Not Just a Boss, But Also a Leader
A Study of Expectations on Managers

Åsa Gidsäter and Lina Sandelin

Not Just a Boss, But Also a Leader
A Study of Expectations on Managers

Åsa Gidsäter and Lina Sandelin

Summary. The purpose of the study was to investigate expectations on managers at Rosemount Tank Radar AB. The study focused on four different perspectives; the board member perspective, the department manager perspective, the group manager perspective and the employee perspective. The aim was to examine these groups' expectations on managers with three research questions. Twenty in-depth interviews were carried out with three board members, six department managers, six group managers and five employees. The result showed that expectations on managers generally did not differ between the perspective holders. Managers were mainly expected to be aligned and to focus on strategic issues, but also to delegate operative work, to inform and communicate and to have enough courage to be a manager.

Followers make positive and negative attributions on leaders. Information about leaders, such as competence, failure or success, influence employees' and followers' perceptions. Employees tend to attribute responsibility to managers when information is lacking or when results are decreasing. On the other hand, managers who cope with change or problems will quickly be viewed as competent (Yukl, 2006). Yukl emphasizes that leadership behavior towards a subordinate consequently depends on whether the subordinate is perceived to be an effective or ineffective worker.

Managers and employees tend to attribute responsibility to one another in both good and bad times. Arvonen and Pettersson (2002) discuss how leadership styles and leadership manners influence organizations and their members. Employee-oriented leadership plays an important role in organizational outcomes, regardless of outcome strength. Being sensitive to employee needs therefore affects well-being within organizations. Van Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill and Stride (2004) explore how leadership behavior affects employee well-being and explain in their article that leader and employee relationship is a two-way process. This process illustrates that subordinates who feel satisfied at work perceive their leaders to be supportive and the leaders in return feel optimistically about these staff members and their performance.

Employees, managers and owners within organizations expect in general a specific behavior, competence or attitude from managers. These expectations vary from individual to individual depending on various factors, such as previous experience, satisfaction or personality. Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) evaluate psychological contracts and describe a contract as a subjective and mental perception between one person and another part. A psychological contract can, for example, be established between an employee and an employer. Mutual obligations and expectations: written, spoken and mental, are therefore being shaped as a result. Rousseau and Tijoriwala state further that these processes take place within the mind of an individual and that each individual has a unique experience and exchange relationship with the employer. Further, psychologi-

cal contracts include expectations that a majority of the employees share; salary, vacation, specific benefits and manager support are some examples of employees' shared expectations on employers.

Vroom and Jago (2007) mean that there is a connection between leadership skills and the effectiveness of an organization. Leadership involves not only influencing others, but also helping an organization to reach its overall goals. Further, the authors imply that leadership is a process of motivating others to achieve significant goals. In order to understand leadership effectiveness, Yukl (2006) states that one must consider three types of factors; (1) characteristics of the leader, (2) characteristics of the follower and (3) characteristics of the situation.

The general purpose of this study was to explore expectations on managers at the incorporated company Rosemount Tank Radar AB. The study has been conducted from four various perspectives; the owner/board perspective, the leadership team perspective, the group manager perspective and the employee perspective.

Previous Research

The following section presents previous studies regarding attributions, psychological contracts and expectations as well as effective leadership. Effective leadership is divided into four sections; the trait approach, the behavior approach, the power-influence approach and the situational approach.

Attributions. Bernstein, Penner, Clarke-Stewart and Roy (2003) define the meaning of a psychological attribution as "…the process of explaining the causes of people's behavior, including one's own…" (p. 655). Employees' perceptions of managers have great importance for the working climate. A majority of positive attributions tend to result in a positive work atmosphere. Managers' competence levels, which includes how well managers perform, affect employees' attributions. The better a manager performs the more optimistic attributions from employees (Yukl, 2006). Immediate action during crises increases, for example, positive attributions from employees. If a manager solves a crisis successfully, he/she will be considered to be particularly competent. Managers who wait to take action will be judged as incompetent, and if the action has no affect, even more negative attributions will be ascribed on managers (Yukl, 2006).

Dasborough (2006) points out that negative interaction that is caused by manager behavior might result in pessimistic feelings and emotions among employees. These feelings stay in focus since employees tend to recall negative incidents more easily than positive incidents. Off-putting interactions challenge employees' job performance and employees' job satisfaction and this, in turn, exposes the managers to more negative attributions (Dasborough, 2006). To avoid such situations, managers should make efforts to show respect and trust, to provide motivation and feedback, but most importantly to communicate effectively. As a result, followers who are emotionally satisfied and feel optimistically about their own situation, both private and in work life, tend to attribute more affirmative feelings and characteristics to their managers according to Van Dierendonck et al. (2004).

Cort, Griffith and White (2007) found that managers who have social and emotional skills are more likely to lead firms to success. These social skills involve a problem solving ability, a great deal of flexibility and the ability to learn from mistakes and past

work. Yukl (2006) emphasizes that managers who try to accomplish organizational changes are exposed to more negative attributions, compared with managers who continue with old strategies. If the change turns out to be successful, employees view the manager as competent and clever. Whether employees attribute negative or positive performance on managers depends on whether external or internal factors affected the outcome. If, for example, the economy in a geographical region is increasing, and all companies within the same field are doing well, a manager or the managing director is less likely to be recognized for the success. Employees tend to attribute the success to external factors in such situations. Also, when a company decreases output, e.g. when new competitors pierce the market, employees avoid holding managers responsible and attribute the decline to external factors (Yukl, 2006).

The Psychological Contract and Expectations. Schein (referred to in Guest, 1998) defines the psychological contract as unwritten and based on mutual expectations between an individual employee and an organization. Herriot (1994) emphasizes that psychological contracts are silent, unspoken and that they generally consist of expectations regarding benefits, wages, promotion, support, loyalty and security. Psychological contracts change continuously since expectations from both individuals and employers adjust over time. Guest (1998) means that psychological contracts are full of nuances; there are at minimum two parties involved, for example one employee and one manager and both have individual and subjective expectations on one another. Both parties might consequently consider their contracts as similar, but the fact is that psychological contracts can be modified in secret by either one of them.

Turnley, Bolino, Lester and Bloodgood (2003) call attention to psychological contract change or breach and how that increases the risk of negative organizational outcomes. Psychological contract satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, affect employee behavior; there is, in fact, a positive correlation between psychological contract satisfaction and employee performance. Turnley and colleagues show that employee performance improves, e.g. increased efficiency and increased work enthusiasm, when psychological contracts appear to be fulfilled and when employees consider managers as having met their expectations. On the other hand, when employees experience a psychological contract breach, a decrease in performance is to be expected, e.g. changes in attitudes, reduced energy at work and less trust for managers and/or the organization.

In their work Porter, Pearce, Tripoli and Lewis (1998) examined explanatory factors regarding employee satisfaction and performance. Similar to Turnley and colleagues result, Porter et al. show that employees who feel unhappy with their employment are more likely to have experienced a psychological contract breach. They were receiving less from the organization than expected. It is therefore noteworthy to clarify employee expectations from the organization and vice versa when clarifying who is responsible for what in the psychological contracts according to Porter et al. (1998).

Bligh and Carsten (2005) find that both employees' and employers' perception of the psychological contract affect work relationships. Managers often face a somewhat difficult situation; as both employers and employees, they have a two-dimensional relationship to the psychological contract. They face expectations and psychological contracts from both top management and employee level. Not only do they have to solve resource questions and strategic work issues with top management, but also support employees with emotional understanding and expertise knowledge. Bligh and Carsten further state that managers have great responsibility when it comes to information flow between top management and employees.

Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) discuss factors that are important in order to interpret and understand the complexity of psychological contracts. First, sensitivity to the content of the psychological contract is vital; for example individual expectations regarding salary, job security and promotion, but also the fact that employee and employer interaction influences contractual outcomes. Secondly, the researchers stress the importance of grasping the main outline of psychological contracts. A contract might be implicit or explicit, spoken or unspoken; hence an understanding of such outlines is vital when interpreting a contract. Last but not least, Rousseau and Tijoriwala emphasize the significance of studying the degree of satisfaction or breaches when learning the meaning of psychological contracts.

Effective Leadership. Strang (2007) defines effective leadership as skills and traits that managers need in order to lead followers efficiently in various situations. Leader effectiveness involves a variety of processes; for example improving productivity and improving employee job fulfillment and performance. Effective managers are not automatically born with all skills and traits; some skills will be developed and learned during practice and some skills can be obtained from other team members. Strang points out that effective managers are trained to behave in suitable manners and that they can see and plan long-term needs. Mintzberg (1989) emphasizes that managers' efficiency is strongly affected by their own insight of the actual job or task. The more insight a manager has, the better he/she will plan and lead the individual, the group or the department. Mintzberg also points out that effective managers encounter questions or need for support quickly and make decisions as fast as possible. Yukl (2006) divides leader effectiveness research into five approaches: *(1) the trait approach, (2) the behavior approach, (3) the power-influence approach, (4) the situational approach and (5) the integrative approach.* The following section examines leader effectiveness research based on Yukl's first four classifications. The fifth approach, which represents a mixture of two or more approaches, will not be presented in this study.

The Trait Approach. Leadership characteristics and skills are correlated with leadership effectiveness. Technical skills facilitate, for example, understanding of products, customers, operational processes and technology development. Interpersonal skills facilitate co-operation, relationships with peers and employees as well as conflict management. Cognitive skills are crucial in order to recognize problems, to analyze situations and to plan strategic work (Yukl, 2006). Mumford, Campion and Morgeson (2007) divide leadership skills into four groups; cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, business skills and strategic skills. They also point out that higher managerial positions require greater skills in some areas. Cognitive skills and interpersonal skills were, for example, vital for all manager positions. Business and strategic skills were in greater demand at higher managerial positions. The conclusion in the authors' article is that business skills and strategic skills have a significant correlation with organizational hierarchy.

Sternberg (2007) points out that an effective manager needs a variety of skills, such as creativity, intellectual skills and practical skills. These skills are necessary to come up with new initiatives, to plan organizational activities and to support the daily work. If a manager lacks creative skills he/she will encounter difficulties when dealing with new and complicated circumstances. A shortage of intellectual skills makes it harder to recognize whether or not decisions and ideas are accurate and trustworthy. Less understanding of practical work complicates introduction of work routines and procedures (Sternberg, 2007).

Mintzberg (1989) explains the importance of managerial skills regarding decision-making. The manager has the overall responsibility for his/her departments' activity; with updated information and ideas of new paths, the manager has to make decisions and choose new strategies. Further, Mintzberg (1973), states that a decision-making process usually starts with a problem and potential resolutions. Possible consequences are evaluated and future goals are discussed in order for the manager to choose the best alternative. Clegg, Kornberger and Rhodes (2007) describe the decision-making process as a relationship between organizational common sense and management. Schlosser and Raghavendra (2004) support an evidence-based practice with research evidence in decision-making processes. Also, an argumentative and a communicative approach with followers facilitates difficulties in decision-making; the manager should reason with various stakeholders, such as employees and/or peers. The manager makes the final decision after input from mainly research evidence and sometimes co-workers. The manager integrates therefore present research evidence together with stakeholders' points of view. According to Schlosser and Raghavendra, a supportive environment will arise combined with increased competence development among managers and stakeholders if evidence-based practice is used during decision-making.

The Behavior Approach. Suutari (1996) defines leadership as "…the behavior of an individual in a managerial position toward members of an organized group…" (p. 391). Vroom and Jago (2007) and Schein (2004) point out that leader behavior affects followers at the same time as leaders can be affected by followers' behavior. Lok, Westwood and Crawford (2005) state that managers who influence employees positively have a diversified behavior approach, for example close interaction, coaching and clear communication. Information and values can as a result be communicated with fewer obstacles. Effective leaders strive to build a positive work atmosphere through team work, co-operation, communication and organizational commitment. Support, coaching and guidance are vital ingredients to create such climates (Yukl, 2006). Anseel and Lievens (2007) show in their article about feedback environment and job satisfaction that employees value when managers are available and when they communicate clear expectations. Other important factors are to acknowledge employee performance, both positive and negative feedback, but also to prioritize employee development and to focus on improving overall communication. Anseel and Lievens state further that manager feedback and employee work fulfillment are positively related.

Arvonen and Pettersson (2002) emphasize the importance of employee-oriented leadership. Organizations that, for example, are characterized by change need managers who specifically create relationships and safety among employees. They conclude that managers need to take the situation into account and structure their behavior into healthy relationships with employees and structure work during organizational changes. Van Dierendonck et al. (2004) state further that managerial behavior based on trust, confidence, appreciation and feedback, significantly improves well-being of employees.

The Power Influence Approach. Mintzberg (1973) explains that if one wants to find out how a leader controls his/her environment, one should study how the leader uses power to achieve desired results from followers. Yukl (2006) states that power means that one party tries to influence another party. French and Raven (referred to in Yukl, 2006) present a classification regarding different types of leadership power: (1) *reward power*; the follower obeys the leader in order to get various rewards, (2) *coercive power*; the follower obeys the leader in order to avoid punishments from the leader, (3): *legitimate power*; the follower obeys the leader since he/she believes that the leader has

the right to demand specific behaviors, (4) *expert power*; the follower obeys the leader since he/she believes that the leader has particular competence and (5) *referent power*; the follower obeys the leader since he/she respects and admires the leader and wants to gain the leaders approval. Yukl (2006) clarifies that French and Raven fail to spot two types of power*; position power* and *personal power*. Position power means that the leader influences followers with the use of his/her position. Hence, power is being used through control of resources, rewards, punishments, information and work environment. Personal power means that the leader controls followers with specific knowledge, friendship and loyalty. Schein (2004) emphasizes that managers often assume that control of information is essential when maintaining power and status.

Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006) point out that the way leaders use power affects the behavior of employees. A key determinant whether managers' leadership behavior is effective or not is how well rewards and punishments are being distributed and managed. Rewards and punishments have significant effects on employee behavior, attitude, perception and well-being. If managers overuse power, or reward and punish in incorrect situations, employees will question the justice and competence of the leader; there is a great risk for a negative work climate in such situations according to Podsakoff and co-writers.

A vital part of the managers' work is to use available information to see overall pictures and to analyze situations correctly. Mintzberg (1989) states that effective managers provide significant information to employees and organize periodic meetings to facilitate co-operation and work effectiveness since issues or questions can be addressed as well as resolved. How much power and influence a leader needs to use depends on the situation. During significant organizational changes, managers need to use more influence if employees are resistant. When employees have the same views and if they are motivated, less influence will be necessary.

