

Conference Proceedings Paper PROS-037

Presented at Sixth Symposium on Process Organization Studies, 2014 June 19-21, Rhodes, Greece.

J. Kampen & A.M. Henken

Title:

Intervening in Emotionally Neglected or Abused Organizations

Changing harmful routines in teams

Abstract

Organizational development is about changing organizational dynamics. This article opens the 'black box' of destructive dynamics in teams in the context of a university of applied sciences. Process theorizing produces know-how knowledge. This type of knowledge is especially beneficial for professional change agents..

In this article we focus on harmful behavioral patterns at the level of teams. We analyze the interaction between supervisors and subordinates through the lens of a new concept for organizational development: the theory of organization emotional neglect. The analogy between parenting styles and leadership styles, especially rejecting-neglecting parenting and laissez faire leadership, is used to show how the patterns of harmful interaction between supervisors and their subordinates in neglected organizations emerge and can be treated on the level of teams. We found that harmful routines do not disappear by compensating the omission of leadership. Resistant behavior gets worse before it's getting better. The routines need to be replaced by sustainable reciprocal interaction. Negative capability is a conditional core competence of change agents in emotionally neglected organizations. A high turnover (>30%) of direct supervisors and of senior management can be expected in the recovery from emotionally neglected organizations.

Introduction

There is a substantial body of knowledge about the human response to change and transition (Elrod & Tippett, 1999). Resistance to change is described collectively as negative and disruptive behavior that jeopardizes the change process and its desired outcome (Kegan, 1994). Resistance is perceived as a phase in 'the change curve' (Kübler-Ross, 1969; Bupp, 1996). The leader must be able to set the course and navigate through 'the death valley of change' by managing the emotional response of the team members to organizational change (Elrod & Tippett, 1999). The role of a participatory leadership style is found to be an important variable in reducing resistance to change (Coch & French, 1948).

We focus on the behavior of the professionals and their supervisors at team level in a faculty of an institution of applied sciences in the Netherlands. This institution adopted the concept of self-directed work teams in order to improve mutual adjustment in teaching processes, collaboration between lecturers and the involvement of professionals in improving the quality of education for the benefit of the students. A delegating leadership style of the direct supervisors of the teams was introduced to facilitate the development of the teams.

The implementation of the concept of self-directed teams and the conduct of delegating leadership behavior proved to be problematic: 'organizational reality' (Frost et al., 1992) is completely different from the outcome as expected by the literature on organizational change. The professionals do not respond to the invitation to participate in solving daily problems in the teams or the initiatives to improve the programs and courses offered to the students. They even reject accountability for the way of performing their own task as lecturer or tutor. Collaboration with colleagues is poor in the same semester or course. There is no response of the team members to a delegating leadership style, the professionals distrust any initiative of the senior management. Direct supervisors are seen as assistants of the senior management with an agenda to cut budgets and to set high demands on the professionals resulting in ever increasing pressure of work. Meanwhile 30 to 50 percent of the professionals show 'bad behavior' (Pearson & Porath, 2009) like self-centeredness, open or surreptitious aggressiveness to their supervisors and weaker members of the teams and inability in general to reflect on their own behavior. They do not accept accountability for their anti-social

behavior. Student satisfaction as measured yearly by the Dutch National Student Survey (www.nse.nl) was low in most bachelor programs.

In this study we focus on collective quiescent and overt forms of resistant behavior in self-directed teams of professionals and the persistent resistance against intervention.

The puzzling questions for the dean of the faculty are: why do the professionals not respond to change as might be expected in the concept of self-directed teams, how come that professionals show such 'bad behavior' and mistrust any initiative of the senior management, why do they even reject accountability for their own performance and behavior.

The research question for this study is: how do harmful patterns of interaction between leaders and followers originate and how can these patterns be changed into constructive patterns of interaction.

In the next section we explore relevant research on leadership behavior, misbehavior of subordinates, group dynamics and the role and competences of the change agents. We engage in an alternative theoretical perspective on developmental problems in organizations and investigate the implications for an effective intervention strategy to move away from harmful routines in organizations.

Theory

Introduction

The phenomena in the workplace, especially the misbehavior of employees that were encountered and observed by the first author as a change agent during organizational development projects have a striking similarity to the descriptions of misbehavior in the developmental psychology literature. There is some research on applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership (Popper & Maysel, 2003). No research has been done however on the analogy between 'bad parenting', especially neglectful parenting, and 'bad leadership' especially non leadership or laissez faire leadership.

A close conceptual relationship was found by Kampen (2011a + b) between the response of children to a neglecting parenting style and the response of subordinates to a laissez faire leadership style.

In this theory section we first explore leadership behavior shown in the teams of the faculty from a theoretical perspective. Secondly we focus on behavior, especially 'bad behavior', of members of the teams, also from a theoretical perspective. Thirdly we take a closer look at the interaction from a group dynamics perspective. Finally we explore the role and competences of change agents from a theoretical perspective.

Leadership behavior

The role of the supervisor of a team was intended to facilitate the professionals and manage daily routines as the team members were assumed to be highly task-responsible and self-sufficient. The leadership practice in the teams of this faculty in this institution of higher education can be characterized as laissez faire. The leader behavior fitted the description of avoiding decisions, hesitating to take action and being absent when needed (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Judge et al. (2004) found that laissez faire leadership had strong negative correlations with leader effectiveness ($r = -.54$) and satisfaction with the leader ($r = -.58$). Laissez faire leadership is often referred to as ineffective (Krasikova et al., 2013), passive negative or zero leadership (Bass, 1990). Ineffective leadership is seen as inability of a leader to achieve goals valued by the organization or mobilize the followers to achieve them (Krasikova et al., 2013). Ineffective leadership is considered to be a demonstration of a leader's natural inaptitude and/or low motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007). Ineffective leadership that is unintentionally harmful is excluded from the definition of destructive leadership by Krasikova et al. (2013). Judge et al. (2004) concluded however that the absence of leadership such as laissez-faire leadership is nearly as important as the presence of constructive forms of leadership. Skogstad et al. (2007) concluded that laissez-faire leadership behavior is a form of destructive leadership behavior that warrants more future research. This article will contribute to this ambition by transferring research findings from the domain of developmental psychology (DP) to the domain of organizational development (OD)

Research in the domain of DP indicates that a rejecting-neglecting parenting style has a negative impact on the developmental competences of children and adolescents (Aichhorn, 1935; Baumrind, 1968, 1978, 1989 and 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983) and is harmful to children and adolescents (Rosenthal, 1987; English, 1998). Rejecting-neglecting parents are low in demandingness as well as responsiveness. Children raised by rejecting-neglecting or permissive parents are incompetent on the dimensions socially assertive and socially

responsible (Baumrind, 1989). In a later longitudinal study Baumrind found that adolescents of rejecting-neglecting or unengaged parents were more anti-social, showed a lack of responsibility, cognitive competence and self-regulation (Baumrind, 1991). Maccoby & Martin (1983) updated Baumrind's parenting styles by using two dimensions: parental demandingness (control, supervision, maturity demands) and parental responsiveness (warmth, acceptance, involvement). Authoritarian parents are characterized by high in demandingness but low in responsiveness. Authoritative parents are characterized by high on both demandingness and responsiveness. The two types of permissive parenting as discussed by Maccoby & Martin (1983) are indulgent parents and neglecting parents. Indulgent parents are characterized by low on demandingness but high on responsiveness while neglecting parents are characterized by low on both demandingness and responsiveness. Indulgent parents are warm, accepting, and tolerant but make few demands for mature behavior, exercise little authority, and allow children to self-regulate as much as possible. Neglecting parents do not care much of their children's behavior and parents are often too preoccupied by their own problems and ignore their children. Neglecting parents often avoid their parental responsibilities (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Neglecting leaders continuously abdicate their responsibilities, similar to neglecting parents. Active managers take the major responsibility for decision making when they are directive and consultative, whereas inactive managers take little or no responsibility as laissez faire leaders (Bass, 1990, p.544).

Two factors were found by Fleishman (1973) that describe leadership behavior: *consideration* and *initiation of structure*. The inconsiderate leader treats subordinates without considering their feelings or competences. The leader whose scale score in initiating structure is low is described as hesitant about taking initiatives (Bass, 1990). Consideration as leadership factor is analogous to 'responsiveness' in parenting and initiating structure is analogous to 'demandingness' in parenting (Popper & Mayesless, 2003). The interaction between the two factors produced four distinct parenting styles or, in analogy, leadership styles as shown in Table 1.

(Table 1 about here)

Behavior of team members

Here we explore the behavior of the members of the teams from a theoretical perspective and use the analogy with the behavior of neglected or emotionally abused children to broaden our understanding of the meaning of 'bad' behavior of members of the self-directed teams.

Gruys & Sackett (2003) use the following definition of counterproductive work behavior (CWB): any intentional behavior on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests. One category of CWB is 'production deviance', involving violating norms about how work is to be accomplished. This includes not being on the job as scheduled (absence, tardiness, long breaks) and behaviors that detract from production when on the job (intentional slow or sloppy work). The behavior of some of the team members fitted this description: they acted as autonomous individuals, following their own rules, criticizing the policies of the institution, and ignoring organizational routines, for example working at home when they were scheduled to teach. The behavior shown by the members of the teams however was not intentionally counterproductive: the professionals are convinced they know better what is best for the students. That brings us to a second category of 'bad behavior' that includes ignorant behavior described as workplace incivility. Pearson & Porath (2009) define workplace incivility as: 'the exchange of seemingly inconsequential inconsiderate words and deeds that violate conventional norms of workplace conduct' (p.12).

