

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

Department of Human Resources and Employment Relations

**FINDING CONGRUENCE BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE,  
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, AND HIRING CRITERIA**

A Thesis in

Human Resources and Employment Relations

by

Sangmi Lee

© 2014 Sangmi Lee

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Master of Science

August 2014

The thesis of Sangmi Lee was reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Sumita Raghuram  
Associate Professor of Human Resources and Employment Relations  
Thesis Adviser

Xiangmin Liu  
Assistant Professor of Human Resources and Employment Relations

Ryan Lamare  
Assistant Professor of Human Resources and Employment Relations

Paul Whitehead  
Professor of Human Resources and Employment Relations

\*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

## ABSTRACT

To maximize firm performance, it is important to have congruence between leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring criteria. By finding out the trends of congruence, company leaders will be able to adjust and choose their style of leadership, culture, and hiring. However, there is not much evidence from current research to support this. The hypothesis of this study is that there is congruence between leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring criteria. This study starts with the goal of finding trends among 70 companies. Adam Bryant's the *New York Times* biweekly column "Corner Office" was used for the research. This was a qualitative study employing Glaser and Strauss' grounded theory. Between leadership style and culture, two congruence relationships were found. The relationship between leadership style and hiring criteria had two statistically significant trends. There were five significant correlations between culture and hiring criteria. Seven out of nine correlations were congruent, and two of them were incongruent. The reasons for lack of further support for the hypothesis are secondary source bias, possibility for leaders' dishonest answers, and vagueness of clarifying whether the leaders' answers captured their companies' culture and hiring criteria entirely.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review and hypothesis.....	3
Organizational culture.....	3
Leadership and culture.....	5
Leadership, culture, and hiring criteria.....	8
Person-Organization (P-O) fit.....	8
Hypothesis.....	15
Methodology.....	19
Procedure .....	19
Results.....	26
Organizational culture coding.....	26
Leadership style coding .....	27
Hiring criteria coding.....	31
Discussion.....	41
Limitations .....	48
Implications and future research.....	49
Appendix A: Highlighted words from the interviews.....	51
Appendix B: Descriptions of leadership, culture, and hiring criteria .....	66
REFERENCES .....	97

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Example of a CEO interview with highlights .....	21
Figure 2. Example of the list of highlighted words, phrases, and direct quotes .....	23

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Organizational culture codes .....	27
Table 2: Leadership style codes .....	31
Table 3: Hiring criteria codes .....	33
Table 4: Company coding example.....	34
Table 5: Variable frequencies .....	35
Table 6: Correlations .....	37
Table 7: Congruent relationships .....	40
Table 8: Incongruent relationships .....	40

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It has been an absolute honor for me to work with my thesis adviser, committee members, all of the professors, fellow students, and friends. Without their help and support, I could not have been able to finish this journey. I also would like to thank the School of Labor and Employment Relations, the Schreyer Honors College, and the Graduate School.

But most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude for my thesis adviser, Dr. Sumita Raghuram. I encountered many obstacles along the way, but Dr. Raghuram was always there providing me with great advice and removing all barriers to completing my work. Without her help, I might have given up writing this thesis. She was the one who inspired me to keep moving on and motivated me to work harder. With her guidance, I learned the true meaning of being a dedicated researcher. I also want to say thank you to my committee members, Dr. Xiangmin (Helen) Liu, Dr. Ryan Lamare, and Dr. Alan Derickson. The fantastic insights and in-depth knowledge on this topic by my thesis committee helped me to sculpt this work into a final product I feel proud of.

Last but not least, I would like to express my love and appreciation to my family. Every time I fell, they lifted me up and helped me to march towards my goals. Without their love and support, I may not have been able to become the person I am today. My mother, Jin Mi, has always been my role model who taught me how to be a smart and strong woman. My brother, Yong Jang (William), has always been my best friend and cheerleader who makes me have a positive attitude toward life. And my dad, Heung Hak, was the strongest person I have ever known. Dad, thank you so much for teaching me how to not give up on life, family, and friends. I hope that he can see what I have achieved from up there. I sincerely dedicate this work to my mom, dad, and brother.

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

In the field of human resource management, many scholars have discussed the strong link between leadership style, organizational culture and performance. Studies on the relationships between leadership style and performance (e.g. Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Howell & Avolio, 1993), and organizational culture and performance (e.g. Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1990; Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981; Kotter & Heskett, 1992) showed that both leadership style and culture are positively related to organizational performance. Hannan, Burton, and Baron's (1996) study showed that the firms that utilized positively strong culture and culture-fit hiring did better than other organizations that were based on engineering or bureaucracy models (Hannan, Burton, & Baron, 1996). Although, previous research emphasizes the importance of well-paired leadership style, culture, and hiring, there are limited studies that look into the specifics of their congruence (Damanpour & Schneider, 2006; Miner, 2000; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Sarros, Cooper, & Santora, 2008; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

This thesis will take a closer look into the congruence between leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring by using CEO interviews of real world companies. Having a strong culture as a leadership tool for organizational success has been supported by substantial empirical and applied evidence (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). In order to create the right organizational culture, appropriate leadership styles and skills are required; because leaders are the ones who can create, maintain, and change the culture of an organization (Barlow, Jordan, & Hendrix, 2003; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Schein, 1992; Siehl, 1985). To make and sustain well-established culture, leaders need to hire individuals who can be absorbed within the culture. Person-organization (P-O) fit is what leaders need to use when picking new employees for

culture who will thrive in the organization's culture (Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 2001).

Applicants who are hired into an organization this way are accustomed to organizational culture quickly and buttress the efforts to sustain the culture (e.g. Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Van Vianen, De Pater, & Van Dijk's, 2007).

By studying the *New York Times*' interviews of CEOs from 70 companies, this thesis will find how CEOs' leadership styles, organizational culture, and hiring practices are connected to each other. Based on grounded theory, this thesis looks into the congruence in a qualitative research way (Glaser & Strauss, 1973). Every leader's responses on leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring were coded and then paired to see if there is any congruence between leadership style and organizational culture, organizational culture and hiring, and leadership and hiring.

This thesis will review literature to provide a background of the study in chapter 2. In the same chapter, the hypothesis of this study will be introduced. Chapter 3 describes the method of the research, including the materials and procedure. Chapter 4 will list the results of the study with statistical charts. The final chapter will discuss the results, limitations, and future implications of this study. Upon the completion of this study, company leaders will be able to have a clearer view on how other CEOs align leadership style, culture, and hiring. Scholars and practitioners will gain insights on the congruence trends. This thesis will be a great guide for anyone who wants to lead a company successfully in a highly volatile and highly competitive market.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review and hypothesis

#### Organizational culture

Culture can be a very abstract term to describe. But this abstract term is the most basic and important backbone of every organization that is operating across the world. Despite the difficulties in defining organizational culture, many scholars have tried to explain it in clear ways. Edgar H. Schein, one of the most notable scholars in the field of organizational development, defined organizational culture in a clearer way after considerable research. He defined culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2004). Daft (2005) described organizational culture as “the set of key values, assumptions, understandings and norms that is shared by members of an organization and taught to new members as correct.” Louis (1983) defined it as “distinctive common understandings around which action is organized peculiar to each group.” Kilmann, Saxton, and Serpa (1985) said that company culture is "the shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms." Uttal (1983) explained it as a "system of shared values about what is important and beliefs about how things work that interact with people, structures, and control systems in an organization to produce behavioral norms." It is evident that in this sample of five definitions on organizational culture, every author uses different terms to explain it. However, one crucial concept is included in all five definitions: collectivity. The underlying values and assumptions of each organization are reflected in the common usages of language, symbols, myths, routines, procedures, rites, rituals, and

performance norms (Schein, 2010). Every group has defining characteristics that have been derived from a shared history among its members. This shared history grows as a culture in an organization, and the strength of culture becomes a determinant factor of an organization's length of existence, stability of membership, and emotional intensity of shared experiences. Culture is crucial for keeping an organization's uniqueness, stability, consistency, patterns, and meaning (Schein, 1992).

Although organizational culture is based on shared values, beliefs, and norms, each group has its own strikingly different culture. These differences are what make each of them unique (Schein, 2010). Researchers have highlighted the uniqueness of each organization's culture because it sometimes results in competitive advantage. By forming both superior and inimitable cultures, organizations can generate powerful advantages over competitors (Reed & DeFiilippi, 1990). The positive link between organizational culture and performance has been claimed by previous studies (e.g. Scholz, 1987). Ogbonna's (1993) literature review on whether culture is manageable or not argues that commonly shared and strongly held organizational values boost employee productivity and minimize undesirable consequences in companies (Ogbonna, 1993). Many studies found out that organizational performance is dependent on the strength and breadth of cultural values (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1990; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Prahalad and Bettis' (1986) study on diversity and company performance found that by focusing on culture, rather than on the tangibles and physicality, organizations performed well. Research on healthcare industry and clinical nurses found that well-formed organizational culture has been related to high job satisfaction and employee retention (Macintosh & Doherty, 2010; Park & Kim, 2009; Tsai & Wu, 2010), organizational effectiveness (Gregory, Harris, Armenakis, & Shook, 2009), and

leadership behavior (Tsai, 2011). A myriad of studies has found the links between organizational culture and performance. Therefore, achieving unique and inimitable culture may provide competitive advantages that can make a company thrive in a competitive market system (Krefting & Frost, 1985).

### **Leadership and culture**

Culture can be formed in two ways: 1) an unstructured group takes patterned norms or behaviors that gradually become culture later on; 2) a creator of a formal group or a person who rises as a leader among others forms culture (Schein, 2004). In the formation of culture, leaders' roles are important. Fred Fiedler (1996), one of the most respected researchers on leadership, stressed the importance of leadership by arguing that the effectiveness of a leader determines the success or failure of a group, organization, or even an entire country. Every leader and entrepreneur has specific personal visions, goals, beliefs, values, and assumptions about how things should be and how they should be done. Leaders impose these basic values in organizations, and organizational members will make decisions based on these thoughts and values (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Schein, 2004).

Imposition of one's beliefs and values is a primary act of leadership, but this does not start culture instantly. Repetitive successes have to follow after each implantation. Workers will follow leaders' words only when their directions produce success. If not, they will not follow the new directions. A successful belief system becomes the "correct" and "right" way. After the quest for the right way is completed, groups will become less conscious of these newfound beliefs and values, and they will begin to treat them more as nonnegotiable assumptions. As this process continues, these assumptions will gradually be embedded in the back of group members' mind. And this is when assumptions become part of the identity of a group (Schein, 2004). As

groups succeed with accepted beliefs and manners, they become stable organizations. To make organizations more stable than ever, leaders must embed their beliefs, values, and assumptions into their organizations. By aligning their values with culture, leaders can form an effective organizational culture (Schein, 2004).

After stabilizing an organization, performance optimization comes next. The performance of an organization is closely related to the consciously aligned employee values and company strategy (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). In order to make an organization effective, a leader needs both tactical and strategic thinking, and a culture that can support them. With strategic and tactical thinking, a leader can build the vision that is required for an organization's successful future. After building the required vision, a leader can now construct culture that can support and revolve around the vision (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

Organizations must have a culture that is more flexible, innovative, adaptive, and entrepreneurial – one that can satisfy the changing demands of different market environments (Orchard, 1998; Parker & Bradley, 2000; Valle, 1999). Leaders need to have an ability to change culture flexibly so they can improve their organizational performance (Brown, 1992; Kotter & Heskett, 2008; Prajogo & Ahmed, 2006; Schein, 1992). Many researchers believe that leadership and organizational culture are highly related to bringing organizational changes (Afsaneh, 1993; Kotter, 1998; Schein, 1992). In Kotter and Heskett's (2008) book on organizational culture and performance with the case studies on Hewlett-Packard, ICI, and Nissan, they argue that leadership is the only tool that will enable one to truly “develop and nurture culture that is adaptive to change.” Leaders are the people who are in a position to influence culture and change greatly (Barlow, Jordan, & Hendrix, 2003; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Leaders' effects on organizational culture and performance have been studied for a very

long time (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Nicholls, 1988; Quick, 1992; Schein, 1992; Simms, 1997).

However, in order to understand leaders' positive influence on culture and performance, looking into a successful type of leadership is required, because unsuccessful leaders are failing due to their inability to make an impact on culture. In recent studies, transformational leadership has been highlighted because previous theories, such as trait, behavioral, and situational, lack modern practicality (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). Transformational leaders are not hesitant changing culture to match it with their vision (Bass, 1985). They are argued to be motivating, visionary, and enthusiastic (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Transformational leaders build empowering cultures because they believe that everyone in an organization is trustworthy and has a unique talent to make contributions. In an empowering and trusting culture, employees typically exhibit a sense of vision and purpose. They identify with organizational visions, goals, and interests. By aligning people and organizational vision, these leaders encourage employees to take greater responsibilities and extra roles to achieve the vision. Transformational leaders enable their employees to reach their full potential by developing them. As a result, workers feel appreciated and rewarded, which affects their satisfaction and work attitude in a positive way (Bass & Avolio, 1993, 1994, 1997; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997).

Previous studies support the link between transformational leaders' innovative and empowering approaches and innovation, which is crucial for an organization to survive in the long run (Ancona & Caldwell, 1987; Ogbonna & Harris, 2000; Zahra, 1999).

As one can see in an example of a transformational leader, leaders are the individuals who can immensely impact culture, performance, and existence. Depending on what kind of leader an organization has, it can be a successful or a failing company. Culture and leaders are

very closely tied together and cannot exist without one another (Elenkov & Manev, 2005; Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003; Tsui, Zhang, Wang, Xin, & Wu, 2006).

### **Leadership, culture, and hiring criteria**

Ostroff, Kinicki, and Tamkins (2003) identified leadership as an emergent process that acts on both organizational climate and culture. Similarly, Denison (1990) claimed that management behaviors reinforce principles of the culture. Among many components that mold culture, the employee selection process is one of them, and it is greatly affected by a leader's visions and values (Schein, 2004). Furthermore, hiring new members gives an opportunity for an organization to change culture that needs to be corrected or support an existing positively strong culture (DiPiro, 2011). Hiring is the subtlest yet the most potent way leaders can take when embedding their beliefs or bringing changes into their organizations (Barlow, Jordan, & Hendrix, 2003; Katz & Kahn, 1978). This is a subtle way to perpetuate leaders' values because selecting new employees is conducted unconsciously. Human beings like others who share similar interests and values with them. Leaders and organizations work in the same way (Schneider, 1987). Leaders prefer hiring job applicants who resemble present members in style, assumptions, values, and beliefs (Schein, 2004). They like hiring applicants who are similar to current organizational culture because they perceive these candidates as having an easier chance of being absorbed by current members who have been with the organization for a longer period of time. Only when new and old employees are working harmoniously, can an organization sail the ocean smoothly. Leaning toward similarities is human nature, and that is why selection is a very subtle, but effective way of injecting leaders' beliefs in an organization (Schein, 1992).

### **Person-Organization (P-O) fit**

Some organizations treat knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) as the major

determining factors when choosing new employees. KSAs are significant for hiring applicants for specified jobs with clearly defined requirements. However, this technique ignores both organizational and personal characteristics because it considers these characteristics irrelevant to immediate job requirements. These organizations only seek out people who can do specific jobs, but go no further than that (Bowen et al., 2001.)