The Situational Approach. Blanchard, Zigarmi and Zigarmi (referred to in Farmer, 2005) stress that situational leaders are described as having three major competencies; the ability to diagnose a situation, the ability to be flexible and the ability to co-work with followers in order to reach top performance. Without these competencies a leader can not find the right leadership style. The foundation in situational leadership is that there is no single leadership style which fits in all situations. Vroom and Jago (2007) emphasize that managers behave differently in various situations and deal with certain issues in alternative ways. Managerial behavior is a sign of organizational mechanisms and reflects various situations that managers encounter.

How managers solve conflicts and deal with difficult demands will consequently vary from time to time. Research has shown that effective leaders are aware of their own behavior and competence. They will lead a group or an individual according to the situation and pay attention to group, individual or stakeholder needs. Prioritizing, skill selecting and behavior depend therefore on the actual situation (Strang, 2007). Contextual aspects influence leadership effectiveness as well, for example type of organization, work culture, management level, leader personality, employee personality, etc. Vroom and Jago (2007) point out that most researchers include situational factors in their studies today; they consider alternative influences and how they affect leader traits and behavior. How leadership is affected by situational contexts can, according to the authors, be divided into three variables:

(1) *Organizational effectiveness.* Both external and internal situational factors affect organizational effectiveness: actions of competitors, actions of customers, legisla-

tion, technology, employees, leaders and much more. Organizational effectiveness can be seen as an indicator of effective leadership since successful outcomes are often the result of team-work and awareness of organizational goal setting. In order to achieve desired results, organizations need managers who can lead their employees to accomplish tasks and goals. The authors state that organizational effectiveness is related to how leaders handle various situations and how those actions influences the effectiveness of the organization.

(2) *Situations shape the behavior of leaders.* All individuals, including leaders, are influenced by the environment. The organizational and societal states influence for example leader behavior, but also the personality and the emotional state of the leader.

(3) *Situations influence the consequences of leader behavior.* The writers state that leadership behavior might be effective in one situation, but ineffective in another. It is therefore vital for leaders to meet each situation with appropriate behavior. Instead of focusing on clichés, such as delegation, creating trusting relationships, customer first, etc., the authors propose that management literature should present appropriate behavior in order to meet the demands of various situations.

The Company in Focus

Rosemount Tank Radar AB (from now on referred to as RTR) is a part of the Emerson group. Emerson is a U.S.-based company with approximately 135,000 employees worldwide. The business mission for RTR is to be the global leader in level measurement solutions and systems for tank gauging through innovative products and superior customer support. RTR has about 440 employees, whereof 280 in Sweden and the rest in seven subsidiaries around the world. In Sweden there are three sites; the headquarters in Göteborg as well as offices in Linköping and Jönköping. The company has three business units; Marine Solutions, Tank Gauging and Process Radar. The majority of the employees are engineers. 47% of the staff has a Bachelor, Master or PhD Degree. About 20% of the employees work with product manufacturing. The company has 12 department managers, who also are members of the leadership team, as well as 32 group managers.

Development and training for managers has, historically, not been prioritized at RTR. Managers at all levels have been very operative, leaving little time for further education and leadership topics. Due to a new Managing Director, the focus has shifted and leadership development is now in the spotlight. The leadership team at RTR has put together a strategic pyramid which contains a number of key initiatives. One of these initiatives is "leadership development". The purpose of the leadership development initiative is to create an organization with managers who are explicit in their leadership and who are excellently skilled in developing their organization and staff.

If RTR is going to develop its leaders, it is crucial that both current and future managers are aware of what is expected of them. After a discussion with the Managing Director and the Director of Human Resources, it was decided that a deeper understanding regarding expectations on managers within the organization was needed in order to find the right leadership areas to develop.

Aim

The aim of the study was to illuminate expectations on RTR managers using the following research questions:

1. What expectations did board members, department managers, group managers and employees have on managers on the basis of the following areas of question?
    A. Strategic Skills
    B. Operative Skills
    C. Courage
    D. Energy and Drive
    E. Organizational Positioning Skills
    F. Personal and Interpersonal Skills
    G. Specific Competence
    H. Department Manager versus Group Manager
    I. Decision-Making
2. Were there any main areas these perspective holders focused on regarding expectations on managers?
3. Did the expectations on managers between these perspective holders differ?

Method

Together with the Director of Human Resources at RTR, a general outline of the study was determined. It was decided that a qualitative study should be conducted. The purpose of a qualitative method, twenty individual, structured, in-depth interviews, was to gain a greater understanding of the four perspective holders' expectations on managers.

Respondents and Selection

Twenty people were engaged in the study. The respondents were chosen in consultation with the Director of Human Resources. Three respondents from the board were chosen as well as six department managers, six group managers and five employees. The number of board members was confined to three as they were the only ones with enough insight into the RTR organization. The first criterion for the two levels of managers was that they should represent the main departments at RTR. The second parameter for selection was that they were managers that were perceived as individuals with opinions and thoughts about leadership. The selected employees were all union representatives, which seemed appropriate since they were already chosen by their members to represent them in other forums.

All twenty respondents agreed to participate in the interviews. Information about age, profession or tasks will not be revealed in the study since confidentiality has been promised. The respondents were mostly men since 72% of the employees are male at the company. Sixteen interviews were conducted with men and four interviews were conducted with women. The respondents had worked at RTR from three months up to 26

years. 80% of the respondents had been employed for at least five years and the average years of employment were 12. The educational background among the respondents was divided as follows: 50% from high school and 50% from university level with a minimum of three years of studies. The average age among the respondents was 41 (*sd* = 6,7).

Procedure

Structured in-depth interviews were conducted with all twenty respondents. A combination of two different interview questions was used as Kvale (1997) describes. Structured questions were used to manage the course of the interview combined with follow-up questions. Trost (1997) explains structured questions as questions where the respondent has no other possibility than to answer the question, hence the interviewer leads the respondent into a specific area of concern. In accordance with Backman (1998) the interview questions were formed to get the best picture of the individuals' subjective reality and surrounding world.

All respondents were invited to the interview through an appointment sent by e-mail. Attached to the message was an introduction letter describing the purpose of the study and an interview guide, to encourage the respondents to start to think about the areas in question.

Eighteen of the interviews were executed face-to-face. Two of the interviews were carried out by phone, since two of the respondents are based in Minnesota, USA. A tape recorder was used to record all interviews. The interviews were conducted between April 12 and June 4, 2007. Every interview took about one hour and was carried out by one of the authors. Each interview was opened by a short introduction of the study, the design of the interview and an assurance of confidentiality. Before the start of the interview all respondents approved the use of a tape recorder. The respondents were asked to imagine a good manager when answering the questions.

Instrument

RTR works with the Lominger Tools (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006) for their leadership development. Lombardo and Eichinger describe the Lominger Tools as research-based, experience-tested tools which are used for everything from organizational development and job profiling to selection, training, individual and team development. The base of all the tools is six factors which have been shown to relate to success at work: strategic skills, operating skills, courage, energy and drive, organizational positioning skills and personal and interpersonal skills.

The guide for the in-depth interviews was compiled in dialogue with the Director of Human Resources and the Managing Director. Most of the questions were based on the Lominger Tools and formed the base of six of our areas. Three areas were selected on request of the Managing Director and the Director of Human Resources; specific competence, department manager versus group manager and decision-making.