Workplace incivility is sometimes intended behavior, sometimes it is not, most of the time it is ignorant. Pearson & Porath (2009) mention examples of behavior also represented in the self-directed teams: interrupting a conversation, arriving late, leaving early, showing little interest in an individual's opinion or emotions, failing to respond to an email request, being left out of the communication loop, taking credits for others efforts, passing blame for your own mistakes, talking down to others (especially members of the senior management), not listening, belittling other's efforts, avoiding someone, making demeaning or derogatory remarks to someone, withholding information. Whether or not incivility is deliberate, it remains potentially destructive because it provokes negative emotions and ensures negative responses.

The anti-social behavior of 30 to 50 percent of the members of the self-directed teams fits all examples of workplace incivility. Most of their uncivil behavior is not intentional. When someone is called to account on his or her behavior the response is denial followed by blaming 'the senior management' or 'the organization'.

From a DP perspective anti-social behavior is a way to survive, of not being harmed. Child abuse and neglect are believed to produce negative consequences in children, including prolonged psychological damage (Rosenthal, 1987). The behavior of abused and neglected children involves cockiness, selfishness, inability to admit fault, engaging in superficial emotional connections, learned helplessness, rituals of perfectionism and aggression. These behaviors symbolically express the abused or neglected children's vulnerabilities. Neglected children show several forms of misbehavior (Redl & Wineman, 1951). The forms of misbehavior of neglected children show a great resemblance to the 'bad' behavior of the professionals in our study. In table 2 forms of manifest behavior and their clinical diagnose are presented.

(Table 2 about here)

The misbehavior of subordinates may not necessarily be a sign of resistance to change but rather of incompetence to face challenges (Kampen & Schuiling, 2005; Kampen 2011a +b). Key notions in the DP research, relevant for this study are: a chronic rejecting neglecting parenting style has a negative influence on the competences of children and affects their social responsibility. Anti-social behavior is part of their repertoire to survive (Kampen, 2011b).

Popper & Mayselless (2003) apply a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. Leader-led relationships are analogous to parent-children dynamics in many respects. A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange (LMX) indicated that leader variables explained the most variance in LMX quality (Dulebohn et al., 2012). Leaders, like parents, are figures whose role and behavior includes guiding, directing, taking charge, and taking care of others less powerful than they and whose fate is highly dependent on them. In this study we assume according to Popper & Mayselless (2003) that leaders with whom followers form emotional relationships function in many aspects as parents (Kampen, 2011a+b). We use this analogy by studying not only good parenting as Popper & Mayselless (2003) did, but also 'bad' parenting. We apply the insight gained from DP research to understand the dynamics between laissez-faire leaders and their 'bad behaving' followers and develop interventions to change the dynamics in organizations on the level of teams. In this study we draw on findings of Kampen (2011a) applying the insights of child development to intervening in neglected organizations.

Kampen (2011a) found that the resistant behavior of neglected or abused children and neglected or emotionally mistreated members of organizations have a striking resemblance (Kampen & Schuiling, 2005; Kampen 2011a). The effect of parental neglect is a developmental disorder of the child which becomes manifest when the child is challenged in social interaction (Glaser, 2002; McSherry, 2007). The concept of self-directed work teams demanded a level of social competence that the professionals did not meet. Organization emotional neglect is defined by Kampen (2011b) as the result of long lasting rejection of responsibilities by leaders causing patterns of harmful interaction between members of the organization, in particular between supervisors and subordinates.

Group interaction

The third section describes the influence of work groups on the anti-social behavior of individual members. Again we compare findings in child development and workplace settings.

Lewin et al. (1939) conducted a series of experimental studies of group life: 'what underlies such differing patterns of group behavior as rebellion against authority, persecution of a scapegoat, apathetic submissiveness to authoritarian domination, or attack upon an out-group?' (p.271). These questions are very similar to our research question: how do harmful patterns of interaction between leaders and followers emerge and how can these patterns be changed into constructive patterns of interaction.

Lewin et al. (1939) conducted an experiment with four clubs of 10-year old boys engaged in a variety of club activities while four different adult leaders participated. One adult leader conducted an authoritarian style, one leader a democratic style and two leaders conducted a laissez faire style. The laissez faire style included complete freedom for group and individual decision, without any leader participation. The laissez faire leader made it clear that he would supply information on the activities when asked. He took no part in work discussions in the group. The laissez faire leader made very infrequent comments on member activities and made no attempt to interfere with the course of events. Lewin et al. (1939) found that the laissez faire style caused the strongest anti-social behavior including a 'strike', rebellious acts, reciprocal aggression among all members, scapegoat attack, release behavior after a decrease in leader pressure and aggression against impersonal 'substitute hate objects' (Lewin et al., 1939, p.288). It was found that in laissez faire the space of free movement was not larger but

smaller than in democracy, because of the lack of structure and interference with the work activities.

The notion that individuals' work groups, as the teams in our study, will influence the likelihood of their behaving in anti-social ways is supported by research (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). Most individuals will likely adapt some of their behaviors, cognitions and attitudes to better fit with the social environment in which they work (Schneider, 1987). Individuals use information from their immediate social environments to interpret events, develop appropriate attitudes and understand expectations concerning their behavior and its consequences (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). If individuals work in environments that include others who serve as models for anti-social behavior, these individuals are more likely to behave themselves in anti-social ways (Bandura, 1977; O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). It was found that group anti-social behavior significantly predicted individual anti-social behavior. Groups displaying high levels of anti-social behavior may influence members to perform anti-social actions. The group provides a social context that is critical to the individual's interpretation of organization level systems (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). When the concept of self-directed teams is applied in a way that full autonomy is granted to high educated professionals without demanding accountability there is an emerging organizational reality of neglect and *laissez faire*. The consequences of organization emotional neglect become manifest over time as the organization can no longer cope with demands of stakeholders, customers and legal demands, as became manifest in the case studied here (Kampen, 2011b).

Research findings in leadership behavior, uncivil and anti-social behavior of employees and the influence of groups on the behavior of individuals show how anti-social behavior can originate and is maintained. Research in DP indicates that a neglecting parenting style is harmful to children and their development. The DP literature also indicates that the anti-social behavior is functional to survive. In order to change the harmful patterns of interactions the opposite of a *laissez faire* leadership style should be introduced rather than a participatory leadership style as indicated in the body of knowledge of change and transition of organizations (Elrod & Tippett, 1999).

The role of the change agent

In this fourth section the role of the change agent is discussed. In fact there are three distinctive roles cooperating in the leadership of change in this case: the direct supervisor of the teams, the senior managers and the consultant acting as team coach.

We use the analogy in leadership styles and parenting styles to define the competences of transformational leadership in neglected organizations (Popper & Mayselless, 2003). Leader-led relationships are analogous to parent-children dynamics in many respects. Leaders, like parents, are figures whose role includes guiding, directing, taking charge, and taking care of others less powerful than they and whose fate is highly dependent on them (Popper & Mayselless, 2003). In table 3 we summarize side-by-side findings regarding good parenting from the DP literature and findings related to transformational leaders. This analogy is used to define the competences of the managers in their role as change agent.

(Table 3 about here)

Leadership is often defined in terms of positive capabilities, those attributes and abilities that allow the leader to promote decisive action even under circumstances of uncertainty. In leading change in neglected organizations the leader also needs a negative capability, the capacity to sustain reflective inaction. 'Negative' points at the ability not to do something, to resist the tendency to disperse in action that enforces the dysfunctional patterns of interaction (Simpson et al., 2002). Leaders in neglected organizations need negative capability in order to contain the emotional resistance in response to their demanding leadership behavior and not being trusted. This capability which manifests in behaviors such as waiting, observing and listening, that are the opposite pole to action as intervention: 'sit on your hands before you react'. In 'negative' circumstances, which are characterized by 'lack', such as in a neglected organization, the pressures to act can be great, especially upon those in leadership positions. Negative capability is more than not acting, it is 'precisely the ability to tolerate anxiety and fear, to stay in the place of uncertainty in order to allow the emergence of new thoughts or perceptions' (Eisold, 2000, p.65).

The role of the consultant is to coach the senior managers in promoting negative capability and helping them to support the direct supervisors who are in the frontline of emotional resistance when they try to change the harmful patterns of behavior. Negative capability indicates a capacity for understanding and empathy for the employees acting out their anxiety

in 'bad' behavior and be able to limit their behavior and continue to think in difficult and emotionally demanding situations.

Experiential learning approaches such as group relations interventions help to develop negative capability of the managers as change agents (Triest, 1999). We integrated the development of negative capability in the intervention method.

Intervention method

A program for change of patterns of interaction between direct supervisors and subordinates was developed and conducted in a faculty of an institution of higher education in the Netherlands over a period of three years. This faculty consists of four institutes (schools). Each institute is led by a director. An institute consists of three to five teams of about 10 to 15 lecturers. Each team has a formal leader, the team supervisor. The intervention program was not started at the same time in each of the four institutes. Actually, it was started in one of the institutes in early 2011, started in a second one in autumn 2011, in a third one in summer 2013, while the fourth institute, which had a quite different and much better performance from the start onwards, participated only in a part of the intervention program all along.