But most companies want to hire employees who can do more than what is required of them. In order to find these types of employees, many organizational psychologists, management scholars, and managers have theorized person-environment fit (P-E fit) for many years. It has now become a central focus in managerial psychology (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). Many researchers have investigated how achieving P-E fit is related to outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and occupational choice (e.g. Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996, Spokane, Meir, & Catalano, 2000; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Many of them have also tried to define the building blocks of P-E fit for better understanding of the fit (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998; Holland, 1997; Schneider, 2001; Caplan, 1987; Dawis, 1992; Judge & Ferris, 1992). P-E fit is defined as a “comprehensive notion that necessarily includes one’s compatibility with multiple systems in the work environment” (Kristof-Brown, Jansen, & Colbert, 2002). P-E fit is an umbrella term for multiple constructs: person-job fit (P-J fit), person-vocation fit (P-V fit), person-person fit (P-P fit), person-group fit (P-G fit), and person-organization fit (P-O fit) (Caplan, 1987; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Cable & Judge, 1996; Judge & Ferris, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Werbel & Gilliland, 1999; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Morley, 2007). All of these concepts are based on distinct characteristics including values, needs, goals, personalities, and abilities (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Most organizations do not hire only for KSAs, but look for a “whole person” who will fit well to the organization culture (Bowen et al., 2001). Schneider’s (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model has been a base for the fit studies. The ASA model suggests that work values are how individuals decide if they want to work for a specific company, how organizations decide whether they would like to hire a specific applicant or not, and how employed workers make a decision if they would like to remain within an organization or not (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Smith, Taylor, & Fleenor, 1998). The similarities allowed job seekers and organizations to make interactional and reciprocal decisions. On one side, organizations attract and select applicants who fit best to their goals, needs, and expectations. On the other hand, applicants choose organizations based on their previous experiences, preferences, goals, needs, characteristics, and interests (Lievens, Decaestecker, & Coetsier, 2001; Schneider, 2001). Among many person-environment (P-E) fits, person-organization (P-O) fit is what is used to test these assumptions regarding the fit between organizations and people (Edwards & Cooper, 1990; Lievens et al., 2001).

Person-organization (P-O) fit can be defined as the “compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics, or both” (Kristof, 1996). P-O fit concentrates on the importance of fit between employees and work processes. It creates an organizational identity through institutionalization of consistent values that permeate an organization’s culture (Werbel & DeMarie, 2005). Under its definition, sharing similar values between employees and organizations is an important characteristic of P-O fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). P-O fit also assumes that the relationship between person and work environment is a decisive factor for attitudes, behaviors, and other personal outcomes (Westerman & Vanka, 2005).

Because of the importance of P-O fit, many researchers have been working to see the role of compatibility between organizations and employees (Kristof, 1996). Compatibility can be conceptualized in four ways: complementary fit, supplementary fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Caplan, 1987; Edwards, 1991; Edwards, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Complementary fit is achieved when an employee and an organization fulfill each other's needs. For this fit, an individual's strengths have to offset weaknesses or needs of an environment, and vice versa. Supplementary fit occurs when an employee has similar characteristics with an organization and its members (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Needs-supplies fit occurs when an organization satisfies individual preferences, needs, and desires. Lastly, demands-abilities fit is met when an individual's abilities and characteristics meet the needs of an organization (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Edwards, 1996).

Most research ignored the connectedness of these four constructs until Kristof (1996) integrated these four different, yet closely related conceptualizations. In her work, Kristof labeled the fit between organization's characteristics (culture/climate, values, goals, and norms) and an individual's characteristics (personality, values, goals, and attitudes) as supplementary fit. Supplementary fit exists when these two groups' characteristics match. Then, what each entity provides and needs are labeled as supplies and demands. These come underneath the organizational and personal characteristics because the demands and supplies are likely to be influenced by characteristics (Hogan, 1991; Schein, 1992). An organization supplies financial, physical, and psychological resources, and task-related and interpersonal opportunities; an individual demands these resources and opportunities. A company demands resources such as time, effort, commitment, and experiences, and KSAs including task and interpersonal skills; an

employee supplies these resources and KSAs in return. When an organization supplies what an employee demands, needs-supplies fit is achieved. On the other hand, when a worker supplies what an organization needs, demands-abilities fit occurs. Both needs-supplies and demands-abilities fits are labeled as complementary fit (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). By integrating these four conceptualization fits, Kristof made it possible to have both supplementary and complementary fits simultaneously (Kristof, 1996).

To operationalize P-O fit, scholars have used value congruence between work and workers (e.g. Chatman, 1991; Judge & Cable, 1997; Kristof, 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Chatman's (1991) study examined how P-O fit affects newcomers' adjustment to the new organization, job satisfaction, and intention to keep the job by using congruence between the work values of the employees and the organization. Chatman used a Q-sort instrument with 54 items to assess value congruence (O'Reilly et al., 1991). Chatman's results show that the individuals with high P-O work value congruence adjusted to the company more quickly and easily, were happier with their work, and intended to keep their jobs longer than the ones who achieved lower P-O value congruence.

Van Vianen, De Pater, and Van Dijk's (2007) conducted their research with a questionnaire and 94 employees from a local company to find relationships between P-O fit and turnover intention. According to their study, individuals who accomplished high P-O work value fit had lower turnover intention. Their research is interesting because they compared same-source fit, which looks into each individual's perceived personal values and organizational values, and different-source fit, which deals with fit between personal values and congregational organizational values from different people. While same-source fit is conceptualized as perceived fit, different-source fit is conceptualized as actual fit. In their result, different-source fit

had stronger impact on turnover intention. Westerman and Cyr's (2004) research also found that employee turnover rate goes down with high P-O fit. Their study involving 105 employees in six U.S. organizations found that high P-O fit is related to high job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and lower turnover intention. Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, and Ferris' (2005) research also supports the positive relationship between P-O fit and job satisfaction and intent to turnover. By integrating multidimensional fit, these researchers found statistically significant relationships between P-O fit and increased job satisfaction and decreased intention to turnover.

Meglino, Ravlin, and Adkins' (1989) research examined work value congruence P-O fit between supervisors and subordinates. They used Comparative Emphasis Scale, which is a 24-item forced-choice instrument that asks participants to rank four work values including achievement, fairness, honesty, and helping and concern (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987a, 1987b; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989, 1992). The result found the link between achieving high P-O fit and high job satisfaction, high organizational commitment, and reporting to work on time (Meglino et al., 1989).

Another fit finding instrument developed by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991), called Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), found seven major dimensions: innovation, stability, orientation towards people (fair and supportive), orientation towards outcomes (results-oriented, achievement-oriented), attention to detail, team orientation, and personal relationship style. With this instrument, O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell concluded that personal and organizational characteristics could be interpreted with patterns. Judge and Cable's (1997) study supports the basic conclusion of OCP. They found that the Big Five personality traits could predict applicants and companies' value preferences, and vice versa. Their findings found reciprocal relationships

between extroversive people and aggressive culture, extroversive personalities and team-oriented culture, innovative characteristics and detail-oriented culture, agreeable people and supportiveness/team-oriented culture, and conscientious applicants and detail/outcome-oriented culture. These value preference matches are linked to hiring, and hiring based on these matches is more likely to predict work outcomes, employee attitudes, and behaviors (Judge & Cable, 1997; Judge & Kristof-Brown, 2004).

As one can see, studies specifically looking at value congruence for achieving P-O fit have shown to be related to positive organizational outcomes. Values are the important linkage between individuals and organizations that affect the organizational success of both parties directly and meaningfully (Cable & Judge, 1997). Achieving a high-degree of P-O fit is related to positive work-related outcomes, buttressing organizational culture, achieving job and career satisfaction, reducing psychological strain, strengthening organizational citizenship behaviors, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, ethical conduct, organizational identification, and job performance (Ng & Burke, 2005; Morley, 2007). Organizational performance was enhanced and employees' resistance and hesitance to change was also reduced in a research study of small to medium size companies in the United Kingdom (Castka, Bamber, Sharp, & Belohoubek, 2001). P-O fit allows organizations to move cross-functionally with changes, goals, and visions (Robbins & Judge, 2009). By achieving P-O fit, an organization can be effective, with dedicated employees who share the same goals and values with those of the company. Because of a myriad of positive outcomes from P-O fit, organizations have emphasized fit in their hiring practices and proactively hire future employees based on fit (Bowen et al., 2001).

## **Hypothesis**

Organizations do not run with clear-cut operational decisions for creating appropriate culture and performance. There are many unpredictable factors that can affect culture and performance. This is why organizations must align leadership, culture, and hiring. Having a strong culture as a leadership tool for organizational success has been supported by substantial empirical and applied evidence (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). To be specific, firms that emphasized strong culture and culture-fit hiring performed better than organizations that were based on engineering or bureaucracy models (Hannan, Burton, & Baron, 1996).

Saying that a leader's success depends on what kind of culture he or she creates and develops is not an exaggeration. Aligning the leader's values, passions, organization's goals, and company's culture is the key to having an effective organization. Only when a leader's own culture is inseparable from that of a company's can the company thrive. To achieve the alignment, leaders make their decisions based on their beliefs and values, and try to share their visions with other employees in their organizations (Rowe & Nejad, 2009). By doing so, leaders guide their employees in the directions they desire.

However, having aligned leadership and culture will only help a company get along so far. Hiring for culture is needed to support this alignment. There are several ways for leaders to develop, manage, and change their culture to promote their employees to perform extraordinarily and go the extra mile. Out of these methods, the most important one is recruiting and selecting people for culture fit (Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly, 1989; O'Reilly et al., 1996; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1997).

As discussed in previous sections, hiring for culture is crucial in terms of forming the right organizational culture. Recruiting is a two-way street: for organizations, they select new

members; for job applicants, they choose organizations to apply to. In order for an organization to have a strong culture that can align values and norms of companies and their employees, leaders should hire people who will fit the culture. Even when hiring for culture fit means trading off some skills that are required for specific jobs, the fit should be emphasized more for organizational success. People can learn new necessary skills, but can hardly learn culture. (Chatman & Cha, 2003). Additionally, employees who do not fit in an organization can dilute a company's culture. These misfits detract the essence of a company's culture, identity, and company-wide goals (Lewis, 2011).

Leaders should consider the selection process as the first stepping-stone for forming a strong organizational culture (Chatman & Cha, 2003). By constructing a comprehensive and culturally relevant selection process, a leader can expect to hire individuals who can follow the culture that a leader has formed based on his or her values and beliefs. These values become norms and organizational culture, and when culture is strong, employees will contribute more to achieve their organizational goals.

Leadership, culture, and hiring are peas in one pod. They are very closely related to building an effective and successful company. Although there have been many studies regarding the importance of aligning leadership, hiring criteria, and culture, the problem of current academia on this topic is that there is limited research that describing the specifics (Damanpour & Schneider, 2006; Miner, 2000; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Sarros, Cooper, & Santora, 2008; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Most of the studies do not specifically explain what kind of leadership goes well with which type of culture, what should be the hiring criteria for a certain culture, or what type of leaders hire certain kinds of applicants. They just state that a leader's role is important for cultivating the right culture, and hiring for culture is needed to support the

right culture (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Martin, 2007). To find the congruence trends, this study will look across organizations. Previous studies focused only on one or a few number of organizations (e.g. Van Vianen, De Pater, & Van Dijk, 2007; Westerman & Cyr, 2004). But to find trends, looking into several different organizations is needed. By finding congruence trends, this study will demonstrate how leaders' values affect organizational culture and hiring criteria.

Several scholars discovered trends of leadership, culture, and hiring. When 112 executives from different countries were interviewed to identify leadership trends, the most often mentioned one was the shift from individualistic leadership to participative and transformative leadership (Criswell & Martin, 2007). A researcher found out that now, companies want to hire people who are comfortable with ambiguity (McIlvaine, 2010). Another study based on interviews with 70 leaders from various companies found that culture that could strategically manage change was a big trend in 2009 (Hagemann & Chrtrand, 2009). Different studies periodically found several trends regarding leadership, culture, and hiring separately, but none has studied specific relationships among them. Without noticing congruence trends using the three criteria, companies will have a hard time figuring out how to align leadership, culture, and hiring.

The goal of this thesis is to find congruence trends between leadership, culture, and hiring in real world companies. Upon finding the congruence, the study will also find out how much power leaders' values have on organizational culture and hiring criteria. Other researchers already discovered the three components' individual trends and importance, and now this study will try to find if there are any congruence trends among them. As a researcher, I hypothesize that there will be congruence trends among these three factors. Finding if there are any congruence trends among leadership, culture, and hiring will be a guide for hiring criteria. At the

same time, researchers on this topic will gain a clearer understanding of where present-day are heading towards with the findings.

Hypothesis: There are congruence trends between hiring processes, organizational cultures, and leadership styles.

## Chapter 3

### Methodology

#### Procedure

The goal of this thesis is to determine if there are any repeating relational patterns among organizational culture, leadership style, and hiring practices. To meet the goal of this thesis, a qualitative research method was used. I chose qualitative research method because it is an adequate research method for sociological theories that have restrictions that come from structural data conditions, consequences, deviances, norms, processes, patterns, and systems (Glaser & Strauss, 1973). Sociological studies involve people, societies, and certain groups that are difficult to predict. Specifically, I used grounded theory that was conceptualized by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss. Grounded theory is one of many qualitative research methodologies that gave light to sociology researchers who had problems validating their qualitative studies. Grounded theory methods of systematic induction, interactive analysis, and comparative analysis define it (Charmaz, 2006). This method allows social researchers' studies to be relevant to the world by predicting social phenomena, and explaining them. Glaser and Strauss say their method is good for both researchers and practitioners because of these practical reasons (Glaser & Strauss, 1973).

With this method, researchers gather data using sources such as constructed interviews, unconstructed interviews, participant observation, etc. (Charmaz & Henwood, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1973; Oktay, 2012). Therefore, I gathered 70 CEO interviews from the *New York Times*' column, "Corner Office," a secondary resource. "Corner Office" is a feature about leadership and management of different companies and organizations. Adam Bryant, a former senior writer and business editor at *Newsweek* magazine and a Pulitzer Prize winner, who also has been a business

reporter, deputy business editor, deputy national editor, and senior editor for the *New York Times*, publishes two interviews each week for his column (Bryant, 2009). “Corner Office” is a great column, where one can learn how present-day leaders manage their companies to achieve success. Each column consists of one interview with a CEO, and it features a CEO’s leadership style, his or her company culture, and how he or she hires. Having interviews with these leaders is almost impossible for a college student. But thanks to Bryant’s column, I could learn their work ethics and management styles described in their own words. Because of these reasons, I chose “Corner Office” to find repeating themes of congruence between leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring criteria.

I started with the first “Corner Office” article that was published on March 13, 2009. I decided to work retrospectively because I wanted to gather relatively “pure” data that had not been influenced by previous interviews that were featured in the column. The 70 interviews took place between March 13, 2009, and July 10, 2010. There were each 43 male and 27 female interviewees. The firms varied from Internet-based companies to Fortune 500 companies.

These 70 “Corner Office” interviews were used for an initial coding. During this initial coding process, I highlighted key words, key phrases, or direct quotes of each CEO that provided insights into their leadership style, organizational culture, or hiring practices. Line-by-line initial coding method like this research’s minimizes the forcing of data into preconceived categories (Charmaz & Henwood, 2008). An example of a highlighted interview is in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Example of a CEO interview with highlights

The second thing I look for is if I were to get on an airplane with this guy or gal, would I want to fly across the Atlantic with them? **Are they nice people to be with?** Do you want to be with them? Because I find that people that don't relate well to anybody, from owners or board members to peers to direct reports to folks that actually work for a living in the trenches, they don't succeed very well. You can usually tell that by asking, "What do you enjoy doing? What do you do as a hobby?" And ask a few questions to the people that work around them, and you get a pretty good sense pretty quickly.

**Q.** How do you run meetings?

**A.** We tend to run meetings a bit like a food fight here at CCMP. **Anybody can have an idea or a thought**, and the best idea wins. And so there's not a lot of formality or pomp and circumstance around it, at all. It's a very **informal** and **very free-flowing** dialogue.

**Q.** Is it ever an issue for you that you want to make sure you're getting straight talk from your direct reports?

**A.** Yes, no question. Some people that were brought up in the hierarchy of life have trouble with that. But they don't survive very long, honestly, in the companies I've run. I usually **tell people upfront what to expect**, and that I really **want their feedback and their ideas**, and if they think I've got a hair out of place or food stuck in my teeth, gosh, I want to know that.

