance in the year of study.

On the whole, managerial personality was a significant predictor of group Success (performance) when managerial behaviours were included in the control variables, and the power of the prediction was significantly different from when managerial behaviours were not controlled. This means that when the relation between managerial personality and managerial behaviours were introduced into the model (controlling the effect) did not significantly change the predictive power of managerial personality in predicting group success. Thus Hypothesis 5 which conjectured that managerial behaviours will significantly mediate the managerial personality- success relationship was not supported by the present study.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Overall, the study which investigated the relationship between managerial personality and group performance as well as the mediating effect of managerial behaviours supports research findings that espouse that personality is an imperative and significant variable in explaining performance among managers and their groups. This empirical finding learn credence to the importance of including personality (e.g., Locus of Control, Big-Five personality, Self-esteem, Self-efficacy etc) test in recruitment and selection of managers as well as placement of other junior employees especially to job that fit their personality. On the mediating effect of managerial behaviour on the managerial personality-group success measured as performance, the study again made another significant contribution to literature on this area of study, thus personality and leadership literature. The key result here is that managerial personality was found to be a much better predictor of performance than managerial behaviours. It is therefore important that organizations inculcate personality test into their recruitment, selection and placement procedures for managers and more particularly employees to ensure their personality fit the job that would be assigned to them. In addition, future research should look at a combination of personality factors (e.g., Self-esteem, Self-efficacy etc) in relation to managerial behaviour and group performance.

6. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

To expand the frontiers of research in this area of study and make informed comparative analysis, it would be better to research in profit oriented public sector organizations (i.e., The Graphic Communication Group limited, Ghana Telecom etc) to enhance our understanding on the relationship between managerial behaviour, managerial personality and organizational performance. In addition, the empirical finding of the present study calls for further investigation into specific managerial skills such as technical, interpersonal and conceptual as well as looking at the effect of personality on these skills and performance.

7. References

- i. Adeyemi-Bello, T. (2003). The impact of leader characteristics on the performance of organizational members: an exploratory study. *Work Study*, 56(6), 286-289.
- ii. Akuamoah-Boateng, R. (2003). Psychology must go town. In a speech presented at the third Ghana Psychological Association annual conference, Accra: GPA
- iii. Aldag, R.J. & Stearns, T.M. (1987). *Management*. Cincinnati, Ohio, South-Western Publishing Co.
- iv. Alexander, R.A., Carson, K.P. & Smith, J.E. (1984). "Leadership: it can a difference". *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 27, pp765-76
- v. Anderson, C.R. (1977). Locus of Control, Coping Behaviour and Performance in a Stress Setting: A Longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 446-451.
- vi. Anderson, C.R. & Craig, E. (1978). Locus of Control, Leader Behaviour and Leader performance among Management Students. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 21(4), 690-698.
- vii. Arnold, H. J. (1985). Task performance, perceived competence, and attributed causes of performance as determinants of intrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 876-888.
- viii. Ashford, S.J. & Cummings, L.L.C. (1993). Feedback as individual resources: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 32, 370-398.
- ix. Astley, G.W. & Van de Van, A.H. (1983). Central Perspectives and debates in Organizational Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28.
- x. Baldauf, A. & Gravens, D.W. (1999). Improving the effectiveness of field sales organizations. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 28, 63-72.
- xi. Barling, J., Weber, T. & Kelloway, E.K. (1996). Effect of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 827-832.
- xii. Barricks, M.K. & Mount, M.K. (1993) "Autonomy as a Moderator of the Relationships between the Big Five Personality Dimension and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 111-118.
- xiii. Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance: beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- xiv. Bass, B.M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- xv. Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
- xvi. Bauer, T.N., & Green, S. G., (1996). The development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1538-1567
- xvii. Baum, J.R. (1995). The relation of trait, competencies, motivation, strategy and structure to venture growth. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 39, 1538-1567.
- xviii. Baum, J.R. (1995). *Motivation, Mediators of Entrepreneurs' Personal Characteristics and New Venture Performance*. Working Paper, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
- xix. Begley, T.M. & Boyd, D.B. (1987). Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and small businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2, 79-93.
- xx. Bennett, R. (1995). *Organizational Behaviour* (2nd ed.). London, Pitman Publishing.
- xxi. Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders- The strategies for taking change*. Harper & Row, New York, NY.
- xxii. Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1982). Management by grid principles or situationalism: Which? *Group and Organization Studies*, 7, 207-210.