The program was designed as an experiential learning process (Kolb, 1984) and was conducted in the context of the faculty during a period of three years. Although specific behavioral skills can be taught, in training transformational leaders in the context of a situation of developmental deprivation, the emphasis needs to be on a process of education and development, not on skill training alone (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988).

As mentioned in the introduction section of this study, the implementation of the concept of self-directed teams and the conduct of participatory leadership behavior proved to be problematic. The phenomena in the organizational reality of the teams resembled all the characteristics of organization emotional neglect (Kampen, 2011b). The program at the level of the faculty in our study was designed using the insights of the concept of emotionally neglected organizations as presented in the theory section of this study. The first step in recovery of neglect is aimed at bringing the members of the management in position and make them competent in authoritative leadership behavior. This is assumed as a preliminary step to bring stability, reliability and limits to tasks, behaviors and social interaction. Priority was given to increasing the competence of the direct supervisors of the teams. The members of the senior management, the directors of the institutes were brought in position as mentor of

the team supervisors. The dean of the faculty was brought in position as principal of the program serving as leader of the transformation process. The dean of the faculty acted as principal for the team of four external team coaches whom he hired in his first year in office to improve the functioning of his faculty.

The first phase in the process of intervening was to systematically observe the response of the so-called self-directed teams to the actual leadership behavior of the direct supervisors. A ten item subscale of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measuring laissez faire leadership was used by the team coach to observe the behavior of subordinates reacting to the behavior of their supervisor in the teams (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Selman, F.,2004). The direct supervisors did not know that this subscale was used by the team coach. The observations took place in the first half of the first year of the program.

The aim of this step was to verify the manifestation of the leadership behavior according to the description in the laissez faire subscale and to identify the behavioral routines that originated from the response of the subordinates to the laissez faire behavior of the supervisors. The routines were supposed to function as 'unwritten rules' for the way things are done in and by the team. The team coach observed the actual behavior in the teams in the daily organizational setting (reflection in action) and gave each supervisor feedback on his leadership behavior and the team on their collective patterns of interaction (reflection on action) (Schön, 1983). Workplace settings attended were: formal meetings of management, in- or outdoor, at team, institute and faculty level, informal meetings in teachers area, as well as coaching and training sessions. The observations of the team coach were discussed and reflected upon in the management team of the institute consisting of the team supervisors of the educational programs and the director of the institute. In this process of reflecting the dominant patterns of interaction were identified and how the patterns served as routines for team life.

The second phase of the intervention strategy consisted of a leadership learning program aimed at changing the leadership style of the supervisors of the teams. The method of learning was experiential learning (Kolb, 1984): a learning process over a period of three years whereby the team supervisors of the four institutes of the faculty worked and learned together by addressing and responding to existing behavioral issues of individuals, patterns of behavior in their teams and reflecting on their own response behavior. Mixed (multi-institute) peer-reviewing groups of team supervisors were formed, each consisting of five team supervisors, guided by one of the team coaches. The supervisors of the teams learned how to

apply a more authoritative and restrictive leadership style. Secondly the members of the senior management were positioned to guide the learning experiences of their team supervisors. Each week the meeting time of the management team of the institute, consisting of the director and the team supervisors, was extended in order to reflect on cases of behavioral problems. This was also done in the management meetings at the level of the faculty.

The third phase in the process of intervening consisted of a series of teambuilding sessions around work related issues and behavioral patterns over a period of two years. This intervention was done during the second and third year of the program. The team coach again reflected on the actual behavior in the teams (reflection in action) and gave each supervisor feedback on his leadership behavior and the team on their collective patterns (reflection on action) (Schön, 1983).

Complementary to the team interventions developmental arrangements between the supervisor and each team member were made. The focus in these arrangements was on mutual adjustment of desired social behavior of individuals. The team coach helped the supervisors in analyzing the behavior of the individual team members as well as their role in enacting the collective harmful routines.

The fourth phase of the program consisted of observation of actual authoritative and restrictive leader behavior in the teams and the response of the team members. This was done in the third year of the program. The aim was to investigate whether the patterns of interaction had changed into more effective routines that acted as new 'unwritten rules' and social norms for individual team members. The ten items in the subscale of the MLQ measuring laissez faire leadership were reformulated in such a way as to express the opposite of laissez faire. This version was used by the team coach to observe the behavior of subordinates reacting to the behavior of their supervisor in the teams.

As a part of the three year intervention process every year two two-day learning seminars were held. Participants were all members of the management of the faculty: the team supervisors, the directors of the four institutes and the dean of the faculty. The theme of these seminars was reflecting on the organizational reality and leadership styles, with a focus on the behavioral aspects. These seminars were meant to share and learn from experiences throughout the faculty and across the organizational levels.

Research Method

Research setting

Research in DP showed that indulgent or neglectful parenting styles cause developmental problems in children. There is some research that indicates that laissez faire leadership is not a type of zero-leadership, but a type of destructive leadership behavior (Skogstad et al., 2007). Kampen found evidence *that* after a long period of laissez faire leadership change to a restrictive and authoritative leadership style resulted in an increase in trust in the direct supervisor (Kampen, 2011a). It is unknown *how* the change in interaction occurred.

Characteristics of researching a process approach are a 'how do'-research question and use of various research methods including longitudinal studies.

We need to know first *how* the process of interaction between a laissez faire leader and the subordinates develops. Second, we need to know *how* the process of interaction develops when the variable of leadership behavior is changed. Third, we have to verify *whether* a significant change in leadership style has occurred, for instance by using the same questionnaire as Kampen (2011a).

The routines studied here are patterns of social behavior as a part of organizational practices (Langley et al., 2013).

Process-oriented research is often designed as inductive, it starts with specific observations from which general patterns are identified and theory developed (Bresman, 2013). In this study, theory and empirical evidence are available concerning the harmful effects of laissez faire leadership, but we do not know how the process of interaction unfolds and how the process of changing harmful patterns develops. So we chose the deductive approach using a validated description of laissez faire behavior to study the response of subordinates and the developing patterns of interaction (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Selman, 2004). The description of leader behavior was reversed and used to study the response of subordinates to restrictive and authoritarian leader behavior and the resulting new patterns of interaction. 'If variance theorizing generates *know-that* type of knowledge, process theorizing produces *know-how* knowledge' (Langley et al., 2013, p.4). This type of knowledge is especially beneficial for professionals in organizational change by opening of the black box of change in interaction. This study of process research was conducted over a period of three years during the intervention and learning program using the methods of observation, interviews and document analysis.

The hypothesized change in leadership behavior and trust was measured in year one and at end of year three. The method is described in the *measure section*.

Empirical setting

The research presented here is the result of a three year study of teams of teachers in bachelor programs in one faculty of a university of applied sciences. This institution is a product of a merger of about six former independent schools with in total about 38.000 students. The faculty in this study is a merger of various technical schools in the field of building & environment, information & communication technology, engineering & design, life sciences, chemistry and chemical technology. This faculty consists of four institutes. Each institute is led by a director. An institute consists of three to five teams of about 10 to 15 lecturers. Each team has a formal leader, the team supervisor. Each team is responsible for one bachelor study program for example *Informatics* or *Electronic Engineering*.

Data collection

Process research

The primary sources of data were structured real-time observations of teams and semi structured interviews. The data for describing the patterns of behavior were collected by the four team coaches who participated in the intervention program. The team coaches conducted two roles: as an interventionist and as researcher. The assignment as team coach in the learning program gave the team coaches access to all members of the faculty-organization and legitimated their observations in the organizational reality assuring an in-depth understanding of the phenomena in the faculty (Merriam, 1995).

In the first year data were also collected by three interim team supervisors in one of the institutes. In the second half of the third year an external master student did real-time observations in one of the teams during regular meetings.

The observations in the teams were done using a ten-item sub-scale of laissez faire behavior as sensitizing concept (Hoonard, 1997). The observer noted both confirming and contrasting reflections (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Two rounds of observations were conducted scoring subordinate behavior in response to leader behavior as presented in Table 4.

(Table 4 about here)

The contents of Table 4 as an observation scheme were not known by the supervisor and the team members. The presence of the team coach was motivated referring to the organization development program installed by the faculty director to increase performance of the faculty. Leadership behavior as described in Table 5 was used in a series of teambuilding sessions in year two and repeated in a series of team building sessions in year three. Leadership behavior is now formulated in an opposite way compared to Table 4, i.e. now from an authoritarian/restrictive perspective.