**Q.** Was there an insight you had that, looking back, put your career on a different trajectory?

**A.** Some of it was luck. But I remember something that Mitt Romney told me at Bain. He said: "Greg, in any interaction, you either gain share or lose share. So treat every interaction as kind of a precious moment in time." And I've always remembered that, because I think it's really true. So what I've tried to do is have more conversations where I'm gaining share than losing share, to **try to add value to everything** I **pass on any opportunity I see that I can't add value on**.

**Q.** Tell me about your as-good-as-it-gets moment in business.

**A.** Being able to hand people checks, whether it was an on-time bonus to say thank you for helping us be on time, or whether it was a car for having perfect attendance, or just being able to hand employees checks. At Burger King we were able to do that, too. We had some big moments financially where we were able to **just hand out checks** to employees who helped us get there. Those are the best days, I think.

Kacie Lee 7/5/13 11:59 PM  
**Comment [18]:** Hiring

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:01 AM  
**Comment [19]:** Culture

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:01 AM  
**Comment [20]:** Culture

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:01 AM  
**Comment [21]:** Culture

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 7:35 PM  
**Comment [22]:** Leadership

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 7:35 PM  
**Comment [23]:** Leadership

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:04 AM  
**Comment [24]:** Business goal

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:04 AM  
**Comment [25]:** Business goal

Kacie Lee 7/6/13 12:08 AM  
**Comment [26]:** Business goal

After highlighting every interview, I made a separate document to list the highlighted parts. Listing was done after each interview because I did not want to lose the true meaning of the highlighted words that were sometimes too vague to understand when taken out of context. Every company had its own list. The highlighted words, phrases, and quotes were listed accordingly under three categories: culture, leadership style, and hiring. Each company also had three additional lists including the name of the company/CEO, business goal(s), and basic company information including size, type of industry, location of its headquarter, and company type (public, private, limited, etc.). These three additional categories were added to enhance my understanding of each CEO's leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring criteria. An example of a list of highlighted key words, phrases, and direct quotes can be seen in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Example of the list of highlighted words, phrases, and direct quotes

Name

eBay (John Donahoe)

Information

- Public
- 31,500 employees (March 2013)
- Headquarter: San Jose, California; Several international offices including in India, Germany, UK, South Korea, and China
- Internet, Online retailing

Culture

- feedback's a gift
- open, objective feedback
- direct in communication
- don't sugarcoat
- get together
- direct
- cross-functional teams (not a team where an idea gets killed by people higher than you)
- agile development [sharp and clear idea who can and needs to be involved in making decision]

Business goal

- make quick decisions [even if not perfect, adjust down the road]
- compete for each customer's business and loyalty
- being more endurance, tougher, more resilience, and less mistakes
- take a swing (make bold moves when needed because there is no such thing as success without any mistakes)
- "You can't play in the major league without having a lot of failures."

Leadership

- help them help themselves (Because a leader can't change an employee's way of thinking or ability.)
- illuminate what needs to get done
- get them into a role where they can do what they're good at
- feedback's a gift
- not afraid of feedback
- reach into the company and talk to different people at different levels
- get together with other employees

Hiring

- Q) "When have you failed and what did you learn from it?"
- Q) "If I were to talk to your boss, your work colleagues, people who work for you, what would they say about you?"
- Q) "If I were to ask those same people what are your priorities? Where do you need to learn, grow, develop?"

After initial coding was completed, I began with focused coding. Focused coding involves taking the most frequent and/or significant initial codes to use for studying, comparing, sorting, and synthesizing large amounts of data (Charmaz & Henwood, 2008). To perform focused coding, 70 CEOs' lists of words were first collated into three separate document files: leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring. The leadership style file contained only leadership style quotes; the organizational culture file included culture related quotes; and the hiring file contained only hiring quotes. This was done to perform focused coding more effectively. I read through each file to find repeating ideas under each category. According to grounded theory, data comparison lets researchers come up with theoretical understandings and interpretations of them. The method proceeds by creating interpretations of the data and assessing the emerging analyses (Charmaz & Henwood, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1973; Oktay, 2012). In this study, interpretations of the data and the emerging analyses are represented with repeating leadership style, culture, and hiring categories. Repeated ideas were grouped accordingly, while ideas that did not fit were sifted out. Only the ideas that were worth researching because of their repetitive nature were coded.

Moving on to categorizing is necessary for capturing the essence of data. While Glaser does not think using theoretical background is needed for conceptualization, Corbin and Strauss assert the need for using theoretical frameworks. Even though the Grounded Theory is based on open coding and freedom of data analysis, Corbin and Strauss believe that literature background is essential for categorizing. They say that using theoretical frameworks determines commitment for research. Also, by referring other literature, a researcher can explore the core concepts and ideas across various study groups, which helps to add more depth, meaning, level of abstraction, and breadth to a study (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). To give more depth and breadth to this study, I

used previous research on leadership styles, organizational culture, and personality. Each research was used to label the codes so I could both capture the nuance in interviewees' answers and give more validation to each code. To code hiring criteria, the Adjective Check List (ACL) was used (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). To code organizational culture, the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) was used (O'Reilly et al., 1991). For leadership style codes, I used both the ACL and Goleman's Six Leadership Styles (Goleman, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). After completing the two-step-coding, I used correlation analysis to find congruence.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Results**

After reading hundreds of highlighted words, phrases, and quotes of 70 interviewed CEOs, I came up with 5 organizational culture categories and 14 subcategories, 5 leadership categories and 34 subcategories, and 11 hiring categories with 25 subcategories. Each category was coded numerically and each subcategory was coded alphabetically.

#### **Organizational culture coding**

For organizational culture categories, I used the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), which was theorized by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell. In their research, they came up with the OCP in order to investigate person-culture fit (O'Reilly et al., 1991). The OCP is based on extensive academia review and practitioner-oriented research on organizational values and culture (e.g. Davis, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kilmann, 1984; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985). This inventory was a great assessment for this study because of its proven validity and fit to the purpose of this study (Kummerow & Kirby, 2014). In the OCP study, 26 value statements had strong correlational relationships with seven concurring culture factors with loadings greater than .40 (O'Reilly et al., 1991).

I chose to work with these 26 value statements because the items are proven to have statistically significant meanings describing an organizational culture. These factors include innovation, stability, respect for people, outcome orientation, attention to detail, team orientation, and aggression (O'Reilly et al., 1991). I matched the 26 OCP value statements with the nuance of each CEO's highlighted phrases on culture. As a result, there were five out of seven culture factors that captured 70 CEOs' answers: innovation, respect for people, outcome orientation, team orientation, and aggression. Stability and attention to detail were not included because no

CEO used the characterizations of these two factors to explain his or her culture. Each of the five factors have subcategories that were derived from the 26 adjectives. Organizational culture codes are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Organizational culture codes

Organizational culture codes			
1	Innovation	4	Team orientation
1a	Innovative	4a	People orientation
1b	Experimenting	4b	Collaboration
1c	Risk taking	4c	Team orientation
		4d	Supportiveness
2	Respect for people	4e	Opportunities for personal growth
2a	Respect for individual		
2b	Fairness	5	Aggression
		5a	Outspoken
3	Outcome orientation		
3a	Achievement orientation		
3b	Action orientation		
3c	Result orientation		

### Leadership style coding

For leadership style criteria, I used two literatures: the Adjective Check List (ACL) developed by Gough and Heilbrun, and Goleman's Six Leadership Styles (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983; Goleman, 2000; Goleman et al., 2002). First, I utilized the ACL because I wanted to code leaders' answers based on a personality scale. The ACL contains 300 adjectives and adjectival phrases that are used to describe personal characteristics on a daily basis. The ACL is based on Murray's need-press system, which asserts that personalities are a reflection of each person's unique personal needs (Murray, 1938). The assessment's validity has been proved by a myriad of researchers for many years (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983).

The ACL was an adequate tool for the research because it is a great assessment for determining personalities of the CEOs. Furthermore, the ACL was used by several leadership studies. For example, Simonton use the ACL to perform a research on 39 American presidents'

personalities and leadership effectiveness (1986). The scale was also used to measure and predict military leadership of Italian and the U.S. military officers (Gough, Lazzari, Fioravanti, & Stracca, 1978). To see how Total Quality Management can be achieved and enhanced by certain types of managers, Mani used the ACL for her research (1995). Because this study involves coding leaders' characteristics and leadership styles, I used the ACL. By using the list of 300 personality adjectives, I could match the leaders' styles. There are five scales in the ACL – Modus Operandi, Need, Topical, Transactional Analysis, and Origen-Intellectance—, but I concentrated only on the Need scales because these scales highlight the theory of Murray and personal behaviors within a normal population (Edwards, 1954). I believed this to be the best ACL scales because leadership styles are a reflection of a leader's need to achieve success. The need scales include 15 scales: achievement, dominance, endurance, order, intraception, nurturance, affiliation, heterosexuality, exhibition, autonomy, aggression, change, succorance, abasement, and deference. Based on Q-sort method, each scale has its own correlated adjectives (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). Gough and Heilbrun have listed both positively and negatively correlated items out of 300 adjectives under each scale (1983). For instance, under achievement, positively correlated adjectives are ambitious, alert, determined, etc.; negatively correlated adjectives are careless, easy going, lazy, etc. Only the positively correlated items were used to match the descriptions of CEO styles in this study because what this research needed was matching CEOs' answers to the scales, not looking for mismatches. Out of 300 adjectives, 70 CEOs' answers could be coded with 34 adjectives.

Even though the ACL has proven its validity in leadership research, I brought Goleman's Six Leadership Styles to incorporate an emotional intelligence facet into my codes (Goleman, 2000; Goleman et al., 2002). For decades, many leadership researchers believed in the trait

theory of leadership. Trait theory presumes that there are certain personal qualities only leaders possess and make them effective (e.g. Bowden, 1926; Cowley, 1931; Kohs & Irle, 1920; Terman, 1904). But later researchers found little to no relationship between traits and leadership emergence and efficiency. Stogdill (1948) said mere possession of traits does not determine leader emergence. Zaccaro, Foti, and Kenney (1991) said trait theory was not enough to explain leadership emergence. House and Aditya (1997) asserted there were only a few, if any, universal traits that determined leadership effectiveness. After many researchers' disappointment on the usefulness of trait theory, the field of leadership studies turned to other factors that can affect leadership including behaviors and situations (Bass, 1990; Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Even though there are many updated leadership theories, I chose to work with Goleman's emotional intelligence and Six Leadership Styles (Goleman, 2000; Goleman, 2002). According to Goleman (2000), possessing emotional intelligence means having the ability to manage relationships and oneself effectively. Based on the consulting firm Hay/McBer's research on random sample of 3,871 executives selected from a database of more than 20,000 executives worldwide, Goleman found six leadership styles that have distinctively different emotional intelligence components from each other (Goleman, 2000; Goleman et al., 2002). According to his study, leadership styles had direct impact on atmosphere and financial performance, and the styles that created positive atmosphere brought about bigger revenue growth (Goleman, 2000). The Six Leadership Styles are visionary, coaching, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter, and commanding. Visionary leaders move people toward a vision along with them. Affiliative leaders focus on building harmonious relationships with people. Democratic leaders assert the importance of teamwork and bringing consensus through participation. Pacesetter leaders have a strong drive for achievement and competence. Coaching leaders develop employees for the

future (Goleman, 2000; Goleman et al., 2002). More detailed explanations of each leadership styles are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.

I believed that analysis of leadership styles that are connected with emotional intelligence would give a richer perspective to my codes and the study. CEOs' personalities coded with the ACL were congruent with the emotional intelligence competences under Goleman's Six Leadership Style. Due to this congruence, I could match Goleman's Six Leadership Styles and the characteristics of each CEO. Also, because trait theory is outdated, I did not want to use only the adjectives to differentiate each leadership style. Therefore, after coding 70 CEOs' leadership answers with the ACL, I distributed the coded adjectives into separate groups using the Six Leadership Styles. Goleman explained the detailed characteristics of each leadership style and I used that as a guidance to group the ACL-coded adjectives under the right leadership style (Goleman et al., 2002). Out of six leadership styles, only five styles were used for coding because no CEO indicated their leadership style as commanding. Leadership style codes are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Leadership style codes

Leadership style codes			
1	Visionary	4	Pacesetting
1a	Motivating	4a	Ambitious
1b	Confident	4b	Alert
1c	Daring	4c	Thorough
1d	Innovative	4d	Exemplary
1e	Act quickly	4e	Assertive
1f	Perceptive	4f	Efficient
1g	Responsible		
1h	Honest	5	Coaching
1i	Organized	5a	Active
1j	Rational	5b	Patient
		5c	Painstaking
2	Affiliative	5d	Persevering
2a	Sociable	5e	Curious
2b	Understanding	5f	Experienced
2c	Affectionate	5g	Trusting
2d	Appreciative	5h	Developing
2e	Helpful	5i	Dependable
2f	Considerate		
3	Democratic		
3a	Unassuming		
3b	Engaging		
3c	Team-oriented		

### Hiring criteria coding

The ACL was also used for hiring criteria. I decided to use the ACL because when companies hire future employees, they look for the fit between organizations and applicants. When matching the fit, organizations see the characteristics of applicants because personality can be one way of measuring one's values, goals, and attitudes (Kristof, 1996). The ACL can also give employment recommendations with its power to measure behavioral attributes (Vidoni, 1977). R. Hogan, J. Hogan, and Roberts (1996) argued that personality assessments like the ACL are suitable for pre-employment screening. Because of these reasons, it has been used as a reliable assessment of employee characteristics and behavioral attributes since its conception

(e.g. Hollander, 1959; John, 1990). For instance, a study involving 206 nurses at a large medical institute indicated that nurses who had personality fit had a higher job satisfaction than those who did not. The researchers, Day and Bedeian, used the ACL to assess employee personality (1995). My usage of the ACL for coding hiring criteria, therefore, is reasonable.

As with the leadership style coding process, I specifically used the need scales because employees' personalities can be seen as a reflection for their need to achieve their goals. Out of 15 need scales, 11 of them were used for coding: achievement, affiliation, aggression, change, deference, dominance, endurance, exhibition, intraception, nurturance, and order. To make the codes clearer to understand for the majority of people who are not familiar with the ACL, I changed unfamiliar terms such as "exhibition" and "intraception" into "extraversion" and "insightfulness." "Exhibition" was changed into "extraversion" based on Piedmont, McCrae, and Costa's (1991) correlational study between the ACL and the five-factor model involving two separate studies with 414 undergraduate students and 445 adult volunteers. According to their research, exhibition was statistically significant and positively correlated to the five-factor model's extraversion (Piedmont et al., 1991). Thus, I changed "exhibition" to "extraversion" for a better understanding. The change of "intraception" into "insightfulness" was also based on a previous study. Tolor's (1961) research, which surveyed 100 psychiatric aides from a hospital, found positive relationship between insightfulness and intraception. According to this study, intraception and insightfulness shared conceptually related variables (Tolor, 1961). As a result, I could change "intraception" to "insightfulness." Four other scales —heterosexuality, autonomy, succorance, and abasement— were not used because none of the CEOs gave answers that fit to these four scales. Out of 300 adjectives, only 25 of the positively correlated items were used to

match the descriptions of desired employee characteristics, because all 70 CEOs' answers could be coded with only 25 adjectives. The codes of hiring criteria are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Hiring criteria codes

Hiring criteria codes			
1	Achievement	7	Endurance
1a	Capable	7a	Persevering
1b	Ambitious	7b	Persistence
1c	Alert		
		8	Extraversion
2	Affiliation	8a	Humorous
2a	Adaptable	8b	Energetic
2b	Sociable		
		9	Insightfulness
3	Aggression	9a	Intelligent
3a	Outspoken	9b	Curious
		9c	Clear-thinking
4	Change	9d	Experienced
4a	Daring		
4b	Unconventional	10	Nurturance
4c	Innovative	10a	Cooperative
		10b	Affectionate
5	Deference	10c	Honest
5a	Fit		
5b	Unassuming	11	Order
		11a	Efficient
6	Dominance		
6a	Dominant		
6b	Motivating		

An example of the highlighted words from the interviews is listed in Appendix A. The list includes representative words from the interviews that I used to establish leadership, culture, and hiring categories. The descriptions of leadership styles, culture, and hiring criteria are listed in Appendix B. This list contains what each category means in detail. Both Appendix A and B are included to promote easier understanding of the coding categories.