- xxiii. Black, J.S. & Porter, L.W. (1991). Managerial Behaviours and Job Performance: A successful manager in Los Angeles may not succeed in Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies*, First Quarterly, 99-113.
- xxiv. Blau, G. (1993). Testing the relationship of Locus of Control to different performance dimension. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66(2).
- xxv. Boachie-Mensah, F.O. (2000). *Essentials of Management*. Cape Coast, Catholic Mission Press.
- xxvi. Boal, K.B. & Whitehead, C.J. (1992). A critique of the Stratified System theory perspective. In R.L. Phillips & J.G. Hunts (Eds.), *Strategic Leadership: A multi-organizational level perspective*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- xxvii. Boone, C.A.J.J. & De Brabander, B. (1993). Generalized versus Specific Locus of Control Expectancies of Chief Executive Officers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 619-626.
- xxviii. Boone, C.A.J.J, De Brabander, B., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (1996). CEO Locus of Control and Small Firm Performance: An integrative framework and empirical test. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(5), 667-699.
- xxix. Boone, C.A.J.J, De Brabander, B., & Hellemans, J. (2000). Locus of Control and Small Firm Performance: A Research Note. *Organization Studies*, 21, 641-646.
- xxx. Bowers, D.G. & Seashore, S.E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11, 238-263.
- xxxi. Bourgeois, L.J. (1985). Strategic goals, perceived uncertainty, and economic performance in volatile environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3, 548-573.
- xxxii. Box, T.M., White, M.A. & Barr, S.H. (1993). A contingency model of new manufacturing firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(2), 34-45.
- xxxiii. Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). *The Competent Manager*, New York: John Wiley.
- xxxiv. Bracker, J.S. & Pearson, J.N. (1986). Planning and financial performance of small mature firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 503-522.

- xxxv. Bradford, D.L., & Cohen, A. R. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- xxxvi. Bradford, S.B. & Kzolowski, S.W. (2002). A typology of virtual teams: implication for effective leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 27(1), 14-49.
- xxxvii. Brearley, M. (2000). Teams: lessons from the world of sports. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 321(7269), 1141.
- xxxviii. Brockhaus, R. H. (1975). I-E locus of control scores as predictors of entrepreneurial intentions. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 433-435.
- xxxix. Brockhaus, R.H. (1980). Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 509-520.
- xl. Burke, R. J. (2005). Why leaders fail: exploring the dark side. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 91-100.
- xli. Cameli, A., Meitar, R. & Weiberg, J. (2006). Self leadership and innovative behaviour at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 75-90.
- xlii. Cameron K.S.C. (1986). Effectiveness as Paradox: Consensus and conflict in conception of organization effectiveness. *Management Science*, 32(5), 539-553.
- xliii. Carpenter, M.A. & Golden, B.R. (1997). Perceived Managerial Discretion: a study of cause and effect. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(3), 187-206.
- xliv. Chauchan, V.S., Dhar, U. & Pathak, R.D. (2005). Factorial constitution of managerial effectiveness: Re-examining an instrument in Indian context. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 164-177.
- xlv. Church, A.H. (1995). Linking leadership behaviour to service performance: do managers make a difference? *Managing Service Quality*, 5(6), 26-31.
- xlvi. Ceasar, D. (2002). The effect of managerial influence behaviour on the transition to Self-Directed Work Teams (SDWTs). *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(7), 628-635.
- xlvii. Chui, S.H., Sharpe, F.G. & McCormick, J. (1996). Visioning and leadership of Principals in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(3), 30-48.
- xlviii. Chun-Hong, L, Zi-you, Y. & Tjosvold, D. (2002). Production and people values: their impact on relationship and leader effectiveness in China. *Leadership and organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 134-144.
- xlix. Coetzer, E.L., & Schepers, J.M. (1997). Die verband tussen lokus van beheer en die werksprestasie van swart bemerkers in die lewensversekeringsbedryf. *Industrial Psychology*, 23, 34-41.
- l. Cohen, A. R., Fink, S. L., Gadon, H., & Willits, R. D. (1984). *Effective behavior in organizations* (3th ed.). Homewood, IL Irwin.
- li. Cole, G. (2004). *Management Theory and Practice*. (6th ed.). UK, Thompson Learning.
- lii. Cook K., Vance, C.A. & Spector, P.E. (2002). The relation of candidate personality with selection interview outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 867-885.