The interviews covered in total 11 areas; background information, strategic skills, operating skills, courage, energy and drive, organizational positioning skills, personal and interpersonal skills, specific competence, department manager versus group manager,

decision-making and miscellaneous issues. The interviews contained in total 19 questions whereof seven focused on background information. All respondents were asked exact by the same questions.

Background Information. Questions were asked regarding name, age, number of years as an employee at RTR, if manager - how many years as a manager, profession/education, place of work/department, number of employees at the department and number of managers at the department.

Strategic Skills. This area concerned understanding of the business, both present and long-term work. The question asked was: "What strategic skills do you expect a manager to possess?"

Operating Skills. The area concerned getting daily work done as well as work methods and processes. The question asked was: "What kind of operating skills do you expect a manager to possess?"

Courage. The area concerned conflict management and tough decision-making. The question asked was: "How do you expect a manager to handle conflicts?"

Energy and Drive. The area concerned focusing on final results and efficiency. The question asked was: "How do you expect a manager to lead employees in order to work efficiently against planned goals?"

Organizational Positioning Skills. The area concerned organizational insights, for example to communicate and understand company policies and current organizational questions. The question asked was: "What knowledge do you expect a manager to have about the organization?"

Personal and Interpersonal Skills. This area covered three different areas: Personality and Attitude, Relationships with Subordinates/Superiors and Ethical Values. The questions asked were: "What kind of a managerial personality do you expect?", "How do you expect a manager to create good relationships with subordinates and superiors?" and "What ethical values do you expect a manager to represent?"

Specific Competence. The area concerned knowledge that a manager needs to possess in order to master the managerial position, for example technical competence, but also personnel-related competence such as labor legislation. The question asked was: *"*What specific knowledge do you expect from a manager?"

Department Manager versus Group Manager. The question asked was: *"*Considering all previous questions, are your expectations on a department manager different from a group manager? If yes, why?"

Decision-Making. The question asked was: "How do you expect a manager to handle a decision-making process?"

Miscellaneous Issues. The final question asked was: "Do you have any other thoughts and opinions regarding expectations on managers? If yes, what?"

Data Analysis

The taped interviews were transcribed word by word. All transcripts were then uploaded into the qualitative computer program QSR Nvivo for further adaptation. The interpretation in QSR Nvivo started with structuring of the material into categories. The transcripts were processed one by one, following the idiographic approach to analysis (Smith, 2003). Everything inessential was removed and the searched themes became clearer.

The actual data process work was conducted mainly by sentence and meaning concentration as Kvale (1997) describes, meaning that all interviews were coded into beforehand decided categories in QSR Nvivo. Most of the categories were developed in advance, based on our areas of question. One category, background information, was documented separately and was used as a helping tool in interview analysis[1] [2].

After the data process work in QSR Nvivo, node coding reports were printed for each research category. The reports were analyzed one by one by high-lighting and coding parts of the text which were relevant for the study.

Results

The following section presents the result from the in-depth interviews. The respondents' answers are divided into following areas of question; strategic skills, operating skills, courage, energy and drive, organizational positioning skills, personal and interpersonal skills, specific competence, department manager versus group manager, decision-making and miscellaneous issues. The final section presents the new category that emerged during the data analysis; parent company views.

Each area of question presents the general view from all four perspective holders: the board members, the department managers, the group managers and the employees, followed by possible group opinions and possible deviating opinions. Group belonging is presented when specific group opinions or deviating opinions occur.

Interview Answers

Strategic Skills. Many respondents thought that managers should have a long-term plan for their business; look forward and see possibilities. Furthermore, managers should point out the direction and plan for the business. Most thought that managers need to have an overall picture of the business.

Many respondents addressed the significance of having a business understanding and knowing "your surrounding world", especially regarding customers and competitors. Some emphasized that an important strategic skill is to effectively communicate goals to employees. Some also expected managers to develop employees.

More than half of the department managers mentioned that it is crucial for managers to be aligned and to see the company as an entity and a system. Less than half of the department managers said that an important competence is to be patient and not afraid of re-evaluating ideas and strategies that do not work. More than half of the group managers mentioned the importance of staffing correctly and to having tools in place for employees to do their job. A few of the employees expected managers to be able to

---

[1] During the interview analysis, the following categorizations were used when presenting the general view from all four perspective holders: a minority (1-5 answers), some (6-10 answers), many (11-15 answers) and most (16-20 answers).

[2] During the interview analysis, the following categorizations were used when presenting group views or deviating views: the board members; few (1 answer) and several (2-3 answers), department managers; less than half (1-3 answers) and more than half (4-6 answers), group managers; less than half (1-3 answers) and more than half (4-6 answers) and employees; few (1-3 answers) and several (4-5 answers).

break down overall strategic goals into understandable goals for employees. The manager should involve and motivate employees in reaching the goals.

A deviating view was that less than half of the department managers thought that managers need a good grip on details as well, in contrast to the "overall perspective" which most respondents agreed on. This may be illustrated by following interview quotation:

> "A manager partly needs to look forward, but also to know the operation in detail. Because the devil is in the details."

Operating Skills. Most respondents mentioned that managers should avoid participating too much in operative issues; they should focus more on strategic and long-term issues. Many of the respondents said that the company has had historically very operative managers.

Most respondents were very clear on the fact that managers should delegate daily work and trust employees to solve various tasks.

> "For me it is the cell phone test or the blackberry test /…/. You know you should be able to detach enough from the day to day business to take part in the long-term stuff. And if you can't do that, that is probably because the rest of your organization isn't set up properly to get stuff done."

Some respondents mentioned that it is very important that managers are knowledgeable about their operation; they should understand time requirements and tools that are needed. Some expressed further that managers are responsible for developing and maintaining work processes. Many thought that important operative skills include utilizing employees, planning resources and working with staffing and time management.

Several of the board members said that managers need to be good communicators and maintain good connections with employees. Several of the board members also mentioned that is important to be action-oriented and very hard working. If necessary, managers should work more than 37 hours a week.

More than half of the department managers indicated that managers easily can become a "break block" if they get too involved in other people's work. Managers have too much on their plate to be able to focus on details. Several of the employees felt that managers should help with prioritizing and coaching.

Less than half of the group managers stated the deviating opinion that managers should not forget to be operative since it is easy to get caught up in their own managerial work. Managers should therefore remind themselves to be available for employees.

Courage. This question focused on solving conflicts. Many respondents expected that managers not should be afraid of conflicts. It was viewed as a clear manager responsibility to solve conflicts. Some added that a conflict needs to be addressed immediately. Some thought that when handling a conflict within the work group, managers should remain diplomatic and neutral. A minority said that managers need to be straightforward when handling conflicts. A minority mentioned that managers should not be afraid to ask for help from the HR department if a conflict gets too infected.

Managers need to be able to read a situation and adjust their conflict management approach depending on the issue, said a minority. Many thought that managers should be able to stand up for what they think is right, even if they are standing alone.

> *"It is not a popularity contest. Sure, it is great if you can always agree with all of your employees. But that is not a given situation. They often say that being a manager is a lonely job. And it is."*

Several of the board members clarified further the issue of managerial courage. They indicated that managers should not hide behind the management or the HR department when facing conflicts or tough decisions.

Energy and Drive. Most respondents expected managers to make sure that their employees know and understand what they are supposed to do. To facilitate employees work, managers should provide support, feedback, training and resources. The respondents expected managers to discuss goals with employees; this included why certain goals exist and how goals should be reached.