(Table 5 about here)

Member-check (Merriam, 1995) of the observations was conducted by using the last 30 minutes of the team meetings and teambuilding sessions to share the observations of the team coach with the group. The observations were noted briefly during the session and more comprehensively written down after the session but always the same day. The observations included meaningful events during the sessions, behavior of individual members (including non-verbal behavior as 'keeping silent', 'just nodded', 'comes in late', 'leaves early', 'reads his email during the session'), interactions between members of the group and their supervisor, interactions between group members and collective patterns of behavior (including 'interpreting for each other', 'not listening to other members', 'blaming everyone outside the group'). The group members were asked if they recognized the observations. The aim was twofold: to check the observations and to alert the members of their behavior and its consequences. The team coaches were trained observers familiar with the concept of organization emotional neglect and able to recognize the characteristics of neglect and interpret the behavior of both supervisors and subordinates. Additionally the team coaches attended various meetings at faculty, institute and team level such as graduation meetings, open days, meetings with the representative advisory body, lectures, workgroup sessions with students and management meetings. This real-time observation was completed with numerous conversations in corridors, at cantina tables, in computer rooms, during coffee breaks etcetera. The team coaches and the master student had access to secondary resources as internal reports concerning student evaluations, job satisfaction, performance evaluations, email correspondence and data concerning absenteeism on account of ill health. The sample of the teams included all teams conducting bachelor programs, excluding teams with facilitating tasks, management support (HR, accounting, quality assurance), master

programs and research. The bachelor programs amount 80 percent of the staffing of the faculty.

Measure of change in behavioral patterns: questionnaire

At two moments in time (t1 and t2) a questionnaire was used to obtain information on leadership behavior and on trust under employees, supervisors and higher management of the four institutes and the faculty. The questions about leadership behavior originate from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire: LBDQ-form XII (Stogdill, 1963). The LBDQ-form XII comprises two scales: initiating structure (IS) and consideration (C). The descriptions of these two leadership dimensions 'initiating structure' and 'consideration' have proven to be very stable and consistent under various conditions in various types of organizations (Taylor, Crook & Dropkin, 1961; Philipsen, 1965). The reliability (Cronbachs alfa) of the scale 'initiating structure' in the LBDQ-XII is .78, for 'consideration' .90, as calculated by Schriesheim & Kerr (1974). Kampen estimated reliability for 'initiating structure' at .85 and for 'consideration' at .88 (Kampen, 2011a).

The questions about organizational trust and self-efficacy are scales composed and studied for reliability by Kampen and used in a previous study (Kampen, 2011a). Reliability of the scale 'trust' in whole was estimated at .88: reliabilities for subscales 'trust in top', 'trust in direct supervisor', 'trust in colleagues' and 'self-trust (self-efficacy)' were respectively .91, .92, .89 and .71. The first measure was conducted at the start of the intervention program in April/May 2010 (t1). One of the four institutes (Institute 3, I3) refused to participate in this measure at that time. The second measure was held in January 2014 (t2). All four institutes participated this time.

Data Analysis

Process research

The actual observations of interactions were used for both within-case (team) analysis and cross-case (between teams) analysis. Within-case analysis centered on how each team changed its patterns over time. Tables of observed patterns of behavior were conducted to facilitate cross-case comparison to identify similarities and differences across cases.

Comparison with existing research on the behavior of neglected children was added to highlight similarities and differences and sharpen definitions of the emerging patterns. The iteration between theoretical insights and data improved definitions and action-reaction

relationships (Van Aken, 2007; Andriessen, 2007). The insights on the influence of work groups on the (anti-) social behavior of individuals helped to analyze how the behavior in teams is copied by its members.

Peer-reviewing (Merriam, 1995) was conducted by the team coaches who co-reflected monthly on their observations, iteratively sharpening their definitions and understanding. The descriptions of the response of subordinates to the leader behavior were also peer-reviewed in the meetings of the management teams in the domains and in the management team of the faculty.

During the three year program the results of the process research were used as input in the learning seminars visited by all members of the management of the faculty. The descriptions of the behavior in the teams were used as case-material to analyze and to reflect on personal leadership behavior. The descriptions of the patterns of behavior also served to give words and meaning to experiences and emotions of the supervisors and helped the members of the senior management to fulfill their role as mentors of the supervisors. In the learning seminars findings of the field studies were used to reflect on change in leadership behavior and were connected with the theoretical findings discussed in the *theory section* of this study.

Finally the findings of the process research were presented by the dean of the faculty, assisted by the leading team coach, in several collegial settings outside the faculty and outside the institution of higher education. The findings were discussed with five colleague-deans of the faculty, members of the governing board and the executive HR-manager of the institution of higher education using the method of realistic interviews (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). This method is aimed at testing the logic of analyzing and fine tuning of the conceptualization of the findings. The same procedure was used in presenting the findings in three phases of the process research in the peer-review setting of a group of six executive board members of six different non-profit organizations facing the same situation of organization emotional neglect.

Measure of change in behavioral patterns: questionnaire

Data from I3 were not used in the statistical analyses because only data for t2 were available for this institute. Data from 124 (t1) and 122 (t2) respondents respectively were used in the analyses (Table 6).

(Table 6 about here)

The data were analyzed with a Generalized Linear Model (SPSS Statistics 20). Progressive selection on significances ($P < .05$) led to the following model:

$Y = \text{Intercept} + \text{Institute} + \text{Time} + \text{Team nested within Institute} + \text{Time nested within (Team and Institute)} + \text{rest.}$

Significances of the model factors are presented in Table 7.

(Table 7 about here)

Results

In this section the results are presented of two complementary research methods. In the descriptive paragraph the process of emerging and altering of harmful patterns of interaction is reported. In the quantitative paragraph the direction of the change in leadership behavior is verified: has a significant change in leadership behavior in the supposed direction, from *laissez faire* towards authoritative or restrictive, occurred.

The aim of using two different research methods is to conclude whether the findings of *how* and *that* are congruent or not.

Descriptive

In this section the emergence of the patterns of behavior is reported. We expected to be able to change the harmful patterns when the omission of leadership was compensated. So the *laissez faire* leadership behavior was 'reversed' to restrictive behavior. This process of changing the harmful routines is reported in the second and third paragraph of this section. The first step was to observe how the lecturers responded to the *laissez faire* behavior of the team supervisors. We discovered how the process of neglect unfolds as a response to low consideration and low initiating structure. This is presented in Table 8. We illustrate the process of neglect by an example that is indicative of the organizational reality in this faculty. The process of emotional neglect starts when a young new lecturer is appointed: he is strongly motivated to pass on his knowledge to the students and has high expectations about the professionalism of his colleagues and the institute. He seeks for structure and guidance but discovers there is no educational policy and if there is, it is not implemented or followed by his colleagues. The management of the institute does not demand a coherent implementation of policies and leaves great freedom of performance with the teams and the

individual lecturers. His team supervisor is busy managing daily affairs concerning timetables, finding replacements for absent colleagues, carrying out administrative tasks and answering questions of lecturers. Over a period of time he discovers the daily routines in the institute: everyone seems to do what he thinks is right or suits him best. His initial response is to change things for the better. He has a lot of ideas how to do that. He seeks support in newly arrived colleagues and initiates a workgroup for improving the quality of lectures in his course of the program. His initiative is censured by the elder colleagues, who oppose to a change of the program. They tell him that they tried this before and that it did not improve the educational practice. The management of the institute does not interfere. When the workgroup offers a new pedagogical concept for a course in the program, it is discussed in the management team of the institute without a conclusion or formal decision. The lecturer who initiated the new pedagogical concept decides to implement it himself the next semester together with some colleagues who agree with him.

He asks his team supervisor for modification of the timetable of the course. No decision is made by the team supervisor although the motivation of the lecturer is sound and with arguments. The lecturer who is now de-motivated seeks support in the senior management of the institute. The answer to his request is that the modification of the timetable would establish a precedent and cannot be granted for that reason.

The lecturer decides to organize his own timetable in order to implement his own pedagogical concept. To his surprise the administering staff of the timetables is willing to change the timetable and finds a way to do that at the expense of extra teaching hours for this course so no hours have to be taken from others courses.

When a newly appointed colleague asks for advice, the lecturer explains how it works. His tone of voice is resigned and slightly cynical as a result of his recent experiences. During team meetings he now opposes to changes in the timetable of the program suggested by the team supervisor because he wants to protect his own course. Now he has learned how to modify the timetable to his own wishes, he organizes that he is not scheduled on Fridays. When asked by his team supervisor he proclaims that this is his 'working at home'-day. The team supervisor, who has a problem scheduling enough lecturing hours on Friday, does not have the nerve to confront the lecturer.

As a member of his team the 'new' lecturer is at the bottom of the social hierarchy of the team. He is expected to support the views of the elder colleagues during the team meetings and to oppose to the policies of the senior management of the institution. The elder lecturers have their 'rights' to be scheduled by priority in the program of the graduate students in the

third year, while the 'new' ones are scheduled in the first grade where dropout of students is highest and motivation is problematic. The 'new' lecturers learn from their senior colleagues how to survive in the system. They keep silent about anti-social behavior of their senior colleagues such as 'not answering emails from management or students', 'arriving late in meetings', 'purposely working slowly when preparations need to be done', 'spreading harmful rumours about institutional policies', 'complaining about insignificant things at work'. We call this the phase of disclosure of organizational reality. This is the phase in which due to long lasting laissez faire leadership (Table 4) the needs of the employees are neglected, no response is given to their initiatives, no demands are set to their performance, their anti-social behavior is not limited and has no consequences. The employees learn the kind of behavior shown in column two of Table 8. This behavior is functional in this situation of non-leadership and serves as a survival strategy. The employees pass on their learned misbehavior to their colleagues resulting in shared norms of the teams as 'unwritten rules' to survive the lack of leadership as shown in column three of Table 8. The neglecting effect on individuals is undermining of their self-efficacy as shown in column four of Table 8. The final outcome is that quality of work is low, personal goals prevail above organizational goals resulting in low effectivity and poor performance and organizational costs increase substantially as shown in column five of Table 8.