- liii. Conger, J.A. (1989). *Leadership: the art of empowering*. *Academy of Management Executive*, February, 17-24.
- liv. Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1997). Towards a behavioural theory of charismatic leadership in organizational setting. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- lv. Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- lvi. Cox, T. (1993). The multicultural organization. *The Executive*, 5(2), 34-47. In Shanton C and Tharenou P (2004), *Competencies needed for managing a multicultural work group*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 42(1), 57-74.
- lvii. Dean, J.W. & Sharfman, M.P. (1996). Does decision making process matter? A study of strategic decision making effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 368-396.
- lviii. Donaldson, G. & Lorsch, J. (1983). *Decision-making at the Top*. New York: Basic Books.
- lix. Dwight, N. & Neibuhr, R.E. (1984). Attributional influences on the Job Performance- Job Satisfaction relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(2), 424-431.
- lx. Day, D.V. & Lord, R.G. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational performance: Suggestion for a New Theory and methods. *Journal of Management* 453-464.
- lxi. In Robbins S. P and Laugton N (2001). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, Application* (2nd ed.), Toronto, Ontario, Pearson Education, Canada Inc.
- lxii. Drucker, P.F. (1992). The society of organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 1, 95-104.
- lxiii. Druckman, D., Singer, J.E. & Van Cott, H. (1997). *Enhancing organizational performance* (Eds.). Washington D.C: National Academy Press.
- lxiv. Durand, D.E. & Nord, W.R. (1976). Perceived leader behaviour as a function of personality characteristics of Supervisors and Subordinates. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 19(3), 427-438.
- lxv. Dunn, D.S. (2001). *Statistics and Data Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences*. USA, McGraw-Hill Companies Inc
- lxvi. Entrialgo, M., Fernandez, E. & Vazgues, C.J. (2000). Psychological Characteristics and Process: the role of the entrepreneurship in Spanish SMEs. *Journal of Innovation Management*, 3(3), 137-149.
- lxvii. Envic, B.R. & Langford, M. (2000). The Five –Factor Model of Personality: Assessing Entrepreneurs and Managers. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Management*, 6, 6-17
- lxviii. Egwakhe, A. J. (2014). Leadership Dual Behaviour and Workers' Performance: A People-Task Orientation Model. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*. 3(1) pp 184-191
- lxix. Falbe, C.M & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combination of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 638-652.
- lxx. Fisher, B.M. & Edwards, J.E. (1988). Consideration and initiating structure and their relationships with leader effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 201-205.

- lxxi. Fazel, J.L. & D'Itri, P.M. (1997). Managerial Efficiency, Managerial Succession and Organizational Performance. *Management and Decision Economics*, 18, 289-308.
- lxxii. Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 1-6.
- lxxiii. Fernández, S. (2003). Developing and testing an integrative framework of public sector managerial leadership: Evidence from the public education arena. In a paper presented at the 7th National Public Management Research Conference, Washington, D.C.
- lxxiv. Fraenkel, J.R. & Wellen, N.E. (2000). How to design and evaluate research in education, (4th ed.). USA, McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- lxxv. Frost, D.E., Fiedler, F.E., & Anderson, J.W. (1983). The role of personal risk taking in effective leadership. *Human Relations*, 36, 185-202
- lxxvi. Gil, F., Rico, R., Alcover, M.C. & Barrase, A. (2005). Change-oriented leadership, satisfaction and performance in work groups: Effects of team climate and group potency. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(3/4), 312-328.
- lxxvii. Ginter, P. M., & Duncan, W. J. (1990). Macro environmental analysis for strategic management. *Long Range Planning*, 23, 91-100.
- lxxviii. Gouatarbes, B. (2006). Why do people engage in startup activities? Personality trait and cognitive processes. TU-91,167 Seminar in Business Strategy and International Business.
- lxxix. Govindarajan, V. (1984). Appropriateness of accounting data in performance evaluation: an empirical examination of environment uncertainty as an intervening variable. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 9(2), 125-135.
- lxxx. Gray, J.H. (1999). A predictive model of Small Business success. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(2).
- lxxxi. Grinyer, P. H., Mayes, D., & McKiernan, P. (1990). The sharp benders: Achieving a sustained improvement in performance. *Long Range Planning*, 23, 116-125.
- lxxxii. Gronn, P. (1997). Leading for learning: Organizational transformation and the formation of leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, 16(4), 274-283.