A minority stressed the process of breaking down company goals to a level that people understand. By using the company's strategic pyramid as a support tool, managers were expected to present goals that fit each individual, the group and the department.

> *"The idea of the pyramid is quite smart. Most of the things you communicate regarding changes can be connected to the pyramid and you can explain the goals we want to reach by using different projects."*

Some stressed that a follow-up system helps employees to work efficiently against planned goals. They mentioned the company's present follow-up system, the Goal Setting Process, as a manager tool. Some mentioned that managers need to release some of their control to facilitate efficient work. Managers were expected to trust employees and should provide more responsibility to them.

Organizational Positioning Skills. Most respondents expected managers to understand their organization; to know and understand its policies, culture, routines and who is responsible for what. If managers do not know or understand a company policy, they should search for the information or ask someone who might know.

A minority stressed that managers need to understand the organization in order to benefit their own department and to drive the department's wishes within the company. Another minority view was that managers were expected to see how their own department fits within the organizational system and how that, in turn, affects the company. A minority mentioned that managers need to understand other organizations/departments, both inside and outside the company. They need to interact with these organizations and get support and maintain relationships. A minority mentioned that managers often lack knowledge about organizational theory; the respondents meant that theoretical skills are vital when organizing the own department. Some respondents emphasized that managers must communicate company issues, policies and changes.

> *"It is important to communicate policies. Sometimes we have a company day or a meeting about, for example, values and goals. After that you hear nothing, you only see a sign of a strategic pyramid in a meeting room. You do not know how the work continues, sometimes information is lacking."*

A minority expected managers to stand up for the company and to support company policies. The general opinion was that managers should be aware of policies since they represent the company. A minority said that it is important to remember that a policy or

a process always can be changed. Less than half of the group managers stressed that managers are expected to make sure that policies are being followed by employees.

A deviating view was that less than half of the group managers stated that managers need different organizational insight depending on managerial position. The Managing Director was, for example, expected to have full organizational insight, while department managers were expected to focus more on their own department.

Another deviating opinion, stated by less than half of the group managers, was that employees also have a responsibility to search for information in order to understand organizational questions, and that it is not only managers' responsibility.

Personal and Interpersonal Skills; Personality and Attitude. Most respondents expressed that there are some basic characteristics that managers are expected to possess'; being straight-forward, honest, communicative and able to show empathy. The respondents stressed that managers should have the courage to make decisions and to communicate clearly. According to some, managers were expected to take time to listen and to have an open door. Some emphasized the importance of having managers who communicate well. An open personality was, according to these respondents, very significant.

Several of the board members stressed positive leadership personalities among managers. These respondents expected managers to lead change in a positive manner and to find the right solutions.

Personal and Interpersonal Skills; Relationships with Subordinates/Superiors. Most respondents did not differentiate between how to create relationships with subordinates or superiors. Managers should use clear and open communication; they should be there for others, provide help and support, but also be honest and behave correctly.

A minority expected managers to fulfill their responsibility, especially to make sure that specific managerial tasks are being completed, something following quotation shows:

> *"And in a good way complete managerial tasks, like salary meetings and goal setting meetings. /.../ I believe that is important for the relationship with the employee. How to create a relationship upwards is harder, but to show commitment and knowledge, to take the managerial role seriously, for example by handling managerial tasks, that /.../ creates good relationships upwards as well."*

A minority called attention to the importance of having managers who are aligned with the company. The expectation was that managers should stand up for leadership team decisions and that they inform and bring solutions which are in line with company goals. A minority also stressed the importance of feedback. They wanted managers to be engaged in employees' work by providing fast feedback or follow-up meetings. A few of the employees expected particularly group managers to have a tougher approach upwards in order to create trusting relationships downwards. Group managers should fight for resources and make sure that their group functions well.

Personal and Interpersonal Skills; Ethical Values. Most respondents answered that it is very important for managers to follow, communicate and act according to the company's Ethics Handbook as well as other rules and policies. Some emphasized that it is crucial for managers to be good role models for employees in terms of ethics. A minority thought that managers are responsible for making sure that their employees understand what is expected of them, as following quotation illustrates:

> *"If the company has guidelines and policies, a manager needs to show the employees that he represents them and will always comply with them. As soon as a manager diverges from them, the employees will copy his behavior. It is really that simple."*

Some respondents emphasized that managers are not only responsible for following company rules, but also rules, laws and common values of the society in general. A minority pointed out that it is always good that managers have common sense when it comes to ethical issues.

Many stressed the importance of having managers who are open to diversity and equality issues when it comes to recruiting and interacting with current personnel. Some mentioned that managers should treat employees with respect and honesty, especially when giving feedback. A minority said that managers should not be afraid to stand up for what is right.

Specific Competence. Most respondents answered that managers need a basic technical skill in order to understand the work their employees are doing and the tools needed to get the work done. Most agreed that managers do not need to be an expert in the technical area.

The areas of legislation, recruitment and rehabilitation were mentioned by many. They agreed that managers only need to have a basic knowledge in these areas and it was more important they know who to contact for support. A minority expected managers to have a feeling for hiring people since staffing was viewed as an important specific competence. Another area that was mentioned by a minority was that managers are responsible for creating a good working environment where employees are motivated. Less than half of the department managers said that a financial understanding is important.

Department Manager versus Group Manager. Many respondents thought that there was a difference between department managers and group managers. Department managers should focus on strategic issues and group managers should focus on operative issues. A minority stated that department managers should live in the future and that group managers should live in the present.

Some had, in general, higher expectations on department managers than on group managers. Department managers should delegate more than group managers. Some thought that department managers should have a better overall view of the company. A minority expected department managers to take on more responsibility for communicating and informing than group managers. A minority mentioned that department managers have more power and influence and should therefore bear higher expectations and tougher decisions. The group managers were expected to take a larger responsibility in maintaining the connection with employees, according to a minority. Several of the board members had many specific expectations on department managers: to be aligned, to lead by example, to have a company view, to have managerial courage, to develop employees and to manage staffing.

Less than half of the department managers had the deviating view that group managers are more important and therefore should bear higher expectations than department managers. Group managers were perceived as the ones who actually carry out work and implement strategies.

Some respondents answered the question with a no; that there is no major difference between expectations on department managers versus expectations on group managers. The two different managers may have different perspectives and different focus but the basic expectations on them are the same.

> *"No, basically they don't* [differ]. *Maybe the responsibility of and the demands on a department manager are tougher. But if you look at the basic parts in how a manager should be and act, I don't think so. All group managers should really be a potential replacement for the department manager."*

Decision-Making. Many respondents emphasized that managers need to have the courage to make decisions. Many focused on the importance of having managers who stand up for their beliefs and who have the courage to make decisions despite disapproval.

Most expected managers to collect information and facts before making a decision. A minority view was that if more people were involved in a decision-making process, the better the result of the decision would be. Some focused on clear communication during a decision-making process. Managers should describe why a decision is taken and how that will affect the individual, the group or the department. Many emphasized that consensus can not be reached all the time; they expected managers to be able to make decisions despite disagreements. Democracy and discussion were central, but more important were that managers step in and make the right decision, despite majority or minority opinions. A minority expected managers to make a decision in alignment with company policies and visions.

A minority pointed out that managers are expected to handle a decision-making process according to the situation.

A deviating opinion was that a minority expected managers to avoid asking for input in some cases since the decision-making process might take too long.

Miscellaneous Issues. A minority of the respondents expected managers to have time to be a manager since that was seen as a problem today. When not being too operative, managers are busy with meetings. The company should furthermore provide a balance between responsibilities and authorizations.