After establishing leadership style, culture, and hiring codes, I coded each company accordingly. For example, if company A had a motivating leadership, I put 1a, which is the code for this type of leadership style. An example of a company coding is in Table 4.

Table 4. Company coding example

	Company name	Organizational culture	Leadership	Hiring
1	CCMP Capital	3a/3c/4a/4b	1a/2c/2e/3a/4f/5h	1a/9a
2	Macy's	1a/3a/3c/4b	1f/1g/1i/2a/2b/2f/5f	1b/9a
3	Wal-Mart	3a	1h/2a/2c/2d/4a/5g	7a/8b
4	Best Buy	4a/4b/4c	1h/2a/2e/2f/3c/4b/4f/5a	1b/5a/9d
5	Ford Motor	4b/4c	1a/1j/2e/3a/3c/4a/4f/5a/5h	1b/4a/5a/7a/10a

Upon completing the first company coding, I realized analyzing correlations based on subcategories would be too tedious and inefficient because there were too many subcategories. Therefore, I disregarded subcategories, but focused only on the big categories. The subcategories could be adequately grouped with the ACL, the OCP, and the Six Leadership Styles. The big labels were coded in an Excel file to be used for SPSS analysis. "1" indicated the fit for each criterion, and "0" indicated no fit. For example, in case of Macy's organizational culture category, its codes 1a, 3a, 3c, 4b were coded as "1" for culture category 1 (innovation), "1" for category 3 (Outcome orientation), and "1" for category 4 (team orientation). Finally, to test the hypothesis, I conducted frequency analysis and simple bivariate correlation analysis using SPSS. Table 5 shows frequencies of each variable.

Table 5. Variable frequencies

	Frequency	Percent
<b>Organization culture</b>		
Innovative	22	31.4
Respect for people	12	17.1
Outcome-oriented	41	58.6
Team-oriented	63	90.0
Aggressive	5	7.1
<b>Leadership</b>		
Visionary	59	84.3
Affiliative	62	88.6
Democratic	47	67.1
Pacesetting	63	90.0
Coaching	68	97.1
<b>Hiring criteria</b>		
Achievement	61	87.1
Affiliation	27	38.6
Aggressiveness	3	4.3
Change	27	38.6
Deference	44	62.9
Dominance	18	25.7
Endurance	26	37.1
Extraversion	12	17.1

Insightfulness	32	45.7
Nurturance	31	44.3
Order	3	4.3

Note: N=70

Among 25 variables, coaching leadership has the highest frequency of 97.1%. Out of 70 companies, only two companies' CEOs did not pick this leadership style as their attribute. The variables that have the least frequency were tied. Both hire for aggression and hire for order have 4.3%. Only 3 CEOs designated these attributes to be desirable when hiring.

In the culture category, team-oriented culture has the most cases of yes (90%). 63 organizations said they have a team-oriented culture. In the hiring category, hire for achievement has the highest percentage of yes (87.1%). CEOs of 61 companies identified that they pick new employees based on how achievement-oriented the applicant are.

Table 6 shows a simple bivariate correlation matrix between the variables.

Table 6. Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
<b>Culture</b>																					
1. Innovative																					
2. Respect for people	.02																				
3. Outcome-oriented	.20	-.00																			
4. Team-oriented	-.08	-.10	.01																		
5. Aggressive	-.07	-.13	.01	-.09																	
<b>Leadership</b>																					
6. Visionary	.04	-.12	.04	-.01	-.03																
7. Affiliative	-.14	-.08	-.21	.33**	-.08	-.16															
8. Democratic	-.12	-.09	-.09	.07	.08	.20	.04														
9. Pacesetter	-.29*	-.10	.01	.05	.09	.25*	.03	.27*													
10. Coaching	-.07	.08	.03	.23	.05	-.07	.21	.25*	-.06												
<b>Hiring</b>																					
11. Achievement	.26*	.18	.02	.01	.11	.07	-.14	-.09	-.13	-.07											
12. Affiliation	.03	-.05	-.05	.07	.35**	-.06	.01	.18	.17	.14	.13										
13. Aggressiveness	-.14	.28**	.18	.07	.22	.09	.08	-.00	.07	.04	.08	-.02									
14. Change	.29*	.19	-.11	-.23	.01	.02	-.08	.05	-.13	-.04	.13	.16	-.02								
15. Deference	-.12	-.12	.01	.14	-.02	-.09	.00	-.16	-.06	-.13	-.12	.06	.02	-.12							
16. Dominance	.10	.08	-.17	-.02	-.04	.07	.01	-.15	-.02	-.29*	.03	.00	-.12	.07	.05						
17. Endurance	-.01	.04	-.01	-.24*	.02	.17	-.28*	-.03	-.04	-.22	-.15	-.06	.13	.24*	.04	.29*					

---

18. Extraversion	-.06	.20	-.00	-.23	.17	.20	.04	.08	.15	.08	-.05	.11	.47**	.11	-.20	.08	.28*			
19. Insightfulness	.18	.20	-.10	.12	-.14	.00	.06	.03	-.08	.16	.01	.10	.09	.10	-.01	.38**	.07	.12		
20. Nurturance	.14	.13	.05	.10	.09	-.09	-.04	.01	.11	-.19	-.00	.12	.10	-.06	.21	.27*	.15	.05	.05	
21. Order	.01	-.10	.04	.07	.22	-.10	.08	-.15	.07	.04	-.13	.12	.30*	.12	.02	-.12	.13	.09	-.19	-.05

---

Note: N= 70, \* p≤.05, \*\* p≤.01

I hypothesized that there would be congruence relationships between leadership style, organizational culture, and hiring criteria. The starred items indicate statistically significant bivariate association between variables. Among the relationships between leadership and culture, there were two statistically significant correlations between “Affiliative leadership” and “Team-oriented culture” ( $r=.33$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ), and “Pacesetting leadership” and “Innovative culture” ( $r= -.29$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

Between leadership and hiring, there two statistically significant correlations: “Coaching leadership” and “Hiring for dominance” ( $r= -.29$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), and “Affiliative leadership” and “Hiring for endurance” ( $r= -.28$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

There were five statistically significant correlations between culture and hiring criteria: “Innovative culture” and “Hiring for achievement” ( $r=.26$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), “Aggressive culture” and “Hiring for affiliation” ( $r=.35$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ), “Respect for people culture” and “Hiring for aggression” ( $r=.28$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ), “Innovative culture” and “Hiring for change” ( $r=.29$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), and “Team-oriented culture” and “Hiring for endurance” ( $r= -.24$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

Out of nine correlations, seven of them were congruent and two of them were incongruent. Based on these mixed results with both congruent and incongruent relationships, I find partial support for the hypothesis. In Table 7 and Table 8, I have listed congruent and incongruent relationships separately.

Table 7. Congruent relationships

Congruent relationships	
<b>Leadership style – Organizational culture</b>	
Affiliative leadership – Team-oriented culture	$r=.239$ ( $p\leq.01$ )
Pacesetting leadership – Innovative culture	$r= -.287$ ( $p\leq.05$ )
<b>Leadership style – Hiring criteria</b>	
Coaching leadership – Hiring for dominance	$r= -.291$ ( $p\leq.05$ )
Affiliative leadership – Hiring for endurance	$r= -.281$ ( $p\leq.05$ )
<b>Organizational culture – Hiring criteria</b>	
Innovative culture – Hiring for achievement	$r=.260$ ( $p\leq.05$ )
Innovative culture – Hiring for change	$r=.285$ ( $p\leq.05$ )
Team-oriented culture – Hiring for endurance	$r= -.237$ ( $p\leq.05$ )

Table 8. Incongruent relationships

Incongruent relationships	
<b>Organizational culture – Hiring criteria</b>	
Aggressive culture – Hiring for affiliation	$r=.350$ ( $p\leq.01$ )
Respect for people culture – Hiring for aggression	$r=.278$ ( $p\leq.01$ )

## Chapter 5

### Discussion

Before describing the relationships, it has to be stated that my hypothesis was partially supported because of the coexistence of both congruent and incongruent relationships in my result.

In this section, I discuss the correlational relationships among the factors. First of all, I examine seven congruent relationships. “Affiliative leadership” and “Team-oriented culture” have a positively significant correlation. Affiliative leaders are those who share their feelings openly and have collaborative competence. These leaders believe personal relationships are the stepping-stone for building a stronger team. This type of leaders builds close personal relationships with employees to give them an emotional support. They look after employees whenever they have a hard time. They believe that empathy is a fundamental component in truly meaningful personal relationships (Goleman et al., 2002). By having affectionate relationships with employees, affiliative leaders boost employee loyalty and collaboration (Gleeson, 2013). Team-oriented culture emphasizes collaboration and cooperation among employees. It revolves around people-oriented mind, behaviors, goals, and teams (O’Reilly et al., 1991). Because both affiliative leadership and team-oriented culture elaborate the importance of working together, their positive relationship is understandable.

The second congruent relationship between leadership style and organizational culture is between “Pacesetting leadership” and “Innovative culture”. Pacesetting leaders strive for excellence all the time and expect their subordinates to be the same. They are impatient with poorly performing employees and hardly give chances for them to try once more. Their goal is to get everything done perfectly and efficiently. This kind of leadership does not promote trust

between leaders and employees (Goleman et al., 2002). Especially in an innovative culture where people are encouraged to be brave enough to embrace changes and challenges, pacesetter leadership does not fit at all (Goleman et al., 2002; Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). Because pacesetter leaders do not tolerate mistakes, they tend to micromanage. Having a fear for making mistakes means these leaders are not brave enough to explore outside of their specialty. Also, their lack of trust in their subordinates' abilities blocks employees from having different and innovative ideas (Goleman et al., 2002). As a result, a negative correlational relationship between pacesetter leadership and innovative culture is no surprise.

“Coaching leadership” and “Hiring for dominance” have a negatively correlated relationship. Dominant employees have a strong presence in their groups with their leadership skills. They motivate their fellow co-workers and actively engage in meetings. They are the people who already have enough experience to be influential in a group (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). On the other hand, coaching leaders are the ones who desire to develop employees for their future. They help people to identify their dreams, goals, strengths, and weaknesses. Coaching leaders' number one priority is making employees to get closer to their goals with leaders' help (Goleman et al., 2002). However, dominant employees are already experienced, and they are likely to be the ones who do not need to be coached or developed anymore. If an employee has already reached a plateau in one's career and is strong enough to be influential in a group, coaching leaders will lose interest in him or her because they do not see any developing points. Therefore, negatively correlated coaching leadership and hiring for dominance have a congruent relationship.

“Innovative culture” and “Hiring for achievement” have a statistically significant correlation relationship. Achievement-oriented employees are goal-driven people who are

determined to do well. They also have initiative power to come up with ideas that will support them to achieve their visions. Innovative culture promotes people to be brave enough to embrace changes and challenges (O'Reilly et al., 1991). Creativity alone cannot bring about innovation; ability to initiate and implement creative ideas is needed for making culture truly innovative. Implementation requires strong will to step closer to the planned goals and the initiative to execute the idea (Amabile, 2000; Kanter, 1988; Miron, Erez, & Naveh, 2004; Mumford & Gustafson, 1988; Van de Ven, 1986). CEOs know that achievement-oriented people are the right fit for implementing creative ideas with their ambition, and this is why innovative culture is prone to hire employees who are achievement-oriented.

“Innovative culture” is positively correlated with “Hiring for change.” Although innovative culture thinks implementation is crucial for sustaining innovation, creativity is a necessary precursor for this type of culture (Amabile, 1983; Amabile, 2000). Change-oriented employees are creative, and not afraid of taking risks (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). Creativity is the core value of an innovative culture, and this elucidates the strongly positive relationship between innovative culture and hiring change-oriented applicants.

“Team-oriented culture” and “Hiring for endurance” also has a congruent relationship. Enduring employees are noted for their perseverance and persistence (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). While their tendency to stick to their values and beliefs can be helpful to go on with existing projects, their persistence can be a blocker against collaboration. For achieving collaboration, one should know how to accept different ideas and know when to bend their beliefs (West, 2012). If an employee does not accept diversity of thoughts, team-oriented culture will collapse with absence of collaboration. Hence, team-oriented culture is not likely to hire employees based on their endurance.

The last congruent relationship is between “Affiliative leadership” and “Hiring for endurance.” As noted above, affiliative leaders focus on building strong personal relationships. They put much of their energy to emotionally support their subordinates. To give sufficient emotional support, affiliative leaders will even give up on marching toward work goals (Goleman et al., 2002). On the other hand, enduring employees feel strong responsibility for reaching goals and working conscientiously. Because they have had to overcome several failures before, they are more resilient than other employees. Hardships can hardly beat up this kind of employees (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). Although enduring employees already have resilience and persistence to carry on even in harsh situations, they need continuous attention from their leaders. To promote their positive attributes further, an organization needs to provide opportunities for career development, self-development, and continuous learning (Collard, Epperheimer, & Saign, 1996). By integrating developing opportunities and work goals, enduring employees will feel more satisfied with their work (Waterman, Waterman, & Collard, 1994). Affiliative leaders do not provide these kinds of developing opportunities, but mainly emotional and personal support (Goleman et al., 2002). There is a big mismatch between these two types of people. One is concentrating on personal relationships and the other needs constant chances for growing. Therefore, negative correlation between affiliative leadership and hiring for enduring employees is supported and congruent.

Incongruent relationships should be highlighted for the purpose of this research, too. “Aggressive culture” and “Hiring for affiliation” have a statistically significant positive correlational relationship. Aggressive culture is based on competitiveness and outperforming other companies. By having frequent and passionate debates and negotiations, aggressive culture organizations find ways to defeat competitors (O’Reilly et al., 1991). In a very different note,

affiliative people focus on maintaining amicable personal relationships and caring for each other (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). In an aggressive culture, everyone is an enemy and someone to beat for personal victory. Group members who admit their shortcomings and seek extra help from their co-workers are seen as incompetent and weak (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988). This inharmonious relationship between affiliative people and aggressive culture should have given negatively correlated coefficient. However, in this study, they have an exceptionally statistically strong positive relationship. The reason for this unexpected relationship is difficult to explain and understand. Hence, they have an incongruent relationship.

For the relationship between “Respect for people culture” and “Hiring for aggression,” there is a positively strong correlational relationship. Respect for people culture values each individual’s uniqueness and individuality, but there is no strong driving force for employees to achieve certain goals (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; O’Reilly et al., 1991). Meanwhile, aggressive people are those who are not afraid of speaking their mind. These people are not yes men but rather critically approach to problems. Because they are very outspoken, they tend to be careless about what others feel and think. If hurting others with critical words is needed to speak up their mind, aggressive people will not hesitate from doing so (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). Their critical mind and audacity to speak up can be helpful in some situations, but in a culture where individual rights are respected, aggressive employees are misfit. However, interestingly enough, the result from this research shows a positive relationship between two. This cannot be explained with existing literature. Thus, it is an incongruent relationship.