- lxxxiii. Glaser, E.L. (1980). Productivity gains through work life improvement. *Personnel*, 57(1), 71-77.
- lxxxiv. Greenberger, D.B. & Strasser, S. (1986). Development and application of model of personal control in organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 164-177.
- lxxxv. Halikias, J. & Panavotopoulou, L. (2003). Chief Executive Personality and Export Involvement. *Management Decision*, 41(4), 340-349.
- lxxxvi. Hall, D.T. & Foulkes, F.K. (1991). "Senior executive development as a competitive advantage." *Advances in Applied Business Strategy*, 2. JAI Press, Greenwich.
- lxxxvii. Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- lxxxviii. Hambick, D.C. & Finkelstein, S. (1987). Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes. In L.L. Cumming & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 9, 369-406. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- lxxxix. Hambick, D.C. & Mason, P.A. (1986). Upper Echelon: The Organization as a Reflection of Its Top Managers. *The Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206
- xc. Hannan, M.T. & Freeman, J.H. (1977). The population ecology of organization. *American Journal of Sociology*, 28, 929-964.
- xc. Harrow, J. (1997). Managing Risk and Delivering Quality Services: a case of study perspective. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 10(5), 331-352.
- xcii. Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J.W. & Woodman Jr., R.W. (1992). *Organizational Behaviour* (6th ed.). USA, West Publishing Company.
- xciii. Herron, L. & Robinson, R.B. (1993). A structural model of the effects of entrepreneurial characteristics on venture capital performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8, 281-294.
- xciv. Hodgkinson, G.P. (1992). Development and validation of the Strategic Locus of Control Scale. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(4), 311-317.
- xcv. Hodgkinson, G.P., & Sparrow, P.R. (2002). *The Competent Organization*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- xcvi. Hogan, J. & Hogan, R. (2001). Assessing leadership: a view of dark side. *International Journal of Education and Assessment*, 9, 40-51.
- xcvii. Hogan, J. & Hogan, R. (2002). "Leadership and Socio-political intelligence" in Riggio, R.E, Murphy, S.E and Pirozzolo (Eds.). *Multiple intelligence and leadership*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- xcviii. Hogan, R. (1999). Trouble at the top: causes and consequences of managerial incompetence. *Consulting Psychology*, 46, 1061-87.
- xcix. Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- c. Hollenbeck, J. & Whitener, E. (1988). Reclaiming personality traits for personnel selection. *Journal of Management*, 14, 81-94.
- ci. House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership (pp. 189-207). In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- cii. House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-98.
- ciii. House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. 1991. Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.
- civ. Howell, J.M., & Frost, P. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 243-269.
- cv. Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictor of consolidated business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78: 891-902.
- cvi. Howell, J.M. & Higgins, C.A. (1990) Champion of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 317-341.

- cvii. Hymowitz, C. (1988). Five main reasons why managers fail. *Wall Street Journal*, 2, 25.
- cviii. Jacob, T.O., & Jaques, E. (1990). *Military Executive Leaders*. In K. E. Clark and M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*, 281-295. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- cix. Johnson, A.L., Luthans, F. & Hennessy, H.W. (1984). The Role of Locus of Control in Leader Influence Behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, 70.
- cx. Johnson, J.B. & Joslyn, R.A. (1995). *Political Science Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Washington DC, Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- cxii. Kanter, R. (1985). *The change Masters*. Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.
- cxiii. Kanter, R.M. (1989). The new managerial work. *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 85-92.
- cxiv. Kathuria, R. & Porth, S.J. (2003). Strategy – manager characteristics alignment and performance: A manufacturing perspective. *International Journal of Operations*, 23(3), 255-276.
- cxv. Keenan, A. (1982). Candidate personality and performance in the selection interview. *Personnel Review*, 11, 22-25.
- cxvi. Kelly, D. (2000). Using vision to improve organizational communication. *Leadership and Organization Development*, 21(2), 92-101.
- cxvii. Keller, J. & Dansereau, (1995). Leadership and Empowerment: A social exchange perspectives. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 127-147.
- cxviii. Klein, J. (2002). Prediction of success for school Principal candidates by means of decision-making test. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(2), 118-135.
- cxix. Klein, J. & Wasserstein-Warnet, M. (2000). Predictive validity of locus of control test in selection of school administrators. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(1), 7-24
- cx. Klimoski, R.J. & Hayes, M. J. (1980). Leadership behaviour and subordinate motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 543-564.