(Table 8 about here)

The intervention method is aimed at changing the leadership behavior. We expected this to compensate the omission of consideration and initiating structure. To restore the deviant behavior initially restrictive and authoritative (Table 5) leader behavior is necessary (see column 1 in Table 9).

In response to the restrictive leader behavior most lecturers stick to their behavior and avoid taking responsibility. They interpret the new leader behavior of their team supervisors as 'order from above'. They see the team supervisors as 'one of them', surviving in the school system. The lecturers say 'yes' to the demands of the team supervisors but do 'no'. Sometimes they behave as asked to please their team supervisor for example arriving in time at meetings for a short period of time. The lecturers perceive their autonomy is limited and defend their space by claiming that professional autonomy is in favor of the students. The lecturer

mentioned above who developed his own pedagogical concept protects his way of lecturing by bonding with colleagues in the team. When his team supervisor shows constructive interest in the pedagogical concept, because that might be applicable in other courses, the lecturer distrusts the intention of the team supervisor. He is vague about the concept knowing his elder colleagues do not want to adopt it. When asked to be scheduled for lectures on Friday he refuses pointing at the amount of administrative work to be done. In fact Friday is his 'father's day' with his children, that he perceives as a compensation for his hard work. The response of the lecturers to the changing demands on task- and social behavior can be illustrated by forms of quiescent and overt resistant behavior as shown during the team sessions. Each team session is scheduled in the agenda of the team members three months prior to the session. Some lecturers check out a week before the session, some colleagues tell the team supervisor by email they have other more pressing work to do, some colleagues do not show up without giving notice.

For each session an agenda is drawn up by the team supervisor and he asks the team members for input. No response is given. A program for the session is composed by the team supervisor assisted by the team coach: in the program the objective of the session is clarified and what is expected from the participants. At the beginning of the team sessions the participants question the objective of this session and changes to the agenda are suggested such as discussing the necessity of standardization of semester programs or the long term strategy of the university, topics beyond influence of the team supervisor. Examples of behavior shown during the team sessions are: questioning the need for a team session 'we are a perfectly self-directed team', blaming the senior management of the institution of higher education for cutting budgets and imposing silly rules, referring to the past as 'much better' than nowadays, complaining about the conditions to work under, complaining about information systems, complaining about a lack of communication. Interaction between participants resembles quiescent collective resistance manifesting in not listening to one another, giving opinions and not asking questions, denying when feedback is given, non-participation and standing aloof, answering emails on smart phone and leaving early because of an 'important meeting' elsewhere and then drive home. Acts of overt resistance to change consists of undermining behavior. A complaint of intimidating behavior is lodged against one of the team supervisors who had marked the performance of two lecturers as unsatisfactory. Anonymous and non-signed letters complaining about 'the bad situation in the faculty' are sent to the dean of the faculty and the governing board of the institution of higher education. Damaging or harmful rumors are spread about the team coaches. Letters and emails

complaining about the lack of professional autonomy are sent to the governing board. Representatives of the business community of the educational programs are briefed by lecturers with selective perceptions about the restructuring of educational programs and asked to intervene.

Turnover in the management is substantial. During the process of changing leader behavior one third of the team supervisors resign from their role as direct supervisor. They can not cope with the harmful patterns of interaction. Some team managers give an indulgent response in order to ease the emotional resistance. Some colleagues return to the style of laissez faire. A member of the senior management is replaced because this director is not committed to the process of change of interaction in the teams and does not understand what had to be done. Turnover under subordinates consists of younger lecturers who cannot resist the pressure of the group dominated by the elder lecturers.

We call this the phase of restoring daily organizational routines. The first response of subordinates in neglected organizations is shown in column two of Table 9. They try to persist in their behavior which was functional in the laissez faire situation. In response to this behavior the leader needs to repeat his vision, provide clear structure, set limits and pay attention to needs and competencies of his employees. During this phase of restoration output may decrease, and turnover increases especially under direct supervisors who cannot cope with the situation of un-reciprocal or resistant behavior.

(Table 9 about here)

We expected the change in leadership style to alter the patterns of harmful interaction, but we discovered that the patterns of survival are strong. The restrictive leader behavior needed consistency over a longer period of time to take effect.

We take a closer look at daily organizational life and afterwards at the process of changing routines in the teams. Routines in daily organizational life, which is in itself complex and demanding in every institution of higher education nowadays, are now lived up to, preserved and respected. The team supervisors now tell individuals they will have to accept the consequences of their actions. Demanding a change in behavior was done before but now the lecturers whom it concerned start to suffer the consequences. The individual is made accountable for his duty, his behavior, his attitude towards tasks, colleagues, students and personnel of facility departments such as the administrators of the timetables. At first full

commitment is not asked, just do the job you are paid for. In turn the team supervisors themselves act as a role model: standing by agreements, show interest in the craftsmanship of lecturers, giving sound feedback on the performance of individuals, stick to organizational routines and appointments made, giving 'no' for an answer if a request cannot be granted. Lecturers who perform poorly for over a longer time are offered coaching and training but at the same time demands are made to perform better in a restricted time. If minimal demands are not met and everything possible to improve performance had been done, resignation is enacted. This is a novelty in this institution where one third of the lecturers was under performance level as scored according to the benchmark of good performing lecturers. Team dynamics changed step by step. In the initial phase the team supervisor worked hard to structure the agenda, lead and conclude discussions, alert the participants to dysfunctional patterns and limit uncivil and anti-social behavior. The team supervisor now invites the new and the modest members of the team to participate in discussions at the same time interrupting and silencing the dominant team members and asking them to listen to their colleagues. The new routines in the teams are maintained and no exception or excuse is accepted. At first this has to be done by the team supervisors themselves, but after a year team members began to address their colleagues.

As the new routines in the teams become part of daily organizational life, team members show more initiative in offering ideas, performing tasks on behalf of the group and show a more reflective attitude towards their role in the team performance.

Turnover percentage in the ranks of team supervisors is high in this phase: over 30 percent left or resigned. Interim team supervisors are appointed in five teams. In the selection of their permanent successors transformational competences, especially in guiding attitude and behavior, are dominant.

We call this phase the phase of accountable interaction..Persistent restrictive leadership will lead to a normal routine of organizational life that is functional and civil as described in column five of Table 9.

We discovered that restoration of stable and civil daily organizational life cannot simply be established by replacing 'bad' leadership by 'good' leadership, meaning introduction of consideration and initiating structure. It takes a reaffirmation of functional routines and replacement of harmful by respectful routines: this cannot be done only by changing the leadership style but also asks for change of attitudes and behaviors of every individual that is

part of the interaction. In the context of the long lasting absence of leadership self-direction is ineffective and defensive routines are maintained because they were functional to survive in the former hostile team environment. All members of a team need to be held accountable for their role in enacting the harmful routines. It is the responsibility of the direct supervisor to demand change from individuals and is in the formal position to let individuals suffer the consequences of their anti-social behavior. After returning to normal leader subordinate interaction other leadership styles come into view like authoritative and participative styles (Table 1).

So we discovered three phases: the phase of neglecting leader behavior, the phase of initial restrictive leadership to restore normal leader subordinate interaction and finally the establishment of reciprocal interaction between leader and subordinate.

The role of the direct supervisor as a change agent as well as the role of the team coach and the members of the senior management is discussed in the last paragraph of this section. The director of the faculty, the Dean, started the intervention program shortly after he came into office. His first observation was that he had to lead an organization with abnormal routines, where people were absorbingly busy getting daily affairs done, where implementation of policies was problematic, where everyone was complaining about the organization and the management, and where the situation before the merger of the institutes into one faculty was romanticized. The concept of organization emotional neglect as he came to know it was to his opinion fully applicable in his situation. He initially is the only senior manager who faces organizational reality. His report of the organizational reality to his colleagues of other faculties and the governing board is not appreciated. He is blamed to air the faculty's and university's dirty linen. However, the dean of the faculty is given the opportunity to intervene and to restore the situation to normality. He starts with adapting the structure of the faculty and eliminates two of the three management layers between him and the teams of lecturers. He implements a clear supervising structure of four institutes, each with a director, each with 3 to 5 teams with a team supervisor, as described earlier in this paper. He is the chair of the management team of institute directors and starts forming and developing his team. He realized that his team has to be in position to restore leadership. The first year of his appointment the dean of the faculty has to survive on his own: it is a period of disappointments, anger, frustration, fatigue, loneliness and of uncertainty about his own vision, sometimes uncertainty about his position, but also trust in the direction he had taken and trust in the ultimate results when given enough time. He assigns external professional

expertise to develop and guide an intervention method for organizational development. Gradually his team grows in performance over a period of time of about 1.5 year. Gradually the directors take their position towards the team supervisors, guiding them to adapt a more restrictive leadership style. In 2013 two two-day sessions are held with all directors and team supervisors. It shows that the team supervisors have adopted their new role. The dean of the faculty points out to the institute directors that they are in a similar situation as he was at the start and that they need to help and support each other.