Besides these congruent and incongruent trends, the study found the most popular categories leaders picked. The most frequently picked answer was “Coaching leadership” (97.1%). Out of 70 interviewees, 68 of them identified themselves as a coaching leader. On the

same horizon, “Team-oriented culture” was the most picked label from the culture categories (90%). These findings match another study based on the surveys with 247 senior executives from all over the world. 97% of these company leaders identified that collaboration is inevitable for company success. They say collaboration is a must to survive in a complex global environment filled with new technology (Criswell & Martin, 2007). Incongruously, today’s culture is based on individuality rather than teamwork, but leaders label themselves and their culture to be team-oriented. While most of the leaders said collaboration is necessary, only 47% of 115 senior executives believed their leaders were skilled collaborators (Criswell & Martin, 2007). I assumed that the gap between the reality and ideality is the cause for the lack of truly collaborative organizations and leaders.

For hiring, “Hiring for achievement” was picked the most (87.1%). I guess the reason why this is so is that leaders do not want to waste time teaching required skills for newly employed individuals and motivating them to work hard. If applicants are already task-prepared and goal-driven, CEOs can save training time and use it for something more important instead. In previous studies, researchers said that hiring only for skills, knowledge, and abilities does not work anymore if there is no cultural fit between applicants and companies (Bowen et al., 2001; Chatman & Cha, 2003). But based on my research, leaders still think skills are basic requirements for newly hired employees. People say today’s CEOs are no longer traditional, but in my opinion, this is a premature assumption because leaders obviously still want skilled employees.

There are several reasons why I could not find more congruence trends. The first one is secondary source bias. I conducted this research with Adam Bryant’s CEO interview column, “Corner Office” from *The New York Times*. Even though Bryant interviewed these leaders in

person, there is a possibility that his bias was included in his column. Of course a reporter's number one priority is reporting only the truth. But depending on a reporter's beliefs or focus, same word can be interpreted in different ways. If this was the case, I was in a vulnerable position because the coding was based on already-biased study material.

Another possible bias comes from the leaders. There might have been a social desirability bias (e.g. Chung & Monroe, 2003; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). There is a chance that the leaders did not participate in their interviews honestly. They might have used descriptions that do not really fit their leadership style, organizational culture, or hiring criteria just to make themselves look good to the readers. Because readers have no power to test the truth of what the leaders say, CEOs might have made up good images for their public standing. If this was the case, it might have been the reason why I could not find more significant congruence, particularly, in the leadership category. Most of the respondents said the same characteristics and values. In reality, it could be because leaders have similar traits, or maybe just because they knew what the readers wanted to hear. There is also a chance they might have copied previous interviews' "good-looking" answers, which might have corrupted the data. Just by reading scripted interviews on a newspaper, I could not validate the honesty of the leaders during the interviews.

The last limitation is from the interview itself. I wanted to capture the hiring criteria and culture for each organization as a whole. But neither Bryant nor the CEOs specified whom their hiring criteria and culture were for. I assumed they were talking about their organizational culture and hiring criteria as whole. There is a chance, however, these leaders only depicted culture of high rankers and hiring criteria for leadership positions. In some cases, leaders' hiring requirements for senior executives may affect the entire company's hiring tactics. If this was so, I can assume that the leaders' comments on hiring and culture capture the big picture. But on the

other hand, if leaders' hiring criteria is applied only to the people on the top, their interviews might have corrupted the study's analysis.

### **Limitations**

Being a study based on a single rater, this thesis might have been limited from getting more meaningful congruence and objective results. I was the only one who read the interviews, sorted out the key words, made categories, and coded. In order to minimize single rater bias, I went over the interviews and categories multiple times. However, there cannot be 100% objectivity when there is only one rater because peer review and amend processes are eliminated.

Also, if there were more data available for determining hiring criteria, the thesis might have been able to find more congruence. Because CEOs are not the sole people who hire applicants, they might have not pictured detailed hiring criteria. One interview can hardly explain company wise hiring criteria perfectly. If there were further interviews with CEOs or human resources department, I could have found stronger relationship between leadership and hiring criteria, and culture and hiring criteria.

The lack of phenomenon might have affected the results of this thesis, too. Culture is such a complex idea that cannot be explained only one person's words. If this thesis included vast amount of people's views on their organizational culture, the study could have succeeded finding stronger congruence. In previous organizational culture studies, researchers used a company wise assessment on culture intensity and consensus to identify each organization's central values (Enz, 1988; Saffold, 1988). Only when an organizational value is shared across units and levels, it can be considered being a part of culture (Weiner, 1988). Culture is formed by many people over time; therefore, one interview by a CEO cannot give perfectly objective and detailed descriptions of organizational culture.

Lastly, I could have gone further with the research by adding more factors such as company size, industry sector, location, gender of CEO, profitability, age of a company, etc. These various factors are strong enough to make crucial differences in the results of this thesis. If I have added more variables, this study could have gained more insights and added more values to current academia.

### **Implications and future research**

This research has a potential to go beyond this thesis. With the research, I found seven congruence trends, but this topic needs more room to grow. As noted above, some of the limitations might have stopped me from achieving more than what I wanted. For future researchers, if they can conduct research without the limitations stated above, they will have a better chance of finding more congruence trends.

Research on leadership, organizational culture, and hiring is constantly taking place; but finding those that connect the dots between these three is difficult. Theoretically, these three are linked positively. Now it is the time to put more efforts into studying the relationships between them in practical settings. In the real business world, what people need is not mere academic persuasion, but practical evidence that says something is worthy of implementing in leading companies.

As I insisted above, today's market is fiercely competitive. More detailed research on this topic will give employers, companies, leaders, and CEOs a better idea why the alignment is important and how to achieve it. By finding out more congruence, leaders will increase their understanding of these trends, the challenges they create and face, and their potential impact on how to make organizations successful. At the same time, applicants and employees can train themselves to be more desirable assets in companies by reading the points about what employers

really want. Everyone in in different facets of organizations will be better off with further research on this topic. This will truly be win-win research for both employers and employees.

**Appendix A: Highlighted words from the interviews**  
(Excerpts from Adam Bryant's "Corner Office")

**A. Organizational culture**

1. Innovative culture

*1a. Innovation*

- "What are we going to do next? What fields are we going to work in? What are our new big things?"
- Allow people who have a creative idea to run with it
- The creatives are absolutely the center of gravity
- Never be afraid to change, even when we're at the top of our game
- Change is going around all the time

*1b. Experimenting*

- interest in new technology
- using Web 2.0 technologies

*1c. Risk taking*

- Remain optimistic in the face of a challenge
- Allow people to take risks and grow their career
- "It's O.K. to take a chance. It's O.K. to try, and if it doesn't work it's O.K."

2. Respect for people culture

*2a. Respect for individual*

- Environment of respect for their opinions, their needs, their concerns
- Mutual respect: "I've got your back. We're going to create a family. We're going to cover for each other."
- Honored for being who you are
- Where people can expose themselves (Be themselves)
- Recognize and celebrate each person's individuality
- True personalities to shine in the workplace environment
- "Employees first"
- Inverted the pyramid of the organization
- Reverse accountability (Not where people rely on the C.E.O., but the other way.)

*2b. Fairness*

- Multinational
- Almost all of the people on our staff have traveled all around the world and have lived everywhere

3. Outcome-oriented culture

*3a. Achievement orientation*

- Truly staying focused on our core mission

- Smart objectives — not too many, four or five.
- If you are not doing something that contributes to one of these 10 priorities, stop doing it
- Practical
- as few meetings as possible
- be and end on time
- carve through the agenda (whenever a meeting happens, set time and try to fit everything in set time and agenda)
- More alignment in terms of how everyone in the company is thinking.
- Have clear view of what they do for consumers
- “Our collective vision”
- Setting a goal that’s at the right intersection of ambitious and feasible
- Power of setting stretch goals, but within reach
- Clear, measurable goals
- People understand that it’s essentially their responsibility to have good ideas
- In a team, each person runs one’s part
- “O.K., this is where we want to go, and if we don’t achieve it, it’s O.K., we’ll try in another way to get there.”
- “There is no such thing as failure. You’re always learning. You gain experience.”
- Learn as much as employees can
- Learning
- Massive collaborative learning [by reviewing others’ works

### *3b. Action orientation*

- Our most important asset is our time
- Every once in a while a couple of people will say, “Yeah, I could use this time back,” and they get up and leave”
- “Once yes, implementation is really fast.”

### *3c. Results orientation*

- Culture of winning
- Go a lot further
- Strive really, really, really hard today not to work a sixth day
- Where people can put their best work

## 4. Team-oriented culture

### *4a. People orientation*

#### *1a. Having relationships with people*

- Connect with people
- Good quality of relationships that makes organization work
- People interaction
- Don’t be uncollegial
- Nice to each other
- People do their thing and the C.E.O. trust them
- People come to work for me
- Supports honesty

- Sincerely open
- “Without intellectual honesty, you can’t have a culture that’s willing to tolerate failure because people cling too much to an idea that likely will be bad or isn’t working and they feel like their reputation is tied up in it. They can’t admit failure.”
- A level of independence
- Not where somebody to tell you what to do and not think for yourself
- Liberating everybody to choose the means to the ends
- “Air of excitement”
- “We’ll love what we’re doing, have some laughs and a few beers, and it’s going to be O.K.”
- View culture as our No. 1 priority

#### *4b. Collaboration*

- Do great things together
- “If people worked together you would get a better result than if you were working independently.”
- Business review is an opportunity for people below him can discuss about where the company is heading
- The best ideas or important ideas or new ideas can come from anywhere in an organization
- Entrepreneurial environment to be able to exercise talent
- When employee coming up with an idea, “If you’re passionate about it, just run with it.”
- “Snowball effect”: once employees see other employees just doing stuff, then that lets them feel like they have more permission to run with their ideas.
- Cross-functional teams (not a team where an idea gets killed by people higher than you)
- No office hierarchies
- Any given moment any one of those people from the highest to the lowest can be the most important person that day in your operation
- A lot of back and forth
- Where people are comfortable talking
- Meaningful conversation with their manager
- “Be brief, be bright and be gone.”
- “Three slides, three points.”
- Express complete thoughts
- Clearer more concise
- If you want to say something, do it while you are in the room

#### *4c. Team orientation*

- “We” are very expansive
- “This is our culture”
- Give other people the chance to speak
- Open to what’s going on
- Not much that is distilled or screened
- One big open room
- Company-first kind of approach
- Time commitments
- Loyalty with team

*4d. Supportiveness*

- People have an innate need for well-deserved recognition
- Let those people who have worked on a project be out there in a meeting so everyone can see what kind of people you're building behind you
- "We promote somebody that we hope people say, 'It's about time' — that people have already been following them, and so organically they have gotten to the next level. Then we acknowledge it with a promotion." (Promote someone who really deserves it)

*4e. Opportunities for personal growth*

- developing people
- Honest about positive and negative feedback
- "These are the directional comments that people have about you." (People give direct comments on the C.E.O.)

## 5. Aggressive culture

*5a. Outspoken*

- Negotiation
- Passionate, long, frequent meetings

**B. Leadership style**

## 1. Visionary leadership

*1a. Daring*

- Open to new challenges
- Don't be afraid
- "I think best when I'm under adversity."
- Willingness to take risks
- Taking more risk
- Taking some calculated risks

*1b. Innovative*

- Change even when you think all the cylinders are clicking and everything's right
- Constantly look for how to do it better
- Being creative and innovative

*1c. Act quickly*

- Respond quickly
- Think on feet
- Make decisions quicker on the spot

*1d. Perceptive*

- Confidence in your gut feeling
- Get instinct that helps making difficult decisions
- Go with your gut sometimes. Trust and believe yourself.

*Ie. Motivating*

- Decide how I motivate my executive team to help me carry out my vision and my goals
- Make people happy to be part of my team.
- Making the team have a hunger to do something
- Let people be at their best

*If. Confident*

- “Be confident, not certain.”
- Pretty comfortable with being in a situation that doesn’t look right
- Making the best of the state of chaos

*Ig. Responsible*

- Pay careful attention to make sure everybody was just doing the right thing
- People come work for me (Responsible over her employees)
- Let go and still make sure everything happens

*Ih. Honest*

- Insulate people from things that really happen
- If you don’t know something, it’s just so much better to say so.
- Be just who he is

*Ii. Organized*

- Getting them doing the right thing
- He realizes he has partial fault for assigning wrong work to wrong people.
- Ensuring that we have the right people within our organization
- Need people who share your passion and your vision for where you want to go
- “I’ll take one fantastic graphic designer and one fantastic brand strategy person over a roomful of mediocre people in those.”
- “Culture drives innovation and whatever else you’re trying to drive within a company — innovation, execution, whatever it’s going to be.”
- It’s all about the informal structure.
- Change the culture down to every single person in the company
- Figure out who really pulls the strings and where the real power base is, who you have to collaborate with, who you have to inform, who you have to seek for advice and agreement
- Figuring out how things really work around here
- Intimate knowledge about what’s going on

*Ij. Rational*

- Level out sales quota because you don’t want to get too high, because when they fall, they really fall.
- Balancing the near term with the longer term
- Take a far more level-headed (balanced, reliable, stable) approach

## 2. Affiliative leadership

*2a. Sociable*

- Trying to move around the campus, either literally or digitally
- “I don’t sit on fancy chairs. I’d rather sitting on the floor working with people.”
- Don’t isolate herself from the people who work for her
- Really present in our office when I’m there
- Understand what it’s like working in the bottom
- Figuring out what they want to do
- Have some sense of what everyone does every day
- Town halls with employees at least once every eight weeks
- Webcast every month
- Weekly voice mail (So people know what’s going on)
- Small group meetings maybe quarterly

### *2b. Understanding*

- Go through orientation just like everyone else [to see how it feels like to be at the company for the first time]
- Interpersonal relationships
- Interpersonal dynamic
- No e-mail, instead, personal communication
- “Keep it human. Keep it alive. Don’t turn into a robot.”

### *2c. Affectionate*

- Care about the people they lead
- Care about the people who work for you
- “If you are good for your people, they’ll be good to you, and help you and help propel you up in your career.”
- Be kind to the employees and take care of them and they’ll perform for you.
- Show them you really count on them
- Make people understand that you are listening to them
- “I want people to know that I’m reading these things, I’m listening to them, that what they say is important, I heard it, I’m paying attention to it.”
- The quality of the followers is in direct correlation to the respect you hold them in
- Respecting people’s time
- Treat your employees like they can vote
- Treat me with respect, I’ll do more for you.
- Earn respect from people you work with

### *2d. Appreciative*

- Little things are big deals
- “Always went out to the airport on holidays, and always made sure that I was there and I’d thank people for giving up their holiday to work.”
- Appreciation for different kinds of people, where they come from and how they work.
- Make them feel their own stats are important
- Acknowledging people’s contribution that make the company doing well
- Make them feel like their contribution is recognized and valued

### *2e. Helpful*

- Anyone from our company can book half an hour with me
- “If they e-mail me day or night, I will be back to them.”

### *2f. Considerate*

- “Listen and learn first”
- “By listening first and trying to understand how we got here and their story, I don’t leave people feel defensive. It allows them to then hear my point of view. And then we can move into solutions.”
- “By listening to all sides, I could try to figure out the right answer.”

## 3. Democratic leadership

### *3a. Unassuming*

- I’m not the greatest and brightest leader born
- I don’t have all the answers or all the best ideas, nor do I want to.

### *3b. Engaging*

- People make direct reports to him
- “Take 30 or so high-potential employees and spend a day with them. And I’ll talk to them about culture, I’ll talk to them about helping. We’ll call it a C.E.O. forum and work directly with them about issues like leadership, philosophy of leadership, and real business issues that we’re facing”

### *3c. Team-oriented*

- “We’re in this together. We’re a team.”
- “What’s our goal, and how do we, as a team, collectively make it happen?”
- It’s very much about the team
- How do you include everybody so you know where you are on that plan, so you can work on areas that need special attention.
- Involving them (hired smart people) in a decision
- Make my team members feel valued by asking them: “What do you think? What would you
- Not let people’s positions dictate how influential their ideas are
- Brainstorm with my team
- Valuing lots of different kinds of opinions and people of different backgrounds.