- cxi. Komaki, J. (1986). Toward effective supervision: An operant analysis and comparison of managers at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 270-278.
- cxii. Komaki, J., Desselles, M.L., & Bowman, E.D. (1989). Definitely not a breeze: Extending an operant model of effective supervision to teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 522-529.
- cxiii. Korunka, C., Frank, H., Lueger, M., & Mugler, J. (2003). The entrepreneurial personality in the context of resources, environment, and the startup process-A configurational approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 23-42.
- cxiv. Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 37-60.
- cxv. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- cxvi. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- cxvii. Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour*. (5th ed.). New York, NY, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- cxviii. Labbaf, H., Analoui, F, & Cusworth, J.W. (1996). Senior managers' effectiveness: the case of the Steel Industry in Iran. *Journal of Management Development*, 15(9), 47-63.
- cxvix. Laughhunn, D.J., Payne, J.W. & Crum, R. (1980). Managerial risk preferences for below target returns. *Management Science*, 26(12), 1238-1249.
- cxx. Lieberman, S., & O'Connor, J.F. (1972). Leadership and organizational performance. A study of large corporations. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 117-130.
- cxxi. Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425
- cxxii. Liden, R.C. & Arad, S. (1996). A power perspective of empowerment and work group: Implication for human resource management research. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 14, 205-251.
- cxxiii. Lipsky, D.R., (1996). The relationship between managerial leadership behaviour, effectiveness and success. PhD thesis, Hofstra University.
- cxxiv. Littrell, R.F. & Valentin, L.N. (2005). Preferred leadership behaviour: Exploratory results from Romania, Germany and the UK. *Journal of Management and Development*, 24(5), 421-442. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- cxxv. Lobel, S. (1990). Global leadership competencies: Managing to a different drumbeat. *Human Resource Management*, 29, 39-47.
- cxxvi. Loo, R. (1991). "Management Training in Canadian Organizations." *Journal of Management Development*, 10(5), 60-72.
- cxxvii. Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effective correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of MLQ leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425
- cxxviii. Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- cxxvix. Mahoney, A.T. & Weiner, N. (1981). A model of corporate performance as a function of environment, organizational and leadership influences. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 453-470.
- cxxx. McCarter, W.W. & Campbell, C.R. (2006). Leadership, management and derailment: A model of individual success and failure. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 27(3), 190-202.
- cxli. MacCrimmon, K.R. & Wehrung, D.A. (1984). The risk-in-basket. *Journal of Business*, 57(3), 367-387.
- cxlii. MacCrimmon, K.R. & Wehrung, D.A. (1990). Characteristics of risk-taking executives. *Management Science*, 36(4), 422-435.
- cxliii. Masterangelo, A., Eddy, E. R. & Lorenzet, S. J. (2004). The importance of personal and professional leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 25(5), 435-451.
- cxliiii. McCauley, C.D. (1986). *Developmental experiences in managerial work*. Technical Report No. 26. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- cxliv. McGrath, R. & MacMillian, I. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- cxlv. McKenna, E. (1994). *Business Psychology and Organizational Behaviour: A Student Handbook* (2nd Rev. ed.). Hove, UK: Lawerance Erlbaum Associates Ltd.
- cxlvi. March, J.G. & Shapira, Z. (1988). *Managerial perspectives on risk and risk-taking: Decisions & Organizations*. New York: Basil Blackwell
- cxlvii. March, J.G., & Shapira, Z. 1987. "Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking." *Management Science*, 33(11): 1404–1418.
- cxlviii. Merton, R. (1946). *Mass Persuasion*. New York, NY: Harpers.
- cxlix. Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M.F.R. & Toulouse, J. (1982). Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making, structure, and environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 237-253.
- cl. Miller, D. & Friesen, R. (1984). *Organization: a quantum view*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- cli. Miller, D., & Toulouse, J. (1986). Chief executive personality and corporate strategy and structure in small firms. *Management Science*, 32, 1389-1409.
- clii. Millet, M.S. (2006). Futuring and Visioning: Complementary approach to strategic decision making. *Strategy and Leadership*, 34(4), 43-50.
- cliii. Millet, P. (2005). Locus of control and its relation to work life: studies from the fields of vocational rehabilitation and small firms in Sweden. Department of Human Work Science. Lulea University of Technology, Sweden.
- cliv. Miles, S.J. & Mangold, G. (2002). The impact of team leader's performance on team member performance satisfaction: the subordinate's perspective. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 8(5/6), 113-121.