The team supervisors serve as change agents in the frontline and they experience the quiescent and overt resistance at first hand and full time: they are permanently 'under fire' (Simpson et al.,2002). This is a major emotional strain because most team supervisors are former lecturers, some of them supervise their former direct colleagues. There was hardly any professional distance between the role as leader and as a colleague while some team supervisors combined their part time supervisor role with substantial lecturing hours. Their role in the neglecting phase was in fact acting as assistants to the lectures, organizing daily affairs such as facility management, administrative tasks and sometimes fill in for absent lecturers. With the introduction of the concept of self-directed teams all team supervisors who opted for that role had been appointed to lead the self-directed teams. In organizational reality they continued to fulfill their leadership role as before. In their own perception the lecturers serve as perfect self-directed teams. When the team supervisors are demanded to take position as leaders and to apply an authoritative or even restrictive leadership style this means a significant change of leader behavior for them. The response of the lecturers to the restrictive leadership behavior is the most difficult to handle for the team supervisors. Most of the lecturers continue to behave like before and respond with quiescent and overt resistance. The experience of the lecturers with change so far is that change never lasted long. This meant that the intended normal leader subordinate interaction is not yet established. The old patterns survive and are enforced in the team interaction. The team supervisors have to persist in a leader behavior that was not familiar to most of them. On top of that they have to contain the emotions of the lecturers and cope with distrust and envious attacks on their integrity. Most of the team supervisors have positive leadership capabilities as trouble shooters but lack the negative capabilities to cope with resistance and undermining. Besides in some institutions there is a lack of support by the senior management so these directors had to be relieved after some time.

As change agent the first author, Kampen, acted in four distinct roles. He has an expert role in applying the concept of emotional organization neglect and the method of intervention, he

carries out the role of process consultant in the timing of interventions and intervening in the organizational and team dynamics, the role of leadership coach for members of the senior management and team coach. His three other external colleagues act as team coach and leadership coach for the team supervisors.

In the role as team coach the external change agents serve as role model for the team supervisors and interact directly with the lecturers in the presence of the direct supervisor. In their role as team coach they are dedicated to keep the direct supervisors as well as the senior managers in position. They also serve as 'the capable other' (Vygotsky, 1930, 1978) standing side by side in the team dynamics with the team supervisors and the team members. The team coaches play a significant part in stimulating the negative capability of the managers at all organizational levels and in containing the uncertainties in learning new leader behavior and handling the 'bad behavior' of some team members.

Quantitative results

The parameter estimates of the statistical model are presented in Table 10, with the intercept estimates in the front row. Intercepts were significantly higher than zero (bold underlined). Maximum possible score is five. 'Self-trust' has the highest score (4.150), while 'trust in top' was lowest (3.340), on average. The other numbers shown in the columns 5 to 10 are deviations from the estimate of the last factor in each series (Institute, Time, Team) and therefore this last factor is always zero. Deviations that are significant are shown in bold and are underlined. There were no significant differences between institutes in the parameters 'trust in direct supervisors', 'trust in direct colleagues' and 'self-trust'. With regard to the variables 'consideration', 'structure' and 'trust in top' significant differences were found between the institutes. Institute 4 which had a good performance from the start onwards, scored high in 'consideration' and 'trust in top', while Institute 1, where the intervention program started early 2011, scored high in 'structure'. No significant differences between t1 and t2 in 'consideration', 'initiating structure' and 'trust' were found at the level of the institutes. However, at team level, scores on 'consideration' at t2 were significantly lower compared to t1 for Institute 1 and 2. In Institute 1 team 3 scored significantly higher on 'initiating structure' on t2. In teams where differences between t1 and t2 in 'consideration', 'trust in top' and 'trust in direct supervisor' were significant, the score at t2 was lower than at t1. In Institute 4 there were no significant longitudinal effects on either variables.

(Table 10 about here)

Conclusions and discussion

The concept of organization emotional neglect proved a useful concept to diagnose the failure of the implementation of self-directed teams. The concept provides a strategy and an intervention method for organizational development to catch up from a situation of organizational deprivation. We discovered that the managerial conditions mentioned by Kampen (2011b) are a critical factor in implementing the intervention program, especially the preliminary condition of managers being in position and the competence for initiating behavioral change by the senior management and the direct supervisors. This condition caused the process of intervening was delayed in Institute I2 due to turnover in senior management as well as direct supervisors.

We expected that fulfilling the omission of leadership would lead to a change of the behavior of individuals and the routines in the teams. But initially there is no constructive reciprocity of the team members to the new leader behavior. We found that the attitude of the team members aimed at surviving is strong enough to withstand the demands and the personal attention because they mistrust the members of the management. They had learned to avoid responsibility in their relationship with the supervisors. The behavior of the team members have to be changed proactively in a process of intervening and learning in daily organizational life. Not only intervening at the level of individuals is necessary, also at the level of the teams in order to stop the harmful routines and replace them by mutually respectful interaction. We discovered three phases in the process of changing the harmful routines in the teams over a period of three years: *the phase of disclosure of organizational reality, the phase of restoring daily organizational routines and the phase of accountable interaction*. The findings of the longitudinal study of leadership styles and organizational trust indicate that the OD process of the faculty is now in phase two of changing the routines at the level of the institutes. The results showed that Institute 1 (I1) where the intervention program started first and covered a three year period, had the highest score on 'initiating structure', especially due to Team 3. In Institute 3, where the intervention program started recently due to replacement of all the supervisors and the director, no significant change in the score on 'initiating structure' was found and at the same time showed a lower score on 'consideration' and 'trust in top' on t2 than on t1. The lower score in 'consideration' corresponds with the diminishing job satisfaction of the subordinates as measured in the

biyearly (2009, 2011, 2013) employee monitoring system (Werkbelevingsonderzoek, Schouten & Nelissen). In phase two in this study subordinate job satisfaction is diminishing due to the focus on restoration of daily organizational routines and structuring leadership of behaviorally-based performance of the teams. Research confirms that consideration and job satisfaction of subordinates are strongly and positively related (Judge et al., 2004). This study and the research by Kampen (2011a) suggests that *trust* as leadership outcome in emotionally neglected organizations or teams is not as strongly related to *consideration* as indicated by research findings in healthy organizations.. Further research is necessary on leadership outcomes in emotionally neglected organizations especially the correlations with *trust* on the level of individuals, teams and organization. The process study of the behavioral patterns in the teams suggests that change in employee behavior is not reciprocal to the change of leader behavior, but the result of explicit interventions aimed at acceptance of accountability of their own behavior by employees. This study suggests that the intervention process needs to be continued for a period of more than three years, corresponding to the length of the period of laissez faire leadership, to expect an increase in scores on the dimension 'consideration' and the variable of 'trust in top'. The institute that performed best from the start onwards, Institute 4, also scored highest in 'consideration' and 'trust in top'. This suggests that the state of deprivation between the institutes differed and so is the duration of the effort to achieve 'normal' patterns of behavior in the teams. When we compare the findings of *what*, the transition from harmful to respectful routines in teams, and *how* the process of behavioral change and interaction has taken place we conclude that these research findings are complementary. The findings of the process study reveal that change of the dynamics in emotionally neglected organizations is characterized by a lack of reciprocity in interaction between leader and subordinates: this is reflected in the findings of the longitudinal measure of leadership behavior and the correlation with trust.

The process of changing the harmful routines takes a severe emotional toll on the change agents. The needed competence goes beyond transformational leadership: leaders of the recovery process of emotionally neglected organizations need a large negative capability in order to cope with the resistance accompanying the change of harmful behavioral patterns. Under the circumstances of emotionally neglected organizations direct supervisors need to be selected on restrictive and authoritative leadership competences. When direct supervisors selected on the competence of facilitating self-directed teams are faced with the need to change the behavioral patterns of neglect, the stretch in their personal development proves

too ambitious for >30 percent of the supervisors, as shown in this case. This also applies to the profile of the members of the senior management in neglected organizations, they need negative capability to support and contain the collective resistance in the teams and they need the competence to withstand the tendency to move too fast and the pressure to solve organizational problems in too short a time.

Overall, as is recognized within and outside this institution of higher education, a substantial change took place. The educational programs are in a process of redesign, external private and public companies are involved.. Early 2014 the faculty was honoured by the chairman of the Royal Association MKB-Nederland, the largest association of entrepreneurs in the Netherlands (covering about 120 lines of business and 250 regional and local trades representing about 150.000 entrepreneurs) as the frontrunner in adapting the educational programs to developments in industry (Henken, 2014). Student satisfaction as measured by the Dutch National Student Survey rose substantially in the two institutes where the intervention program started first, in 2011. The scores remained at about the same high level in the institute that performed already good. The scores of the institute where the interventions started recently remained quite low compared to the results of the other institutes.

We finish with some limitations of the study and the scholarly and professional significance of this study. Both authors are reflective practitioners, involved both professionally and scholarly in the described case. The second author is dean of the faculty who is the commissioner of the organization development program for which he has assigned the first author as a professional change agent. They decided to study the process of OD for two reasons: 1. By publishing this study they expose their work to professional and scholarly review and aim to add knowledge to the domain of organizational change; and 2. In reflecting on the process of OD of one faculty of the institution and doing research they enact the strategy of the university, which is aimed at educating reflective practitioners.