A minority of the respondents stressed that there should be other ways to get a wage increase or advance in the company. To promote an individual to a managerial position should not be the only reward system.

A few of the board members said that communication is not effective in the organization; a problem that the department managers are responsible for. Department managers need to set up the stage for group managers in terms of wide and open communication.

Less than half of the department managers stressed the importance of alignment. Managers should avoid revealing their personal view if that differs from leadership team decisions. A few of the employees took the opportunity to encourage managers to "dare to be a manager" and not to act as a friend or a colleague but instead as a person who are in charge.

Parent Company Views. The fact that RTR has been owned by an American company, Emerson, for the past six years presented new expectations on managers. Managers were expected to have a network within Emerson; they should represent Emerson and strive to integrate the Emerson culture into their own organization, according to a minority.

> *"For a manager in this company, it is necessary to have a network within Emerson in order for the work within the department to run smoothly. And*

also help with putting across the culture from the Emerson organization, so it will not come as a shock to the own organization."

Less than half of the department managers mentioned that managers were expected to stand up for any of the consequences that might arise from being a part of Emerson, and facilitate the work of making the company function within the bigger corporate sphere.

Discussion

The section begins with a discussion of the results, followed by a final discussion. Relevant results of the study will be interpreted and areas of improvement will be enlightened. In addition to that, the design of the study will be scrutinized, followed by suggestions for future research.

Discussion of the Result

Strategic Skills. Many respondents expected managers to have a long-term plan and an overall picture of the business, this expectation is in accordance with Mintzberg (1989) who states that it is a managerial responsibility to lead and plan an organization. More than half of the department managers said that a general business understanding was important. The respondents' expectations show, in accordance with Yukl (2006), that cognitive skills are important in order to recognize problems, to analyze situations and to plan strategic work. It is interesting to note that three perspective holders emphasized different strategic skills: more than half of the group managers focused on employee questions, such as to staff correctly and provide resources, a few of the employees' emphasized communication, especially when breaking down strategic goals, and less than half of the department managers emphasized involvement in details. How come these perspective holders focus on various skills? A reason for the different focus might be that group managers prioritize staffing in their strategic planning and that employees actually feel that communication is lacking. The department managers' statement regarding involvement in details falls into contrast with the overall perspective and general business knowledge that most respondents agreed on. Can it be that some of the department managers prioritize operative and detailed work over strategic work? The respondents' expectations on managers are in accordance with Mumford et al. (2007) who state that strategic skills seem to be demanded to a greater degree at higher manager positions.

Operating Skills. Managers were *not* expected to participate too much in operative work. It seems like both group managers and department managers at RTR need to let go of some control and give more trust to employees. More than half of the department managers were aware of this fact, but it seems like the group managers believe that they were not expected to improve trust and delegation to the same degree as the department managers. As Van Dierendonck et al. (2004) states, an increased delegation and trust might improve employees' well-being at RTR.

Many respondents thought that it was important that managers have operative skills as well, such as planning resources, staffing and time management. A balance between strategic work and operative work seems to be most expected. But, why do more than half of the department managers know that they should avoid being too operative while

having department managers who actually are involved in operative work? The reason could be need of control or lack of trust, but also that many managers at RTR might have a deep technical interest. Some managers might prefer to work with operative issues and details instead of handling managerial tasks. Another reason could be the use of expert power which according to French and Raven (referred to in Yukl, 2006) occurs when followers obey managers due to their expert power. In this case, RTR managers might use specific technical and operative competence as a source of power.

Several of the board members said that action orientation and hard work are important operative skills. In order to be successful, overtime is often expected. A possible explanation to that statement is that American work culture differs somewhat from the Swedish work culture. Even though tough work periods require hard work, Swedish board members would most likely have a softer approach towards the individual. One reason for that difference might be that Sweden has a stronger system of, for example, labor legislation. It is important that managers meet employees' expectations regarding work/life balance. According to Greenblatt (2002) it is a strategic responsibility for organizations to create the right work/life balance for employees' and as a result employee efficiency and satisfaction will increase.

Courage. Many respondents particularly stressed courage when solving conflicts and some expected managers to solve conflicts as soon as possible. It was interesting to note that some respondents expected managers to handle conflicts with a diplomatic and neutral approach. If managers do not take conflicts seriously, frustration among employees might occur and the manager in question is more likely to be seen as incompetent. Employees' perception about managers affects the working environment. How managers perform, affects employees' attributions. Quick action during crises and decision-making processes increases positive attributions from employees according to Mintzberg (1989) and Yukl (2006).

A minority of the respondents mentioned that managers are free to ask for help, for example from the HR department. RTR managers are encouraged to stand alone, and while help always can be provided it is most important that managers are comfortable with their responsibility and to stand up for their opinion, a fact which both Mintzberg (1989) and Yukl (2006) emphasize as well.

Energy and Drive. Most respondents expected managers to provide coaching and support in order to ensure that employees know what they are supposed to do. Breaking down company goals to an individual level was important, as stated by a minority of the respondents. Managers should consequently provide feedback and support in order to create a positive work atmosphere and to facilitate employees' work (Yukl, 2006).

Some respondents stressed the importance of having a follow-up system. Managers who provide help and coaching and who use clear communication improve employees' well-being (Lok et al., 2005). Managers at RTR will most likely achieve a win-win situation if they provide more feedback and support; employees would probably enjoy work more and the working climate would improve.

Organizational Positioning Skills. Most respondents expected managers to understand company policies and routines and if any questions or difficulties were encountered; managers were expected to search for information and to find the right answer. Communication and information are fundamental for organizational well-being, according to Lok et al. (2005). Organizations must therefore have an open communication system which is honest and invites everyone to participate; in this, managers have a big responsibility to understand and to inform about company issues.

A minority view was that managers should stand up for company policies, be aligned and represent the company. This result indicates that some managers do not stand up for company policies. Some managers might communicate and understand policies, but do not necessarily support them all the way. As Schein (2004) stresses, managers must understand that their behavior and values affect employees. Employees often identify themselves with managers; therefore the suggestion for RTR managers is to set a good example.

Further, managers might have a problem seeing how their own department or group affects the company. A minority view was that managers were expected to think about the company as a system, meaning how their work influences the company. It seems like some managers focus too much on their departments' activity. A suggestion is to open up for more cooperation between various functions combined with a systematic thinking; in turn causal effects within the company will be easier to target and to understand, a statement which is in accordance with Schein (2004).

A deviating opinion, stated by a less than half of the group managers, was that managers need different organizational insight depending on managerial position. The Managing Director was expected to have full organizational knowledge, while department managers should focus on their area. The group managers' opinion is similar to Mumford et al. (2007) who state that higher managerial positions require greater skills. Furnham (2002) emphasizes, on the other hand, that group managers have an essential role since they are both operative and implement changes. The group managers' view is not necessarily most appropriate for the company in focus. Organizational changes are present due to the parent company, and, in accordance with Reynold's (2006), one must emphasize that all managers should be aware of what it going on within the company, especially during times of change. It is therefore better to provide as much information as possible to employees. However, employees have a responsibility to search for information as well. This interesting deviating opinion was stated by less than half of the group managers and not at all mentioned by any employee. Do employees lean too much on their managers or do they not have the interest or energy to search for information?