- clv. Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- clvi. Morse, J.J. & Wagner, F.R. (1978). Measuring the process of managerial effectiveness. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1), 23-35.
- clvii. Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). *Psychology Applied to Work: an introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*, (6th ed.). USA, Wadsworth.
- clviii. Muehlfeld, K. & Witteloostuijn, A.V. (2006). Trader personality and trading performance: an explorative financial market pilot experiment. Preliminary Draft.
- clix. Mullins, J.L. (1995). *Management and Organizational Behaviour* (5th ed.). London, Pearson Education Limited.
- clx. Mullins, J.L. (2002). *Management and Organizational Behaviour* (6th ed.). FT: Prentice-Hall, Harlow.
- clxi. Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S. J., Johnson, J.F., Diana, M., Gilbert, J.A. & Threlfall, K.V. (2000). Patterns of Leader Characteristics: Implication for performance and development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 111-133.
- clxii. Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a Mediator of the relationship between Methods of Mentoring and organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- clxiii. Neshamba, F., (2001). Growth and transformation among small business in Kenya. Africa centre for Entrepreneurship and Growth, Paper: Nottingham business School, United Kingdom 1-19.
- clxiv. O'Brien, G.E. (1983). Locus of control, work and retirement. In Lefcourt, H.M. (Ed.), *Research in locus of control*, Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press.
- clxv. Odom, R.Y & Boxx, W.R. (1988). Environment planning processes and organizational performance of churches. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 197-205.
- clxvi. Ozaralli, N. (2003). Effects of Transformational leadership and empowerment on team effectiveness. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 24(6), 335-344.
- clxvii. Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival guide: a step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS*. Maryborough, Victoria: McPherson's Printing Group.
- clxviii. Paulhus, D.L. & Martin, C.L. (1998). Functional Flexibility. A new conception of interpersonal flexibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 88-101.
- clxix. Peters, T.J., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference*. New York: Random House.
- clxx. Phares, E.J. (1962), "Perceptual threshold decrements as a function of skill and chance expectancies." *Journal of Psychology*, 53, 399-407.
- clxxi. Phillips, P.A. (2000). The strategic planning/finance interface: Does sophistication really matter? *Management Decision*, 38(8), 541-549.
- clxxii. Perry, C. (1990). After further sightings of the heffalump. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 5, 22-31.
- clxxiii. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. & Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational leadership behaviours and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 22, 259-289.
- clxxiv. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Morrman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- clxxv. Pounder, J.S. (2001). New leadership and University organizational effectiveness: exploring the relationship. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 22(6), 281-290.
- clxxvi. Recado, R.J. (2000). Best practices in organizations experiencing extensive and rapid change. *National Productivity Review*, Summer, 79.
- clxxvii. Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2000). Psychological approaches to entrepreneurial success. A general model and overview of findings. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 101-142. Chichester: Wiley.
- clxxviii. Robinson, R.B. & Pearce, (1988). Planned patterns of strategic behaviour and their relation to business unit performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 43-60.

- clxxix. Robinson, S. & Weldon, E. (1993). Feedback seeking in groups: A theoretical perspectives. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 71-86.
- clxxx. Rodsutti, M.C. & Swierczek, F.W. (2002). Leadership and organizational effectiveness in multinational enterprise in the Southeast Asia. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 23(5), 250-259.
- clxxxi. Roth, K. (1995). Managing International Independence: CEO characteristics in a resource-based framework. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 200-231.
- clxxxii. Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal-external control of re-enforcement. *Psychology Monographs*, 80, 1014-1053.
- clxxxiii. Russell, C.J. (2001). The quantum skills model in management: A New Paradigm to enhance effective leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 22(5/6), 264-274.
- clxxxiv. Scalancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Constraints on administrator discretion: the limited influence of mayors on city budgets. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 12, 475-498.
- clxxxv. Scalancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1980). Effects of ownership and performance on executive tenure in US corporations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(4), 653-654.
- clxxxvi. Schepers, J.M. (1995). Die Lokus van beheer vraelys: Konstruksie en evaluering van 'n nuwe meetinstrument. Tegniese verslag. Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit.
- clxxxvii. Selart, M. (2005). Understanding the role of locus of control in consultative decision making: a case study. *Management Decision*, 43(13), 397-412.
- clxxxviii. Semarco, K.M.S. (2004). The Relationship among Personality Patterns, Managerial Behaviours and Entrepreneurial Success in Ghana. M. Phil Thesis.