## 4. Pacesetting leadership

### *4a. Ambitious*

- leadership skills to drive those sales
- Have a passion for winning
- “We’ve got to win”
- “I’m working super-overtime every day to try and do reset them.”
- “I work too much, but I don’t expect the same thing from you. I just work a lot because I don’t need much sleep or have children.”
- Work 85 – 100 hours/week because it’s fun and motivating

*4b. Alert*

- Really understanding where you can make the biggest contribution
- Seeing the role and the value I bring to the organization
- “What do I add? What can I bring that others cannot access without me?”

*4c. Thorough*

- “If we win, I still evaluate the pitch and whether it was the best portrayal of who we are, or whether we won for some other reason.”
- Whether it was the best that we were capable of doing, not just based on the outcome.
- “Stats don’t lie. It’s not subjective. It’s just, what are your goals and did you meet them?”

*4d. Exemplary*

- “Show young employees how I operate and work instead of telling them what they ought to be doing.”
- C.E.O. should be exemplary because everyone looks up to him/her; a wrong example can set wrong image of running a company

*4e. Assertive*

- “My job is not to make everybody happy. My job is to chart the right course and, at the end of the day, I leave this building and if I feel like I’ve done the right thing and people respect me, I’m happy.”
- Not a consensus builder anymore
- Balance between being too friendly with the people you manage and learning the appropriate boundaries and distances around certain things

*4f. Efficient*

- Outspoken, so people don’t assume
- Communicating effectively and often
- Communicate “no,” when needed
- Leave no ambiguity [in communication]
- Coach people to communicate clearly
- Be clear on what our goals and vision are
- “I’m clear in terms of what we’re going.”
- Making sure that everybody, at every point, understood what was going on
- Don’t have to know answers that I didn’t have to know
- Decide who were the “blockers,” or the toxic personalities who needed to go
- Hard stop during the meeting, so they can finish in time with no chit-chat
- I don’t care how bad the situation is — the sooner you catch it, the better
- If mistake, bring it to my attention right away
- No fixing it first and telling me later
- Very singularly directed
- Focusing on the right problems
- More of a plan around things that I felt I needed to do to grow
- List-make, do to-do list, prioritize to-do list, get through to-do list
- Set key priorities for the day
- “Everybody to write down on Sunday night or Monday morning what are your three priorities

for the week, and then on Friday see how you did against them. It's the only way people can stay focused and not burn out."

## 5. Coaching leadership

### *5a. Active*

- Look for ideas, people doing things in ways that are different, doing things that are important for our future
- Go outside your own geography and learn the way other people live and think. See what's out there that are more important than what you already know
- Observing and learning
- "Failure is impossible."
- Spend time on the things that aren't going well to be more productive
- "It's O.K. to take a chance. It's O.K. to try, and if it doesn't work, learn from it, adjust and keep failing forward. And if you just fail forward all the time — learn, fail, learn, fail, learn, fail — but every single time you're making it better and better."

### *5b. Patient*

- Not lose temper
- Even if I am upset, I try to say: "O.K., thanks for telling me. Now let's figure out what to do from here."

### *5c. Painstaking*

- When react to something, take a five-second tape delay and self-edit before say something (Think before react)
- "I usually take as much time as I possibly can before giving people advice."
- Less massaging, more thinking, more reflecting

### *5d. Persevering*

- Same code of conduct in business and your personal life
- Mold a business around your philosophy
- Live within my means

### *5e. Curious*

- Asking the right questions, you can get to the heart of the issue right away
- Give fewer answers and I ask a lot more questions.
- Having debates about what the questions should be

### *5f. Experienced*

- Subtly tell people what they need to do (not telling them directly what should be done in a dictator way)
- How to influence people to get things done, as opposed to running and rapping on them.
- Put a few things out there, and then they have to be adopted. If you're forcing it, it's not going to work.
- Able to play in different circles of people
- Situational management: different management method according to different individuals and

situations

- Learn to communicate differently with different people

#### *5g. Trusting*

- “If you lose confidence in them, then you can’t keep them.” (keep confidence in employees even when they make mistakes)
- Develop face-to-face trusting relationships with your people
- Trust is needed to have open argument without hurting feelings
- Focus more on the work of leadership, not focus on being the person who solved the details of the problem
- No micromanaging
- Let go and let somebody else do it who knows how to do it better than you do it

#### *5h. Developing*

- continually asking for feedback on how it’s going
- Ask everybody involved what you can do to do an even better job
- My 360-degree feedback is open to 50,000 employees
- On-the-spot feedback (giving feedback every day, on the spot; not really big on year-end feedback)
- Give all the employees a growth path professionally
- Spend time with people two and three levels below to add value to them
- Help them become all they can be.
- Be passionate about what you do and interested in making the people around you better
- Try very hard to be descriptive about how we want to define success and not necessarily prescriptive on telling them exactly how we want to do it
- Build their durability so they can take multiple jobs
- Different players bring different talents to the table
- Help them build a story around their capabilities
- “It is too easy to let the person with great presentation or language skills buffalo you into thinking that they are better or more knowledgeable than someone else who might not necessarily have that particular set of skills.”
- “Feedback: Start out with a positive, but if there isn’t any positive, not going to try to find it if there isn’t anything. I will always give them my point of view and my side, and I will always keep the door open to hear their side, and I will always end with, ‘Here’s what you have to do to correct it.’”
- Praise, constructive criticism, praise
- When giving feedback, everything is threes: three positives and three things they should do differently

#### *5i. Dependable*

- Make employees to believe her way of thinking or plan so they can follow her voluntarily, without adversity
- If you win people over, they’ll follow you
- Articulate the social architecture that others can understand, believe in, and follow

## C. Hiring criteria

### 1. Hiring for achievement

#### *1a. Capable*

- Get truly world-class people working directly for you
- Someone who can do the job better than three people altogether
- People who are at organizations that are, at least in a particular function, better than what you have now.
- Relevant skill set
- “Can you do the job?”
- Professional credentials
- Interest in new technology
- Technical competence
- Passion about technology
- Who can bring new ideas into the organization in a way that will be quickly absorbed into the organization
- Whether I feel like they would be a value-add to the culture and to the dynamics of the company
- Able to deliver results

#### *1b. Ambitious*

- Ability to grow and learn
- Highest-potential people
- Sense of possibility
- Really good work ethic
- Who found their “true north” (Their principal beliefs, which they can stick to)
- Conduct unstructured interview to see what their values are
- How excited and involved could they be?
- Passion is what’s going to get you through your failures
- “I want to work on a piece of business that I really love. I want to come to work every day feeling like, it’s 5 o’clock and I can’t believe how fast it went. I want to be around people who are going to teach me. I don’t know a lot about this business yet. I can’t wait to learn every aspect of it.”
- Show you’re hungry for work you’re applying to
- Who can express concisely what it is that appeals to them about the job they’re interviewing for
- Type A personalities — they are driven, they know what to do, they know how to do it and they can get it done.
- Who thinks like: “I’m going to leave this situation better than I found it.”
- Do they have the ability to find clarity among chaos, to have this calmness to be able to get stuff done?
- Is the person thinking in long term or just wanting to get a job?
- Ask young people what they think they’re going to get out of the first two years and what they want
- People who think big
- “What are you working on developing within yourself right now?”

*1c. Alert*

- Have strong sense of what you have to offer
- “If you had to name something, what would you say is the biggest misperception that people have of you?”

## 2. Hiring for affiliation

*2a. Adaptable*

- adapt to change
- how they've had to adapt or change
- flexibility

*2b. Sociable*

- “What kind of person are you? Can I stand to have dinner with you?”
- Have high emotional intelligence
- Can work their way through a human relationship problem intelligently
- Who have some attachment in their community
- Show they care about something outside of themselves

## 3. Hiring for aggression

*3a. Outspoken*

- Who will kick my butt on points where we disagree
- Demonstrate that they are thinking about things rather than just accepting conventional wisdom
- Don't hire who is little too worried about pleasing me

## 4. Hiring for change

*4a. Daring*

- Have a strong conviction about who they are and what they can offer
- Being comfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty
- Who have taken risks; whether they took a lateral move to get to the next step or they went to a company that wasn't performing, and it was their first opportunity to manage a team that had to do a turnaround.

*4b. Unconventional*

- Has character
- Extreme individuality
- Unconventional

*4c. Innovative*

- “Think outside the confines of their individual expertise and their product group and connect the dots between technologies, customer needs and markets in new ways.”
- People who think differently than I do around the table.
- Open to doing different kinds of things

## 5. Hiring for deference

### *5a. Fit*

- Ability to fit to an organization
- Chemistry that would fit well in our environment
- Really internalize and believe in the core values of the company
- Simulate a real office experience
- Really understand where the talent is for that job
- The right person for a job
- Best predictor of future success is past success
- Does this person have a history of just being proactive in their life and not being told what to do?
- Try to really form a picture of this person outside the job.
- “What kind of people do you like to spend time with?”
- Try to get to know the applicant as much as he can (family, from where, former job, etc.)
- Really candid feedback from 10 different people
- “If I had four of your last bosses in the room, how would they describe you?”
- When there is an open position, write down 10 things that she hears about the person from others on little cardboard cards

### *5b. Unassuming*

- In spite of one’s considerable achievement, talk about how others had a big role to play and not focus as much on their own role
- Don’t hire “yeah-yeah” people who think they know everything
- Have humility to know it’s entirely possible we may not succeed, but it’s worth trying

## 6. Hiring for dominance

### *6a. Dominant*

- Fully engaged with the company (who can get connected with various levels of employees in the company)
- Active in organizations
- Presence
- A time when they were in, say, a leadership situation where something simply would not have happened had they not been there, and what they did to influence the action.
- What did they do and how did you get them [employees] involved?
- Able to get a team together to agree on target customer, products and services you will offer them, and the value and competitive advantage you’re going to create

### *6b. Motivating*

- “Very good glue”: who can motivate and improve morale of people around them
- Ability to influence and motivate others in a sophisticated way — but not necessarily charisma

## 7. Hiring for endurance

### *7a. Persevering*

- “What was your biggest failure? And what did you learn from it and what would you have done

differently?”

- “Tell me about a time when you felt the organization needed to go in a different direction: How did you handle that? How did you approach it and how did you resolve it? If you had a do-over, what would it be?”
- Who can overcome some obstacle and keep moving up the field

#### *7b. Persistence*

- Somebody who has the experience of digging in and mastering a topic
- Someone who sacrifice because it’s the right thing to do and you have pride in it
- “Give me an instance where you really believed in something and you were able to change the course and it was successful, whatever that was.”
- “Give me an example of a situation where you think you took a risk or took a controversial point of view.”

### 8. Hiring for extraversion

#### *8a. Humorous*

- Good sense of humor
- Not who gets offended by every little thing I say
- Don’t hire who is too rigid (Who is too concentrated on getting an A instead of answering the question being asked)

#### *8b. Energetic*

- Enormous energy = physical energy + emotional energy
- Who are energized by what they’re working on
- Hire Tiggers, not Eeyores

### 9. Hiring for insightfulness

#### *9a. Intelligent*

- Take a complex problem, break it down into its pieces and figure out the best way forward

#### *9b. Curious*

- Curiosity to world, business, technology, and business model
- How open they are to understanding the things they don’t know and wanting to learn about that
- Are they asking smart questions?
- Be the inquisitor who will ask a million questions

#### *9c. Clear-thinking*

- Hire people with good judgment

#### *9d. Experienced*

- Breadth of one’s experience, not just vertical career ladders; how much horizontal experiences?
- Who have worked in different places in the world
- Who can bring a lot more context to the discussion
- Practical work experience

- Have more real-world experience
- Quality of experience

## 10. Hiring for nurturance

### *10a. Cooperative*

- “Are you going to be part of the team, or are you going to be one of these independent players who want to take all the credit?”
- Don’t hire who always talks about “me” instead of “we.”
- Who is aware that business is a team sport
- Speak well and write
- Ability to interact with and effectively represent the company
- How articulate they are

### *10b. Affectionate*

- Getting feedback from the receptionists to see if someone comes in and if they weren’t polite, if they didn’t say, “Hello,” or ask them how they were (See how a person treats people in lower jobs)

### *10c. Honest*

- Warren Buffett: “Look for brains, energy and integrity, and if they don’t have the third, integrity, you better watch out, because the first two will kill you.”
- Ability to be very candid on what mistakes they’ve made
- Someone who is going to keep you well informed of everything that’s going on

## 11. Hiring for order

### *11a. Efficient*

- Who can distill a lot of very complicated information down to its essence
- Don’t hire who get distracted by aspects of the company that really have nothing to do with making an investment or determining value

## **Appendix B: Descriptions of leadership, culture, and hiring criteria**

### ***A. Organizational culture***

#### 1. Innovative culture

##### *1a. Innovation*

These companies are very forward-looking and future oriented. They are not afraid of thinking about the future filled with ambiguity and unexpectedness. They constantly plan about what they want to do and what new fields to pioneer in the future. Everyday they create “new normal.”

This culture inspires employees to be creative with new ideas. Without creativity, a company will stay at the same stage for years and will never flourish. Creativity is what fuels these companies to dream about a bigger picture. Creative tension for success energizes these companies.

If change is required to sustain and grow a company, employees in this culture are willing to accept it. They have no negative feelings toward changes. They know that changes are what today’s companies need to compete with newborn innovative organizations. In this culture, change is what people want and falling behind is not. Companies with this culture never stop changing even when they are at the top of their game.

##### *1b. Experimenting*

Employees are not intimidated by new technology. They learn how to use it and master it to contribute to the company success. New technologies include new computer systems, software, tools, etc.

##### *1c. Risk taking*

Without taking risks or chances, no one knows what the results will be like. With challenges and obstacles, employees can upgrade themselves. They can harden their armors for the next challenges. This culture does not tell them to be safe, but brave enough to go to the next level even with uncertainty.

## 2. Respect for people culture

### *2a. Respect for individual*

In this culture, people respect each other in relationships, debates, helping situations, etc. Respect goes in both ways in relationships. Even when opinions differ, they respect others' differences. Mutual respect means they have each other's back as family members do.

People do not disguise themselves in this culture. They celebrate each other's differences and individualities. No one needs to be someone else to fit in culture. Each individual's uniqueness is why his or her CEOs hired each one. If they do not be themselves, it will defy the original purpose of their leaders.

Employees are considered to be more important than CEOs in this culture. CEOs recognize significance of their workers because they are the ones who run the company in different departments. In this culture, CEOs know they are not the sole person who brings changes to their organizations. Employees always come first.

### *2b. Fairness*

This culture is diverse with different kinds of people. Diversity can come from having people with multinational experiences, various age groups, or different genders. Employees in diverse culture are more open to different ideas and culture. These differences make a company unique and inclusive for various kinds of customers. Diversity can be promoted in this culture because no matter where one is from or who one is, everyone is treated fairly.

### 3. Outcome-oriented culture

#### *3a. Achievement orientation*

Employees have focused goals to achieve organizational success. Of course companies have several goals to achieve, but in this focused culture, employees decide what the priorities are first. Then they pay attention to those priorities. By doing so, people can save time spending their valuable time on less crucial matters.

People want to do anything with less resource, time, and effort. This culture fosters people to be as efficient as possible in completing tasks. By being efficient, one can save time and energy for other projects. People have as few meetings as possible in this environment. Instead of having many meaningless meetings, they have one succinct gathering filled with lots of useful ideas.

Meetings do not run overtime or start later than originally planned. People are always on time to save time. For instance, employees do not have to waste time waiting for a latecomer. They can instead work on other tasks with the time they save by being on time.

With a clear common goal, employees can be more focused on what needs to be done. Because they are all on the same page, less time is needed to bring back the deviating ones to the right track. Everyone knows what the company goals are.