Personality and Interpersonal Skills; Personality and Attitude. Most respondents expected some basic characteristics from managers; in general they mentioned honesty and the ability to show empathy. Again, the respondents emphasized clear communication and that managers should have the ability and courage to make decisions, an opinion which is in accordance with Clegg et al. (2007) and Schlosser et al. (2004). It is remarkable that the respondents again mentioned that managers need courage to make decisions. Can it be that some RTR managers avoid tough decision-making?

Several of the board members emphasized that managers need to lead employees with an optimistic attitude. Most important was that managers lead change in a positive manner. These statements are in accordance with Van Dierendonck et al. (2004) who mean that managers must create trust and give motivation and feedback.

Personal and Interpersonal Skills; Relationships with Subordinates/Superiors. Most respondents did not differentiate between how to create well established relationships with subordinates or superiors, the same behaviors were expected regarding relationships downwards and upwards. Most mentioned behaviors were clear and open communication, coaching and support, but also honesty. Managers were not expected to communicate differently with subordinates and superiors. Managers who are socially and emotionally skilled are more likely to lead companies into success and managers'

behaviors affects followers, a statement that one can not stress enough for the managers at RTR and a statement which also is supported by Vroom and Jago (2007) and Cort et al. (2007).

The question is whether all managers at RTR actually stand up for company decisions and company goals. Again, a minority of the respondents expected managers to be aligned with company goals and principles. Negative interaction might occur if managers do not represent the company all the way, according to Dasborough (2006).

A minority of the respondents emphasized the importance of having managers who complete managerial tasks, for example salary meetings and goal setting meetings. Taking the manager work seriously is very important and improves relationships both upwards and downwards. Herriot (1994) and Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) stress that employees' psychological contract generally consists of expectations regarding, for example, wages, support and loyalty. In agreement with Porter et al. (1998) it is important to emphasize that managers who ignore meetings that are meaningful to the employee might result in decreased loyalty towards the manager as well as a decreased feeling of security.

Mentioned many times during the study were that managers should stand up for their employees. A minority of the respondents stated that a general interest in and an ability to fight for employees creates good relationships with both employees and managers. Employee performance and enthusiasm increases when employees' expectations are fulfilled and when managers are similar to themselves, a declaration which is in accordance with Turnely et al. (2003) and Werth, Markel and Förster (2006).

Personal and Interpersonal Skills; Ethical Values. It was very important to most respondents that managers follow rules, norms and regulations at the company. Managers were expected to be role models both regarding company rules and general societal rules. Managers, and employees, develop ethical skills in social activities with other people. As noted by Brown and Treviño (2006) it is important to note that outcomes can increase if employees feel that they can identify with the manager. Ethical values are deeply grounded in our society; how you should treat other people are well defined. Many respondents expected managers to be open-minded, honest and treat everybody equally, a statement which is the foundation in healthy leadership and which all managers should aim to reach.

Specific Competence. The respondents focused on the expectation that managers must be technically skilled. Most respondents mentioned that managers only need a fundamental technical skill; it was not necessary to be an expert. As Sternberg (2006) states an effective manager needs various skills and competencies, such as creativity, intellectual skills and practical skills. Without those skills it is hard to plan the organization and to structure the daily work.

Some of the respondents mentioned that managers could ask the HR department for help regarding, for example, legislation and recruitment issues. It is important to clarify that organizations should always provide support to managers, but only to a certain degree. It is equally important to accentuate the importance of having managers who take their responsibility seriously and who do not ask for help as soon as tough situations occur. If managers lack that strength, the question must be asked whether one is fit to be a manager or not. As Schein (2004) stresses, managers must have the emotional strength to absorb worries and anxieties that any situation can cause combined with the ability to provide support to employees.

Department Manager versus Group Manager. This question divided the respondents in to two groups; the bigger group thought that there was a difference in the expectations on department managers and group managers, and the smaller group that did not see a difference between the two managerial categories. A few of the department managers felt that group managers have a more important role than they do and should therefore bear higher expectations than themselves. In this, it seems like some of the department managers attempt to slide away from their responsibility. As Bligh and Carsten (2005) point out, it is important that all managers are aware of the great responsibility they have when it comes to the information flow between top management and employee level.

The difference in the expectations between department managers and group managers was that department managers were expected to focus on strategic issues and to be a generalist and that group managers were expected to focus on operative issues and to be a specialist. Some respondents mentioned delegation as an important skill, especially for department managers. This is interesting, since delegation earlier in this study was perceived to be an operative skill and mostly a group manager task. A minority also expected department managers to be more responsible for communication and information. It seems like the group managers do not believe that they need to improve the information flow and the delegation to their employees. In accordance with Strang (2007), if managers are more aware of what is expected of them and if they know their own skills and weaknesses, they will be perceived to be more effective as managers.

Some of the respondents stated that they had higher expectations on department managers than on group managers. This expectation decreases group managers' responsibility since they always have someone "above" to turn to. One explanation for this result is that department managers are somewhat expected to bear higher responsibilities regarding communication. They are a source of a lot of information and without their communication; the information flow would be stopped.

Some respondents did not have different expectations on department managers and group managers. Basic managerial skills should be the same regarding level. In agreement with Suutari (1996) it is fundamental that managers are capable of making decisions, delegating, handling conflicts and understanding how leader behaviors affect employees' performance.

Decision-Making. Decision-making was, according to many of the respondents, about courage; courage to make decisions, courage to stand up alone and courage to change possible mistakes. The question of reaching consensus seems to be difficult. Most of the respondents felt that managers should strive to collect facts before making a decision. Of course, managers should make well-grounded decisions based on facts. But, as some of the respondents said, managers should sometimes avoid input from all angles, since the decision process might take too long, a statement which is supported by Schlosser and Raghavendra (2004). It is a managerial responsibility to make decisions and it is a given fact that almost all decisions will leave someone unsatisfied. In agreement with a minority of the respondents, managers should adjust their decision-making process according to the context and situation. However, after a decision is made, the key to successfully implementing the decision is communication (Mintzberg, 1973; Schlosser & Raghavendra, 2004), as some of the respondents expected. Managers need to make sure that employees understand why a decision has been made and on what grounds.

Miscellaneous Issues. This category surfaced a minority expectation on the company: to give managers time to manage and to provide enough resources and support. It was also seen as natural to give enough authority to managers to avoid limitations.

Something else that came up was lack of communication within the company. A few of the board members expressed that department managers are responsible for the shortage of communication. The department managers are a source of a great deal of information; they can therefore set a clear starting point for the flow of communication and information within the company. As Yukl (2006) states, it is crucial that managers have communicative skills in order to facilitate the development of both employees and the organization.

It is also interesting that several of the employees felt the need to encourage managers to "dare to be managers". One must ask the question if this is a general problem at the company. Do managers not take enough responsibility? In accordance with Furnham (2002), managers must have enough courage to be managers; to accept failures, to have the courage to try new ideas and to trust instincts.

Parent Company Views. A minority expected managers to integrate RTR into the parent company Emerson. A manager should not only maintain his/her network within the corporate organization, but also stand up for consequences that may arise from being owned by an American company. This might be difficult for managers since there is a difference between the American culture and the Swedish culture. As Schein (2004) stresses, Swedish organizations often have divisional subcultures; each division often builds its own processes to which employees are very committed. Usually the subcultures are not a problem for the parent company, unless changes occur, such as new management processes or new policies. Once again, it requires a certain amount of company alignment from the managers to stand up for views that are not their own and may be different from RTR work processes.