We focused on the interaction in the teams, the organizational context extended the scope of this study. A program to improve facility management and business performance was conducted simultaneously. The influence and impact of these interventions was not measured in this study. The leader behavior was manipulated by a learning program and coaching on the job. Research indicates that training programs have a significant effect on leader behavior

(Yukl, 1994). The correlation between the leader behavior and trust may be influenced by an extraneous factor such as how much the respondent likes the leader (Yukl, 1994).

Another limitation is the 'n' of this case study: one faculty in one institution with six faculties overall. The organization of the faculty is in itself big and complex enough to enable an OD study. However for reasons of generalization further research is necessary in other emotionally neglected organizations using the same intervention method.

The concept of organization emotional neglect was helpful in diagnosing the failure of the implementation of self-directed teams and to develop an alternative intervention method for OD in the faculty. The concept of emotionally neglected organizations is a relatively new organization theory that gains growing attention in the professional and academic field in the Netherlands but needs more scholarly research. This paper serves as an international introduction of this concept of organization emotional neglect and the application in the field of OD. We hope to generate professional as well as scholarly attention that encourages international application and research.

References

Aichhorn, A. (1935). *Wayward Youth*, New York: Viking Press, also: Northwestern University Press, Reprint 1984.

Aken, J.E. van (2007). Design science and organization development interventions : aligning business and humanistic values. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(1), pp.p67-88

Andriessen, D. (2007). Designing and testing an OD intervention. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 43 (March): pp. 89-107.

Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. Oxford, England: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B.J. and Gibbons, T.C. (1988). *Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach* . In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276-309). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review* 84(2): pp. 191-215.

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: theory, research and managerial applications*. 3rd edition, New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1995)). *Full Range Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden, Redwood City.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian versus Authoritative Parental Control. *Adolescence* 3(11): pp. 255-272.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental Disciplinary Patterns and Social Competence in Children. *Youth and Society* 9(3): pp. 239-276.

Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 11(1): pp. 56-95.

Bresman, H. (2013). Changing routines: A Process Model of Vicarious Group Learning in Pharmaceutical R&D. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.56, No.1, pp.35-61.

Bupp, N. (1996). ``The change curve'', High Performance Work Organization (HPWO) Partnership Seminar, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Placid Harbor, MD, August, pp. 4-11.

Chan, K. and Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a Theory of Individual Differences and Leadership: Understanding the Motivation to Lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, pp.481-498.

Coch, L. and French, J.R.P. Jr (1948). ``Overcoming resistance to change'', *Human Relations*, Vol. 1.

Dulebohn, J.H., Bommer, W.H., Liden, R.C., Brouer, R.L. and Ferris, G.R.(2012). A meta-analysis of antecedent and consequences of leader–member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38, pp. 1715–1759.

Eisold, K. The rediscovery of the unknown: An inquiry into psychoanalytic praxis. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 2000, 36(1), pp.57–75.

- Elrod, P.D. and Tippett, D.D. (1999). "An empirical study of the relationship between team performance and team maturity", *Engineering Management Journal*, March.
- English, D.J. (1998). The extent and consequences of child maltreatment. *The Future of Children*, 8(1): pp. 31-53.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The Description of Supervisory Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 37(1): pp. 1-6.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1961). Leadership and Supervision. In: Fleishman, E.A. (Ed.). *Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Foti, R. J. and Hauenstein, N. M. A.(2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 92(2), pp.347-355
- Frost, P.J., Mitchell, V.F. and Nord, W.R. (1992). *Organizational Reality: Reports from the firing line*. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- Glaser, D. (2002). Emotional abuse and neglect (psychological maltreatment): a conceptual framework. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 26: pp. 697-714.
- Gruys, M.L. and Sackett, P.R.(2003). Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 30–42.
- Henken, A.M. (2014). Authentieke thema's verbinden onderwijs met praktijk. Interview: *Maintenance*, nr 22, March, pp.36 – 38.
- Hinkin, T. R.and Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of "nonleadership": From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 93(6), pp.1234-1248.
- Hoonard, W.C. (1997). *Working with sensitizing concepts. Analytical Field Research*. Thousand Oaks (CA):Sage.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, P.F. and Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The Validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in Leadership Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(1): pp. 36-51.
- Kampen, J. (2011a). *Interventies in verwaarloosde organisaties: een exploratieve studie naar diagnose en herstel*. Proefschrift.
- Kampen, J. (2011b). *Verwaarloosde organisaties: een nieuw organisatieconcept voor professionals*. Deventer, Kluwer.
- Kampen, J., and Schuiling, G.J. (2005). Verwaarloosde organisaties – (Her)opvoeden: een vergeten taak van de manager. *M&O Tijdschrift voor Management en Organisatie* 5 (september/oktober): pp. 30-50.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In Over Our Heads*, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA.

- Krasikova, D.V., Green, S. & LeBreton, J.M. (2013). Destructive leadership: a theoretical review, integration and future research agenda. *Journal of Management* 39: pp.1308 – 1338.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kübler-Ross, E. (1969), *On Death and Dying*, Touchstone, New York, NY.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C. Tsoukas, H. and Van de Ven, A.H. (2013). Process Studies of Change in Organization and Management: Unveiling Temporality, Activity, and Flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56:pp.1-13
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. and White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 10(2): pp. 271-299.
- Maccoby, E.E. and Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: parent's child interaction. In: P.H. Mussen (ed.). *Handbook of Child Psychology volume IV Socialization, Personality and Social Development*. (p. 1-101). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- McSherry, D. (2007). Understanding and addressing the 'neglect of neglect': why are we making a molehill out of a mountain? *Child Abuse and Neglect* 31: pp. 607-614.
- Merriam, S.B. (1995). Theory to Practice. What can you tell from an N of 1: Issues of Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Research. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning*, Vol.4, pp.51-61.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. 1996. Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework.
- Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. (1997) *Realistic Evaluation*, London: Sage
- Pearson, C. and Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior: how incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it*. Portfolio Penquin, New York.
- Philipsen, J. (1965). Het meten van leiderschap. *Mens en Onderneming* 19: pp. 153-171.
- Popper, M. and Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14: pp. 41-65.
- Redl, F. and Wineman, D. (1951). *Children who hate*. New York, The Free Press.
- Robinson, S.L. and O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. (1998). Monkey See, Monkey Do: The Influence of Work Groups on the Antisocial Behavior of Employees. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 6, pp. 658-672
- Rosenthal, K. (1987). Rituals of undoing in Abused and Neglected Children. *Child and Adolescent Social Work* 4 (3&4): pp. 78-88.
- Salancik, G. J. & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: pp.224-253.
- Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: pp.437-454.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

- Schriesheim, C.A. and Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric Properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. *Psychological Bulletin* 81(11): pp.756-765.
- Selman, F. (2004). Innovatie in managementteams: de invloed van teamsamenstelling, teamklimaat en leiderschapsstijl op innovatie. Masterthese, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Simpson, P.F., French, R. and Harvey, C.E. Leadership and negative capability. *Human Relations* 2002 55: pp.1209-1226.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M.S. and Hetland, H. (2007). The Destructiveness of Laissez Faire Leadership. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 12: pp. 80-92.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1963). *Manual for the LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – Form XII: An experimental revision*. Fisher College of Business, The Ohio State University.
- Taylor, M., Crook, R. and Dropkin, S. (1961). Assessing Emerging Leadership Behavior in Small Discussion Groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 32(1): pp. 12-18.
- Triest, J. (1999). The inner drama of taking a role in an organization. In R. French & R. Vince (Eds), *Group relations, management, and organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 209–23.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1930 , 1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Werkbelevingsonderzoek (2009, 2011 and 2013). Schouten & Nelissen.
- Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations*. Prentice Hall (Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Authors and Contact information

Joost Kampen (contact person)	André Henken
Vrije Universiteit, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, PGO Management consultant	University of Applied Sciences Utrecht
De Boelelaan 1105	Nijenoord 1
1081 HV Amsterdam	PO Box 13102 3507 LC Utrecht

The Netherlands
E: j.kampen@vu.nl
P: +31 641783868

The Netherlands
E: andre.henken@hu.nl
P: +31 622378425

Tables

Table 1. Leadership styles (Fleishman, 1953, 1961, 1973; Kampen, 2011b).

Low initiating structure

High initiating structure

<u>High consideration</u>	Delegating: supervisor allows great responsibility with subordinates within broad terms of reference. Participates when asked.	Authoritative: supervisor demands responsibility within a fixed framework. Offers guidance in fulfilling the task and supervises according to competence and accountability.
<u>Low consideration</u>	Laissez faire: supervisor leaves too much responsibility with subordinates, sets no clear goals and omits supervision.	Authoritarian: supervisor orders what and how tasks should be done, leaves no responsibility with subordinates and exercises full control.