- clxxxix. Shane, M. (2004). Is Symbolic Interactionism the Fifth Paradigm of Leadership? School of Management, Victoria University of Technology. Working Paper Series.
- cx. Shuman, J. & Seeger, J. (1986). The theory and practice of strategic management in smaller rapid growth firms. *American Journal of Small Business*, 11(1), 7-8.
- cxci. Shay, J.P., Tracey, J.B., & Peterson, S., (2001). The generalizability of managerial practices across cultural context. *Journal of International Management*. (In Press).
- cxcii. Shin, Y.K. (1998). The trait and leadership styles of CEOs in Korean companies. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 28(4), 40.
- cxci. Spector, P.E. (1982). Behaviour as a function of employees' locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 482-497.
- cxci. Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340.
- cxci. Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). Social Structural Characteristics of Psychological Empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 283-504.
- cxci. Spreitzer, G.M. (1997). Towards common grounds in defining empowerment. In W.A. Pasmore and R.W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in Organizational and Development*, 10, 31-62. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- cxci. Steward, W.H. (1986). *Psychological Correlates of entrepreneurship*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- cxci. Stoner, J.A.F., Freeman, R.E. & Gilbert Jr., D.R. (1999). *Management* (6th ed.). Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., USA.
- cxci. Storms, P.L. & Spector, P.E. (1987). Relationship of organizational frustration with reported behavioural reactions: the moderate effect of locus of control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 227-234.
- cc. Strang, K.D. (2005). Examining effective and ineffective transformational project leadership. *Team Performance Management*, 11(3/4), 68-103.
- cc. Tabanick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- cc. Thomas, A.B. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organization performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 388-400.
- cc. Tepper, B.J., Eisenbach, R. J., Kirby, S. L. & Potter, P. W. (1998). Test of a justice based model of subordinates resistance to downward influence attempt. *Group and Organizational Dynamics*, 26(1), 49-61.
- cc. Tichy, N.M. & Devanna, M.A. (1986). *The Transformation Leader*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- cc. Tiffin, J. & McCormick, E.J. (1961). *Industrial Psychology* (4th ed.). New Jersey (NJ), Prentice Hall Inc. America.
- cc. Weber, P.S. & Weber, E.J. (2001). Changes in employee perception during organizational change, *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 22(6), 291-300.
- cc. Weiner, N. & Mahoney, T. A. (1981). A model of corporate performance as a function of environmental, organizational, and leadership influences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 453-470.
- cc. Welbourne. T.M., Cavanaugh, A.M. and Judge, T.A. (1998). Does the leader make a difference? Relationship between executive leader personality and entrepreneurial firm performance. *Center for Advance Human Resources Studies Working Paper Series*, 17, 4-17.
- cc. Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.S. (1998). *Developing management skills*, (4th ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Weseley.
- cc. weLead, (2001). 8 Trait of effective leaders and leadership self discovery. Online Magazine (www.leadingtoday.org).
- cc. Wikoff, M., Anderson, D.C., & Crowell, C.R. (1983). Behavior management in factory setting: Increasing work efficiency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 4, 97-128.
- cc. Wexley, K.N. & Yukl, G.A. (1984). *Organizational Behaviour and Personnel Psychology* (Revised Edition). USA, Homewood.

- ccxiv. Wood, R.D. (2003). Inspiration leadership model. International Leadership Studies Conference. School of Leadership Studies, Regent University. (www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publication/conference)
- ccxv. Yergin, D. & Stainslaw, A. (2002). *The commanding height: The battle for the world economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- ccxvi. Yukl, G.A., Kim, A. & Fable, C.M. (1996). "Antecedents of influence outcomes." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 309-317.
- ccxvii. Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in organization* (second edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- ccxviii. Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in organization* (third edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- ccxix. Yukl, G A., & Van Fleet, D. (1982). Cross-situational, multi-method research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 87-108.
- ccxx. Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organization* (fifth edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- ccxxi. Yukl, G. (1998). An evaluative essay on current conception of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 525-535.
- ccxxii. Yukl, G. & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 525-535
- ccxxiii. Yukl, G, Wall, S. & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on the managerial practices survey (pp. 223-238). In K. E. Clark and M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of
- ccxxiv. Zhu, W., Chew, I.K.H., & Spangler, W.D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human capital – enhancing human resource management. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 39-52.