Employees make achievable goals because when aims are too high, people lose interest reaching them. Workers are asked to make reasonable goals, not fancy and unrealistic goals. People can be efficient by saving time from not pursuing the stars. This environment has balance between being ambitious and feasible.

Workers have clear ideas about their roles in an organization. Responsible culture asks employees to do their jobs correctly and responsibly. Even though a company is based on

teamwork, without individual efforts, that team cannot work smoothly. Everyone does their part, and then work as a group later.

Workers do not get reprimanded for having failures. Failure is viewed as a great learning tool that can indicate which way to go in the future. Thus, employees do not have fear for trying new ideas, new approaches, and new ventures. Even when people fail, they can smoothly move on to the next plan.

Employees constantly learn to be a better part of a company. Some of them learn collaboratively by reviewing others' work. Both reviewers and people who are being reviewed can learn by correcting the works together. Workers in this environment want to learn constantly. They have open eyes and ears for new skills and ideas.

### *3b. Action orientation*

People do not like wasting time in this culture. Time is something that passes by every second and once it passes by, no one can turn it back. When one is wasting time putting too much effort for nothing, someone stops him or her immediately. Even in a meeting, no one has to stay until the end of it if one is not learning anything from the discussion.

Employees are encouraged to be agile in this culture. They are expected to make quick decisions to save time. Leaders also act quickly so no time is wasted. Once decision is made, implementation happens really fast.

### *3c. Result orientation*

People not only want to do their best, but they long for winning. They are passionate about their work because they believe hardworking will lead them to successful results and victory. This is a culture of winning and people want to be motivated constantly.

No matter which job one has, everyone has to put one's best efforts to do any job.

Employees in this culture treat everyday as a fruitful working day. Because everyone works hard, employees in this culture naturally strive for perfection. No one has sense of entitlement when it comes to working hard.

#### 4. Team-oriented culture

##### *4a. People orientation*

This culture's number one priority is having constant relationships with others. People in this culture believe that the quality of relationships determines success of a company. Their relationships are not limited to coworkers, but expand to their customers too. They achieve mutually beneficial relationships with everyone they interact with.

Employees value relationships and they do not act unreasonably to others. For example, when they have a meeting, they do not attack others groundlessly but debate amicably. If there is anything they want to criticize, they present fair reasons why they do not agree with the idea.

Leaders trust that their employees can complete the assigned work. Employees trust their leaders that they will lead them successfully. Because of this bond of trust, employees think their companies are nice places to work. And because of this, everyone can focus on each one's work without worrying about carrying others' baggage.

Honesty is not just a personal trait. Honest culture is where employees do not lie about success or failure. Employees are open about their feelings, thoughts, and work processes. To encourage intellectual honesty, this culture does not make employees feel like their reputations is directly related to failures. It instead makes people to admit failures and learn lessons from them.

Employees work for one purpose, but each one has one's freedom to choose the way to get to the goal. No one tells them which road to follow. As long as they can complete their tasks, this culture does not worry too much about how they get to the finish line. This level of

autonomy makes employees to be more involved.

Without having fun in a workplace, employees will not be able to show their talents completely. Having fun does not mean they treat their work not seriously. It means they work energetically to generate good results without having too much stress. High-energy culture excites employees to work for more.

Having the right culture where employees can do their best is view as the number one priority. Without the right culture, there will be no motivated workers. And without them, a company will not succeed. Culture is the base of every company's success.

#### *4b. Collaboration*

Employees work in groups to achieve greater goals. They acknowledge collaboration can bring bigger success. Anyone in a company can contribute because everyone works as one big unit. When some group members have a hard time unearthing their talents, others help them out as teammates.

People are encouraged to present their ideas. No one can stop them only because they are from lower level jobs. Leaders leave some space so their followers can fill that voluntarily. CEO is not a sole idea generator. From on-the-road sales man to CEO, anyone's idea can be valuable to an organization.

These organizations are flat where people can interact with each other freely no matter what level of jobs they have. In some companies, good ideas get killed because there are so many upper layers to pass through. In a horizontal organization, this does not happen because good ideas are instantly shared by all kinds of employees. This environment endorses cross-functional teams.

Communication is very valued in this culture. Constant, open, and honest

communications encourage ideas floating around freely. With open communicative culture, people can have clear ideas about what is happening in their companies. But communicative culture does not mean people can have meaningless chitchats constantly. Only meaningful communications are allowed.

Giving out too much unnecessary information wastes time. Leaders want just the information they need. Listeners can focus more on the key points when communication style is direct and succinct. In this culture, leaders do not like their employees presenting ideas using PowerPoint with too many slides and little fonts. Workers do not waste time paying attention to irrelevant stories in this culture.

Workers can express their feelings, thoughts, and ideas clearly in this culture. When they have a disagreement with other coworkers, they are encouraged to spit it out during the meeting, not bringing grudge outside of the room. When employees do not express themselves clearly, others will have a hard time guessing what the speakers are really thinking. This will prevent them from being a unified group.

#### *4c. Team orientation*

Inclusive culture gives employees sense of family. They consider their coworkers as parts of “we.” Everyone is welcome to speak up one’s mind and contribute because every employee is important. It is not about exclusion, but about inclusion.

Workers have access to any information because the culture is transparent. CEOs or high ranked employees do not lie about company performance to give mirage of false success. They are rather very open about what is really going on. Because of this transparency, people’s interactions become very open too.

Employees are loyal and committed to their companies. They focus on their work and

companies. They do what they are supposed to do because they are committed to their teams and roles. This environment is filled with people who have company-first minds.

#### *4d. Supportiveness*

Successful performances are well recognized in this culture. CEOs know people become more motivated to work harder when leaders thank them for achieving goals. They also recognize those people who work behind because others often neglect them. Leaders fill employees' need for recognition and appreciation.

#### *4e. Opportunities for personal growth*

CEOs spot each employee's talents and develop them. Employees do not stay at the same competency level. Because of this continuous talent development, this culture is filled with people who have something to prove. Companies grow as their employees improve.

Employees get honest and direct feedbacks from their leaders. On the other hand, leaders get reverse feedback from their employees. Everyone actively gives feedbacks to each other. But they can only give authentic feedbacks, not the fake ones, which just make listeners feel satisfied and nothing more.

### 5. Aggressive culture

#### *5a. Outspoken*

Employees think debate, meetings, and negotiations are necessary for coming up with new and good ideas. They are passionate about the ideas they present. This culture has high frequency of debates.

### **B. Leadership style**

1. Visionary leadership: Visionary leaders provide long-term direction and vision. They take employees along with them to reach the visionary goals

*1a. Daring*

This kind of leaders is not afraid of taking chances or facing challenges. They are brave enough to accept challenges and find ways to go through them. Some of them find best selves under adversity. Their motto is just doing it without overthinking. They are willing to take risks if the risk is necessary for achieving goals. They do not mind taking more risks because risks sometimes lead to an unexpected success. The reason why they can take risks is that they know they can get something out of failures. They take chances for bigger goals instead of protecting themselves in a shell.

*1b. Innovative*

These CEOs are innovative and creative in terms of coming up with better, different, and helpful ideas. When limiting oneself to one direction, opportunities for improvements go away. Sometimes innovations and creative thinking are needed. Because these leaders bring changes constantly, employees are not agitated by them that much.

*1c. Act quickly*

These people make decisions and think quickly to save time. They are impatient. These CEOs have short response time too. By being quick, they save time and keep the ball rolling.

*1d. Perceptive*

They have instinct for business. Even when someone has all information needed, without a sense for business, decisions cannot be made right away. Business world moves around quickly and leaders sometimes need to make decisions instantly. Instinct kicks in in these situations. They balance themselves using both set business rules and instinct.

*1e. Motivating*

These people have passion for their work and want to lead their employees to work their

best. They guide and help employees through motivation. The ways of motivating people are different from CEO to CEO. Some of them do so with compensation, some of them with motivating words, and others with setting higher goals. To these employers, motivation is the key to better performances.

*If. Confident*

These leaders are confident enough to accept that not everything is under bright light. They are OK with gray areas and ambiguity. They believe they can solve any problems even though there is no certain answer key yet. Possible failures do not deter them from pursuing their plans.

*Ig. Responsible*

They know why they are in their organizations. They are well aware of their roles as leaders: making an organization successful and making employees happy with their work. Workers' happiness means leaders' happiness. They take responsibility for their workers and what they do. As a leader, they make sure everyone does the right thing.

*Ih. Honest*

These leaders are honest and expect others not to lie. They act as who they are and ask their fellows to be authentic too. Employees can access to any information because organizations under these leaders are transparent. Transparency in an organization makes leaders to be honest. Lies only make problems bigger and prevent employees from being on the correct track.

*Ii. Organized*

These leaders optimize employees' abilities by putting them in the right places. They test employees' best qualities and see where they can fit in an organization to bring out the best results. No one is good at everything. Good allocation lets people to complement each other. If a

person's weakness is math and strength is people skill, CEO surrounds math people who are not good with people skill around that employee. Everyone grows together.

Hiring those people who can really do the job is one of these leaders' focus points. They want talented and smart people who can complement the leaders. They see if someone is good enough to contribute to company's success. One way to check is to see if the workers share the same values with the leaders. If not, no matter how talented they are, they are not the right ones for the company.

They believe in the power of creating the right culture where people can be motivated to work and think. If culture is wrong, employees will be lost or not be willing to work hard. They value culture because they value people. Right culture drives innovation too. They think a company's best culture gets established under challenges.

They know who affect their businesses and how their organizations should run. They truly understand their business so they can set the right goals and lead their workers to the right direction. They know everyone's role. They have intimate knowledge of what is happening in their companies.

### *1j. Rational*

When goals are too high to reach, chasers lose interest in them. The more unreasonable goals are, the more likely employees fall deeply and crash. Setting feasible and achievable goals is important to lead employees to produce desirable results. These leaders give long term plans with realistic goals.

2. Affiliative leadership: Affiliative leaders focus on creating harmonious personal relationships between managers and subordinates. They give emotional support for their employees.

### *2a. Sociable*

They have active interest in a person. They want to know what their employees are like in person and what their goals or jobs are like. Some of them also want to know what their employees do outside of work to figure out what kind of people they are in real world. To understand employees' perspectives, they try to see what the works in the bottom of an organization are like. They do not limit themselves to their offices or desks. They go out to see how the company is running and connect with people personally. They have true presence in a company. They are not mystical figure, but a really existing CEO who takes care of the company himself or herself. They have meetings in different ways. For example, some of them have virtual meetings using YouTube, while others have town-hall style meetings where many people physically get together. Even though leaders have different meeting styles, these kinds of leaders believe that having meetings is a good way of connecting with the rest of the company. Many of them like to use technologies such as, webcasts, YouTube, blogs, and websites.

### *2b. Understanding*

They continually meet with people and have conversations with them. They believe having real human relationships is important. Some of them even go to new-employee orientations and say hi to them in person. Not only they connect with employees, but also they do with customers. Without connecting with customers, leaders cannot produce products that will satisfy their targeted population. Connecting with people gives leaders human-like images, clearer pictures how to lead a company, and ideas how to treat their workers.

### *2c. Affectionate*

Caring leaders are someone who is compassionate, empathetic, and kind. They are characterized as those who can be nice to employees and take care of them. By caring

employees, CEOs earn followership. As in old maxim, what goes around comes around. Leaders take care of the workers, and workers treat them back by working hard.

These are the leaders who show that they care and appreciate their employees. They listen actively what their employees are saying and let them know their opinions are always heard and valued. They make employees feel truly valued because they spend enough time to lead their ways. For example, one of the leaders lets his workers know that he reads every e-mail they send by reflecting their opinions on future plans.

They not only respect employees in a relational aspect, but also respect their time by showing up on time. They respect their employees as human beings, not as just a replaceable mechanical part. When communicate, they do not shout or close ears from hearing others' opinions. They think quality of employees is deeply affected by the degree of respect they levy on workers.

Not only respecting employees, but also getting respect back from them is important to some leaders. They are the people who want to be respected from those they work with. What they ask their employees is to be respectful to their bosses so leaders can do more for them. Being respected and getting respect are reciprocal.

#### *2d. Appreciative*

Some leaders think appreciating every little thing what employees do for the company is crucial. They sometimes personally go to the employees' workplaces to appreciate what they are doing. Some of them do not forget about sending simple thank you notes to people. People whom they appreciate are not limited only to high ranking employees but everyone in a company.

They recognize the ones who have done their assigned works. Without proper

recognition, employees will not be motivated to work hard. To encourage them to do the right thing over and over again, these leaders do not forget about recognizing their followers' success. With recognition, employees start to feel their stats do really matter.

### *2e. Helpful*

Their doors are always open for anyone. They open their e-mails, phones, and doors to anyone who wants to talk to them. People have direct access to these leaders. Their doors are not just wide opened, but they respond e-mails back in 24 hours. Because without responding, inquisitors may feel they are talking in an empty open room. Whenever someone needs their help, they do not want their employees to be intimidated talking to or asking questions to them. The purpose of being accessible is connecting with the rest of the company.

### *2f. Considerate*

They not just listen. They really listen. They value active listening very much because they do not want to jump to the conclusion without learning or gathering enough information to get the right sense about a situation. They also want to show they can really listen and truly care about the other speaker. By listening first and trying to understand how others got to their conclusions, CEOs can have open discussions without defending them.

3. Democratic leadership: Democratic leaders encourage employees' commitment through participation and building consensus. They focus on collaboration.

### *3a. Unassuming*

They are humble and not shy about accepting the fact that they are not perfect. Because they are humble, they can ask for help when they have problems. They are overly humble when they do not know something, because they want to learn more than they need.

### *3b. Engaging*

They are actively and fully engaged in running companies. It means they do not just direct people, but they actually participate in decision processes. Methods of engagement are various depending on each CEO's styles. They are not just there, but they actually become part of a company. But it does not mean they micromanage.

### *3c. Team-oriented*

It is always about teamwork and collaboration to them. They value the power of teamwork. They want to achieve bigger goals by working together. They want to destroy hierarchy so everyone can work in one big team, not in one long ladder.

They are the ones who want to include fellow employees to decision processes that are important for running their companies. Not only they include them, but also give sense of inclusiveness. They give this feeling by presenting the ones who work behind projects. Putting everyone under spotlight gives each one a sense of inclusiveness because they are exposed to other coworkers.

When coming up with new ideas, organizational status or hierarchy do not play any role. These leaders are willing to listen and accept good ideas from anywhere in an organization. They do not think higher ranking employees have better ideas than the ones in lower rankings. They brainstorm with their teams.

4. Pacesetting leadership: Pacesetting leaders are goal-oriented. They strive for perfection and set high work standards for everyone.

### *4a. Ambitious*

They are not passive, but willing to go out and compete. They want to lead their teams to win in today's competitive market. They are full of energy and passion. They will do anything to reach their goals. These people work very hard too. They want to exceed other's expectations by

working hard. They do not work hard because someone tells them to, but they do because they enjoy working. They work overtime not only because they enjoy it, but also because they want to make workers' lives better by making their companies successful.

*4b. Alert*

They know about themselves very well. They clearly know what their visions are and what they want to achieve. These CEOs know what their strengths and weaknesses are. They are also aware of what they can do to add values to their companies.

*4c. Thorough*

Without measuring success thoroughly, companies cannot find the right way to go. It is necessary to see if the success was achieved by mere chance or by using the right tactics. If the success happened by chance, the company should find the right ways to achieving goals. If it happened because of smart tactics and plans, they should be continually implemented.

*4d. Exemplary*

They set exemplary work ethics and attitudes; employees follow the leaders right way. Being exemplary means that leaders do not have to say everything they want their employees to do. For example, if a leader is never late for meetings, workers will never do so either. Leaders are living norm setters. They set tones of each company.