Final Discussion

This study has provided results and a discussion about expectations on managers within a technically oriented company. The purpose of the study can be seen as fulfilled since expectations on managers have been enlightened from the four different perspective holders' points of view. A deepened description of various expectations on managers has been presented as well as possible reasons for why certain expectations exist.

Four main areas of expectations on managers became very present during the study and were mentioned in most question categories. Managers were expected to have the courage to be a manager, an expectation which is in accordance with Furnham (2002). Managers were expected to be aligned with the company; they should follow and stand up for company goals and policies. Managers were expected to focus on strategic issues and to delegate operative work to employees. Managers were expected to communicate and keep employees informed about current issues, an expectation which is in accordance with Lok et al. (2005). A possible conclusion gained from the respondents' answers is that the same four areas can be improved within RTR; there is an expressed need for increased courage, increased company alignment, increased delegation as well as increased managerial communication and information.

Expectations on managers between the four perspective holders did not differ much. In general and regarding the four main areas above, the expectations were approxi-

mately the same for all perspective holders. One possible explanation of the respondents' similar views regarding expectations on managers is that all respondents have a manager of their own and are therefore aware of what to expect from managers in general.

Study Design

Interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) inspired the writers during the study since IPA was a suitable approach to best find out how the individuals felt about the area of concern, according to Smith and Osborn (2003). The study illuminated these respondents' comprehensions of the area in question; hence the aim was not to make general claims for a larger population

Both authors are well known at the company. This fact may have had a restraining influence for some of the respondents, a fact which could bias the result and a fact which the authors were aware of during the study. However, the authors influence might benefit the study. IPA supports an insider's perspective in order to get closer to the participant's personal world, according to Smith and Osborn (2003).

Another possible factor of bias is that both of the authors have not been involved in all parts of the study. One author performed all interviews alone; this was perceived to be the best alternative since this author had the most neutral relationship to the respondents. The other author transcribed more interviews. Further, the coding process in QSR Nvivo, involving categorizing and coding of research material was completed by one author. The purpose of that decision was to achieve the most equal way of looking at all the transcripts and to facilitate possible future repetitions of the study. Kvale (1997) points out that there can be as many versions of interpretations as there are researchers, which could be the case in this study. In order to avoid the authors' different starting points biasing the research evaluation, the authors maintained an open dialog to decrease such circumstances.

A face-to-face encounter with two of the board members was not possible, therefore, these interviews were carried out by phone. As Trost (1997) emphasizes, phone interviews might not be most appropriate when aiming for in-depth questions and answers. Maybe these interviews could be perceived as more anonymous, however the authors tried to perform these two interviews as similar to the other 18 as possible.

Suggestions of future research

It would be interesting to conduct this study without differentiating between the four perspective holders. A general quantitative study, for example, a survey involving all employees, could provide valuable statistical information. It would also be interesting to see if expectations on managers would be similar at another company.

During this study the authors have noticed a need for further research regarding organizational cultural differences between Sweden and the USA. A cross-section study between these two countries' organizational cultures would therefore be attractive and of relevance for many Swedish/American companies.

References

Anseel, A., & Lievens, F. (2007). The long-term impact of the feedback environment on job satisfaction: a field study in a Belgian context [electronic version]. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56*, 254-266.

Arvonen, J., & Pettersson, P. (2002). Leadership behaviors as predictors of cost and change effectiveness [electronic version]. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 18*, 101-112.

Backman, J. (1998). *Rapporter och uppsatser.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Bernstein, A. D., Penner, A. L., Clarke-Stewart, A., & Roy, J. E. (2003). *Psychology* (6:th edition). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bligh, C. M., & Carsten, K. M. (2005). Post-merger psychological contracts: exploring a "multiple foci" conceptualization [electronic version]. *Employee Relations*, *27*, 495-510.

Brown, E. M., & Treviño, K. L. (2006). Ethical leadership: a review and future directions [electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 595-616.

Clegg, S., Kornberger, M., & Rhodes, C. (2007). Organizational ethics, decision making, undecidability [electronic version]. *The Sociological Review, 55*, 393-409.

Cort, T. K., Griffith, A. D., & White, S. D. (2007). An attribution theory approach for understanding the internalization of professional service firms [electronic version]. *International Marketing Review, 24*, 9-25.

Dasborough, T. M. (2006). Cognitive asymmetry in employee emotional reactions to leadership behaviors [electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 163-178.

Farmer, A. L. (2005). Situational leadership: a model for leading telecommuters [electronic version]. *Journal of Nursing Management, 13*, 483-489.

Furnham, A. (2002). Managers as change agents [electronic version]. *Journal of Change Management, 3*, 21-29.

Greenblatt, E. (2002). Work/life balance: wisdom or whining [electronic version]. *Organizational Dynamics, 31*, 177-193.

Guest, E. D. (1998). The psychological contract at work [electronic version]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 649-664.

Herriot, P. (1994). *The Career Management Challenge*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kvale, S. (1997). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lok, P., Westwood, R., & Crawford, J. (2005). Perceptions of organizational subculture and their significance for organizational commitment [electronic version]. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *54*, 490-514.

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger. W. R. (2006). *The Career Architect: The Development Planner* (4:th edition). Minneapolis; MN: Lominger Limited Inc.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Inside Our Strange World of Organizations.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.

Mumford, V. T., Campion, A. M., & Morgeson, P. F. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: leadership skill requirements across organizational levels [electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 154-166.

Podsakoff, M. P., Bommer, H. W., Podsakoff, P. N., & MacKenzie, B. S. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes,

perceptions, and behaviors: a meta-analytic review of existing and new research [electronic version]. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*, 113-142.

Porter, W. L., Pearce, L. J., Tripoli, M. A., & Lewis, M. K. (1998). Differential perceptions of employers' inducements: implications for psychological contracts [electronic version]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 769-782.

Reynolds, J. S. (2006). A neurocognitive model of the ethical decision making process: implications for study and practice [electronic version]. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*, 737-748.

Rousseau, M. D., & Tirjoriwala , A. S. (1998). Assessing psychological contracts: issues, alternatives and measures [electronic version]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 679-695.

Schein, H. E. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (3:rd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlosser, W. R., & Raghavendra, P. (2004). Evidence-based practice in argumentative and alternative communication [electronic version]. *Argumentative and Alternative Communication, 20*, 1-21.

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J A. Smith (ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (pp 51-81). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sternberg, J. R. (2007). A systems model of leadership [electronic version]. *American Psychologist, 62*, 34-42.

Strang, D. K. (2007). Examining effective technology project leadership traits and behaviors [electronic version]. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*, 424-462.

Suutari, V. (1996). Leadership ideologies among European managers: a comparative survey in a multinational company [electronic version]. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 12*, 389-409.

Trost, J. (1997). *Kvalitativa intervjuer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Turnley, H. W., Bolino, C. M., Lester, W.S., & Bloodgood, M. J. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors [electronic version]. *Journal of Management, 29*, 187-206.

Van Dierendock, D., Haynes, C., Borill, C., & Stride, C. (2004). Leadership behavior and subordinate well-being [electronic version]. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*, 165-175.

Vroom, H. V., & Jago, G. A. (2007). The role of situation in leadership [electronic version]. *American Psychological Association, 62*, 17-24.

Werth, L., Markel, P., & Förster, J. (2006). The role of subject theories for leadership evaluation [electronic version]. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*, 102-127.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6:th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.