Table 2. Analysis of anti-social behavior of children in response to the adult world (Redl & Wineman, 1951, Kampen, 2011b)

Type of anti-social behavior	Behavior	Clinical diagnose
Incompetence to handle discomfort	Extreme reality denial	Unable to cope with insecurity

	Ridicule, 'diffuse clowning'	Newness panic
	Becoming too demanding	Proving 'them' wrong
	Unable to reflect and learn from experiences	Having learned too well the lessons of traumatic life experiences
Crafty defense mechanisms	Ability to get away with it and not feeling bad about it	Avoiding repression and punishment
	Escape into virtue: ample use of camouflage and strategic retreat	Defense against change
	Denial of accountability	Avoiding to feel guilty
	Mood exploitation	Getting things done

Table 3. Transformational leadership and good parenthood (Popper & Maysel, 2003).

	Transformational leadership	'Good' parenting
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------

Direct supervisor	Gives individual attention: listens, is sensitive and accessible for personal needs and for development and growth	Is sensitive, available, and responsive to the child's needs, understands the child's needs, and adapts his/her responses to those needs
	Sets realistic challenges and inspires faith in one's ability to achieve them	Sets challenging goals for the child according to the child's maturity level; trusts the child to be able to cope in these situations
	Sets goals and standards for performance, but is not critical, judgmental or aggressive	Sets limitations, establishes rules and discipline, but does not criticize, domineer, pressure, or forbid without a reason
Senior management	Provides opportunities for experience and reinforces success	Provides the child with opportunities for new and challenging experiences.
	Wins complete trust and respect, and creates feelings of admiration and pride in being near him/her. Sets personal example	Generates a sense of trust in him/herself. Serves as an example and positive model for the child. Serves as a model for identification and imitation

Table 4: Laissez faire leadership sub-scale MLQ used as observation scheme (Selman, 2004)

	My supervisor,
--	----------------

1	Only tells me what I have to know to do my job
2	Does not seem to care about results
3	Avoids making decisions
4	Stays out of our way
5	If we don't bother him/her, he/she doesn't bother us
6	Does not make a difference to our group's performance
7	Is likely to be absent when needed
8	Is hard to find when a crisis arises
9	Whatever we do is OK with him/her
10	We don't know where he/she stands on issues

Table 5: Restrictive – authoritarian leadership : used as an observation scheme for response and interaction

	My supervisor,
1	Tells me what is important to do my job
2	Is interested in the results of my work
3	Makes prompt and clear decisions
4	Sets clear limits
5	Asks me how I perform, even when I needed no attention
6	Has an obvious contribution to the team performance
7	Is always approachable when needed
8	Takes the lead when a crisis arises
9	Gives dedicated feedback
10	States his vision on important issues

Table 6. Number of respondents.

Institute (I)	Team (T)	Time 1 (t1)	Time 2 (t2)	Total	Used in statistical analysis
1	1	16	9	25	yes
	2	29	9	38	yes
	3	21	16	37	yes
2	1	11	5	16	yes
	2	17	4	21	yes
	3	0	5	5	yes
	4	12	10	22	yes
3	1	0	6	6	no
	2	0	8	8	no
	3	0	1	1	no
	4	0	4	4	no
4	1	5	5	10	yes
	2	6	11	17	yes
	3	7	8	15	yes
	4	0	10	10	yes
	5	0	9	9	yes
Total		124	122	246	

Table 7. Significances (P-values) of the effects of the model factors (Wald Chi Squares)

Factor	Consideration	Structure	Trust in top	Trust in direct supervisor	Trust in direct colleagues	Self-trust
Intercept	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Institute	.000	.178	.000	.000	.133	.056
Time	.000	.034	.001	.000	.550	.672
Team nested within institute	.001	.000	.009	.000	.350	.106
Time nested within team and institute	.018	.000	.000	.009	.591	.885

Table 8. Behavioral patterns emerging from laissez faire leadership and effects on individual self efficacy and organizational performance.

	Leadership behavior	Employee behavior	Behavioral pattern as group attitude	Neglecting effect on individual self efficacy	Ultimate organizational effect
1	Only tells me what I have to know to do my job	Performs his task as told	Just do what you are told to do	My needs are not acknowledged	Decrease in quality of work
2	Does not seem to care about results	Determines results by himself	Results are not important	My performance makes no sense	Personal goals prevail above organization goals: performance decreases
3	Avoids making decisions	Takes a wait-and-see approach	Managers never take decisive action	I cannot rely on managers	Decrease in quality of work
4	Stays out of our way	Takes some slack	Bless your freedom	I can do what I like	Personal goals prevail above organization goals: performance decreases
5	If we don't bother him/her, he/she doesn't bother us	Avoids attracting attention	Do not expect anything from managers	It doesn't matter what I do	Personal goals prevail above organization goals: performance decreases
6	Does not make a difference to our group's performance	Determines his own performance	Take care of yourself	You're just one of the group	Personal goals prevail above organization goals: performance decreases
7	Is likely to be absent when needed	Seeks support with peers	Managers here don't care for their subordinates	I am not important	Decrease in quality of work
8	Is hard to find when a crisis arises	Avoids taking risks	Keep your head down	Take care of yourself	Decrease in quality of work
9	Whatever we do is OK with him/her	Sets his own standards	Manage on your own	I'm expendable as a worker	Personal goals prevail above organization goals: performance decreases
10	We don't know where he/she stands on issues	Takes his own stand without reference	Don't expect answers	I have to find my own way	Decrease in quality of work

Table 9. Restrictive leadership in an emotionally neglected organization aimed at to break through of harmful patterns of interaction

	Behavior leader	Employee behavior in a neglected organization	Leader response behavior	Behavioral pattern	Effect in daily organizational life
1	Explains to me how to do my job	Performs task in his own way	Does not tolerate behavior and demands the job done as expected	You are expected to do the job as demanded	Execution of work is predictable
2	Is interested in the results of my work	Answers evasively about the results of his work	Replies the answer is not satisfactory	It matters to obtain results	Predictability in getting results
3	Makes prompt and clear decisions	Says 'yes' but does 'no'	Upholds decision and tackles employee about dishonesty	Decisions are expected to be executed	Direction in our work is always clear
4	Sets clear limits	Crosses the thin blue line	Demands to go with the crowd and holds employee accountable	Responsibility for your own behavior	Accountability for violating limits
5	Asks me how I perform, even when I needed no attention	Harbours a suspicion about intentions of supervisor	Observes and reflects on competencies of employee	The way work is done is noticed	Appreciation for performance
6	Has an obvious contribution to the team performance	Considers the contribution of supervisor superfluous	Sticks to division of roles	Everybody does what he is supposed to do in his role	Division of roles is clear and accepted
7	Is always approachable when needed	Tries to prove the opposite	Knows when he is needed	Leadership is available and attentive	You can trust that leadership is available when needed
8	Takes the lead when a crisis arises	Is on his qui vive	Provides structure and contains uncertainty	It is clear what everybody's role is in case of emergencies	We can handle emergencies
9	Gives dedicated feedback	Denies and evades	Reinforces the achievements and provides feedback without judgement	Learning is part of the job	Development is expected, stimulated and guided
10	States his vision on important issues	Is not interested	Demands attention	Management has a vision on what is important	Strategic choices are no surprise

Table 10. Parameter estimates as deviations from the last factor in each series: deviations that are significant are bold and underlined.

	Institute	Time	Team	Consideration	Structure	Trust in top	Trust in direct supervisor	Trust in direct colleagues	Self-trust
Intercept				<u>3.750</u>	<u>3.510</u>	<u>3.340</u>	<u>3.680</u>	<u>3.900</u>	<u>4.150</u>
	1			-.126	<u>.625</u>	-.328	.402	.147	.174
	2			<u>-.510</u>	-.300	<u>-.700</u>	-.240	.160	.300
	4			0	0	0	0	0	0
		1		-.181	-.100	-.730	-.181	.089	-.266
		2		0	0	0	0	0	0
	1		1	<u>-.624</u>	<u>-.891</u>	-.345	<u>-.705</u>	-.114	.010
	1		2	<u>-.614</u>	<u>-1.444</u>	<u>-1.012</u>	<u>-1.173</u>	.153	-.164
	1		3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2		1	-.307	.123	-.107	-.540	-.327	-.158
	2		2	.043	<u>.523</u>	.360	-.040	-.193	-.200
	2		3	-.383	.161	-.669	<u>-1.011</u>	-.003	.300
	2		4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4		1	.270	.470	.620	<u>.960</u>	.540	.250
	4		2	.132	-.074	.587	<u>.720</u>	<u>.555</u>	.236
	4		3	.217	-.210	.504	.587	.011	.044
	4		4	-.330	.160	.200	.140	.380	-.025
	4		5	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	<u>.988</u>	.404	<u>1.386</u>	<u>1.041</u>	.128	.308
	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	2	<u>1.140</u>	<u>.921</u>	<u>2.264</u>	<u>1.452</u>	-.382	.482

	Institute	Time	Team	Consideration	Structure	Trust in top	Trust in direct supervisor	Trust in direct colleagues	Self-trust
	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	3	<u>.740</u>	-.314	<u>1.492</u>	.613	.027	.371
	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	1	1	<u>.854</u>	.339	<u>1.797</u>	<u>1.172</u>	.323	.270
	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	1	2	.664	-.131	<u>1.278</u>	.932	.068	.398
	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	1	4	<u>1.255</u>	.648	<u>1.634</u>	<u>1.188</u>	-.096	.274
	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	1	.441	.100	.057	.085	-.148	.282
	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	2	.399	.464	.408	.334	-.260	.268
	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0