*4e. Assertive*

Their definition of being a good leader is not being an employees' best friend. These leaders do not think they have to sacrifice their paths to goals to make everyone happy. They believe they are there to lead people not to amuse them. They will move along with plans even when they do not have consensus.

*4f. Efficient*

They keep communicating with employees not to cause any misunderstandings or to emphasize how they want to lead their companies. Their communication style is clear and direct, which means they request what they want up front without being shy. They do not like risking business with misunderstandings and ambiguity due to vague or lack of communication. They set principles of communications such as communicating effectively or making ideas alive with storytelling.

CEOs lead their employees with clear and direct goals to achieve goals. Because everyone knows where their company is heading to, people are more likely to contribute properly. With clear and direct goals, fewer deviations occur and everyone can concentrate on what is really important. After setting these goals, CEOs make sure if everyone understands what each one needs to do.

Whenever there is something that wastes time, these leaders stop it right away. Examples of something that wastes time are, having unnecessarily long meetings, sharing more information than needed, toxic employees, etc. In case of dealing with toxic employees, they do not try to save their career. Instead, they let them go right away. They try to have as little meetings as possible, so each meeting can be as effective as possible.

When problems occur, these leaders do not want to delay any time to fix them. The sooner they spot the problems and fix them, the smaller damages will there be. They tell employees not to be afraid of telling what is not working because hiding will only worsen problematic parts in an organization. They sometimes personally find two or three top problems in their companies, master, and fix them.

They do not spare their time for little things that will not take them to their goals. They focus on what is really crucial for organizational success. Also, their plans are not in million

different directions, but in one focused direction so people can follow it efficiently. Focus makes everyone to come down to the heart of an issue.

By focusing only on priorities, they enable their employees to work on what is really important. Setting priorities let leaders get to the end more efficiently and faster. When there are multiple priorities, they rank them and decide which one will add the most value to the company. Some of them make day-to-day priority lists.

5. Coaching leadership: Coaching leaders value employee development.

*5a. Active*

Their ears and eyes are always open for learning new stuff. They learn how their companies work, how the industry they are in works, how people live, what ideas others have, how those people solve problems, etc. They think learning is crucial for running a business successfully. They are like a sponge soaking up every possible information just in case they will need it later. They do not view failures as failures. They think failures are necessary evil for learning. Without failures, people cannot learn what went wrong and what should be done differently in the future. They tell employees not to be afraid of making mistakes because mistakes and failures help them to grow.

*5b. Patient*

They do not jump to the conclusions right away. In order to make reasonable decisions, they wait and remain calm even when problems arise. They do not overreact to everything they hear. They patiently wait and decide which one needs more attention and which one does not.

*5c. Painstaking*

They think carefully and deeply when it comes to making decisions. They do not like making hasty decisions. They think making decisions right away will hurt an organization. They

think over and over again and reflect their decisions to be safe. When they give an advice, they take as much time as they can so they can give truly worthy tips.

#### *5d. Persevering*

Consistent leaders do not have deviated ways of leading their companies from their personal lives. Their personal and business ethics are the same. Because their personal and business lives are on the same page, they can be truthful to what they do in workplaces. They can be more believable about what they say.

#### *5e. Curious*

By asking questions, these leaders find ways to correctly lead their companies. Without asking questions, constant guessing will happen that hinders an organization from moving forward. They think that right questions can give proper or unique answers to solve problems. Questioning does not mean that the questioner is weak or incompetent, but it means that persons is willing to find effective ways to run companies and make plans.

#### *5f. Experienced*

These leaders say being a dictator is not listening to employee's words and doing things in one's own way. Not being a dictator means not bossing around employees, not telling them what to do in every situation, and not forcing employees to do something they do not want to. These leaders respect employees' autonomy and decisions.

These leaders have been in different leadership positions, so they know how to lead different groups of people. They are cross-functional leaders. They know situational management, which is using different management skills in different situations. They know these from their past experiences.

#### *5g. Trusting*

These leaders trust employees can do the work they are assigned to. They have faith in their ability. They also build trusting relationships with others. Once leaders lose trust in their employees, employees lose their confidence in completing their work, and at the end leaders lose the talents. Because they trust their employees, they know how to trust their employees and delegate them to do some of their works. By doing so, employees become more accountable who know what to do even under leaders' absence. They do not micromanage and know when to let go. They are not pressured to be the person who does and solves everything. Delegation gives CEOs more time to stay focused on what is really important.

#### *5h. Developing*

Some of them like giving feedbacks and others like receiving feedbacks. Either way, these leaders believe in the power of feedback. They think by giving or receiving feedbacks, anyone can improve. Feedback is a good way of growing competently and personally. With feedbacks, good facets can be better and bad ones can be corrected. Sometimes they give feedbacks by mixing good and bad appropriately. When people hear only criticisms, they tend to close their ears. But when they are praised and then criticized, employees are more likely to accept their faults and fix them. These leaders' win-win feedbacks are constructive based on unbiased opinions.

After these leaders hire people, they do not let their employees stay at the same level. They teach and coach employees to get to the next level and beyond. Some of them even life coach their employees so they can plan a better life. When they mentor, they are supportive, but practical at the same time. They do not give false hopes because false hopes only burst in the air without helping employees reaching to the sky.

They teach employees to be as efficient as possible in their positions. They give strength

for them to be stronger who can do works without getting helps from their leaders. The more workers are developed, the less they need to ask for approvals or opinions of the leaders. To do so, CEOs sometimes push them out of their comfort zones. Just like in the wild, people learn how to survive when they are in difficult situations. In the end, they become more competent who can perform in various fields without too much help from the leaders.

By recognizing talents, these leaders know what each one can do the best. Employees' fancy records or good communication skills do not distract them from noticing the true gem. They know how to spot the real talents each individual has. After that, CEOs build works around their capabilities. This gives employees opportunities to develop their talents.

#### *5i. Dependable*

Gaining followership is winning employees' heart. Because these leaders are dependable their subordinates follow them. Leaders who have followership from their employees have no problem assuring them why they are taking this plan and that action. With adequate followership, leaders can lead their organizations without too much friction. The lesser friction an organization has, the easier to reach to the middles point.

### ***C. Hiring criteria***

#### 1. Hiring for achievement

##### *1a. Capable*

Leaders want talented applicants who are the best in the field. They want talented people because these applicants can complement the leaders. One talented person can do a better job than three average people altogether. These people can save energy, time, and money.

Applicants should have required skills even before coming for an interview. Companies do not want to waste time and energy educating them to master required skills and abilities. For

example, if an applicant wants to work for an accounting firm, he or she should have mathematical knowledge by the time he or she is applying for a job. Their professional credentials are important.

Future employees should know how to use technology. They should have an interest in it. They also must have passion for technology. Technological skills are considered as given attribute to some CEOs.

CEOs want employees who can make impacts in their organizations. These people are the ones who can make wise decisions and come up with good ideas that will lead a company to a better direction. They are good problem solvers too. They are the ones who have infinite possibilities for driving results.

#### *1b. Ambitious*

Employees who stay in the same seat will not contribute to the company's growth that much. The ones who have potentials to grow within a company are desirable employees. If workers do not grow when a company is growing, these employees will not be able to keep up with the upcoming works. If new employees show potentials, CEOs coach them to have a successful career after hiring.

Seeing what kinds of work ethics and personal values they have says a lot about the applicant. Hiring the ones who have matching values with the company is important for building collaborative teams. Some CEOs do not ask them directly what their values are. In a more subtle way, employers ask how they think.

Leaders want people who get excited by something. If they have something that pumps up their blood level, that means they have passion. Passionate employees will do their best to achieve their goals. Passionate applicants are the ones who will fall in love with their jobs.

Passions is what drives their performance.

Applicants should show how much they want the job. The more they show their passion toward the job, the more likely they will excel in a new company. They know why they are in an interview. They have clear reasons why they applied for a certain job. They do not want just a job, but want the job.

Ambitious and goal driven people are needed in companies so they can get works done. They have passion for achieving goals. They want to make contributions. Driven people are necessary to lead others to get to the set goals.

CEOs want people who have future goals for their career. These people do not only work for the moment, but also for their long-term goals and visions. They are future and goal oriented people. When these applicants' visions or goals match with a company's values and goals, CEOs hire them.

CEOs want someone who wants to grow continually. They read and learn all the time. If they have any weaknesses, they are willing to work on them so they do not interfere companies from succeeding.

### *1c. Alert*

These people know what their strengths and weaknesses are. They are not hallucinated by their success. They keep objective view on themselves. Success does not always define oneself, therefore realizing real self is crucial.

## 2. Hiring for affiliation

### *2a. Adaptable*

Companies face changes all the time. Employees should have adaptability and flexibility to settle down with new changes. The ones who cannot be flexible will fall behind and be

terminated in the end. To minimize that risk, employers hire adaptable applicant from the beginning.

### *2b. Sociable*

Leaders want nice people who can stay in touch with others amicably. They want someone whom they can spend time with enjoyably and someone who has good relationships with coworkers. Nice people can bring teammates together, but those who lack people skill cannot do that. Business is not all about numbers, but it always comes down to people interactions and relationships.

People who have connections with people outside of work are the ones who can be good citizens in companies too. They have situational awareness. They know what is going on in the world and pay attention to the people around them. They get excited about the world and their personal connections.

## 3. Hiring for Aggression

### *3a. Outspoken*

Leaders do not need “yes men,” but someone who can challenge them to bring innovation. A company filled with yes men cannot move forward because it will stay with the same ideas. Leaders want someone who can critically argue with them when things do not go well, instead of someone who can calm them down and make them narcissistic. Healthy skepticism makes an organization stronger.

## 4. Hiring for change

### *4a. Daring*

Confident employees who believe in their abilities stick to their plans and push forward. Workers who have no confidence in what they do cannot implement stable and strong plans.

They are not afraid of making mistakes. They do not second-guess, but trust their instinct.

If employees refuse to take risks because of possible future failures, a company will lose an opportunity to develop. Companies, therefore, look for those who are brave enough to take risks. Without taking risks no one knows what will happen. Even if they might fail, by taking risks, they can test their plans. Timid employees will not lay their hands on the projects with possible failures, but also possible success.

#### *4b. Unconventional*

Some leaders want unique applicants who have strong individuality. Their uniqueness gives strength to creative companies. Some CEOs ask them questions like how weird they are. Creative answers to unconventional questions are a good sign of uniqueness.

#### *4c. Innovative*

Creative applicants who can think out of the box are desirable to some companies. Their creativity and willingness to take innovative ways are valued. Without this characteristic, employees will not be able to improve their companies. They are also OK with changes.

### 5. Hiring for deference

#### *5a. Fit*

Even though one has successful career history and numerous talents, if she or he does not fit in the culture, one cannot shine. Culture fit means employees have unspoken chemistry with the company's environment. Culture fit includes fit with coworkers, work mottos, goals, the way company runs, and what the company values most. Without culture fit, employees cannot lead other coworkers because they do not share the beliefs about how teams should operate.

To see whether the applicants fit the vacant position or not, some CEOs give them simulated experiences. They simulate the job to see if the applicants can do the work, like it, and

grow within it. If they do not fit the job, those applicants are not worth hiring even when they are extremely talented. CEOs must have proper understanding of the job in order to test for fit.

CEOs check applicants' track records to see if they had any successful moments in the past. Applicants who were successful in the past have higher chance of doing the same thing in the future. Checking track record is one way of predicting what they will be like in a company. People who have developed other employees before are highly desired.

Reference is a good way of hearing what the applicants were like from their past employers. It gives an idea whether they will be good fit for an organization or not. CEOs can also see if the applicants have potentials to perform well in their companies. If their references say good points about the applicants, they are safe to be hired. Some leaders also ask the applicants directly what others would say about them. It is a good question for them to see how well aware they are about themselves and see if they can honestly reflect themselves.

CEOs really want to know their applicants as real human beings outside of a workplace. Fancy résumés are attractive but they do not say anything about the applicants as persons. Some CEOs spend personal times with the applicants and others ask questions that will reveal the applicants' true personality. Employers want to know how they spend personal time, think, talk, and how strong their personal relationships are.

#### *5b. Unassuming*

They are humble about themselves and their achievements. When they interview, they do not oversell themselves. Arrogant people cannot be good team members. Even when they talk about their past achievements, they do not forget about referring their teammates' efforts.

### 6. Hiring for dominance

#### *6a. Dominant*

These people actively participate in a company. They constantly make connections with others, actively debate in a meeting, and passionately coming up with new ideas. They have presence in their organizations. The connections they make are meaningful because they do it with people from all levels.

Applicants who had leadership experiences are preferred. By asking past experiences when they had to show their leadership skills, CEOs measure how well they will lead their future teammates. For the people whom CEOs hire directly, leadership skill is highly required because they are high ranked employees who will have many teams under them. They should be the people who can attract the right employees later.

#### *6b. Motivating*

People who can motivate others are the ones who can allow their coworkers be their best selves. They improve morale of people too. Someone who can motivate others in a sophisticated way, not necessarily in a charismatic way is hired.

### 7. Hiring for endurance

#### *7a. Persevering*

People who have not experiences challenges before will not know what to do when they face them later. Hearing about if they had any failures and how they overcame them gives a wholesome picture about how proactive and brave they are. Furthermore, people always learn something from hardships, mistakes, and failures. These kinds of learning experiences do not come in other ways. These applicants will know how to go through possible hardships in the future.

#### *7b. Persistence*

People who can dig in are needed because they are the ones who can stay focused on

their tasks until they get satisfactory results. They do not pay attention only to the superficiality, but also on the maturity. If a future employee has experience of mastering one topic, that is a good sign because he or she will have an easier time mastering another topic.

Not only they should have fitting values, but also should have guts to stick to their values even in adversarial situations. People who can stick to their principles at all times will be the ones who can carry out original plans even in difficult situations. They are willing to sacrifice for something they believe. Initiative people are needed so companies can stick to original plans without changing them over and over again.

## 8. Hiring for extraversion

### *8a. Humorous*

Some CEOs want employees who can laugh at themselves. Too buttoned people are offended by little stuff. CEOs do not have time to shaking each grumpy worker's cradle. People who lack sense of humor are often rigid and close-minded, and they cannot hear what the real questions are.

### *8b. Energetic*

Energetic employees make people around them to be excited too. They have positive vibe that makes every room they enter brighter. Companies want someone who has both physical and emotional energy. CEOs who want to make an energetic and powerful institution hire this kind of applicants.

## 9. Hiring for insightfulness

### *9a. Intelligent*

CEOs like to hire smart applicants who have analytical skills, pure intelligence, and education background. Depending on the type of a company, some leaders hire technically smart

people while others hire who have no problem understanding abstract and complex ideas. They want someone who can break down complicated problems into small pieces and being on top of them. They believe experiences can culture one to be a good strategist, but not as well as pure intelligence can.

#### *9b. Curious*

These people are naturally curious and open to any learning experiences. They are not afraid of going out of their comfort zones and learn new lessons. Without passion for learning, people will not grow, which means they will not attribute to the company no more than what they have now. These people read a lot to quench their thirst for curiosity and learning.

Leaders want to hire who can ask relevant and intelligent questions that can challenge the team members. They are the people who do not ask just random questions, but meaningful ones that can stir others' traditional thinking paths. With employees who ask smart questions, CEOs can carve big chunks of marbles until they become masterpieces.

#### *9c. Clear-thinking*

People with good judgment will come up with proper solutions. They also have ability to say no to toxic people or plans. They know how to nip bad strategies in the bud.

#### *9d. Experienced*

The broader experiences one had, the more likely the person is open to accepting different people, ideas, and backgrounds. One cannot learn experiences from a textbook. People with various and vast amounts of experiences can inject different perspectives to an organization. With employees who have different perspectives, team members can see new opportunities and business tactics.

Leaders want someone who had real-world business experiences. The amount of practical

work experiences tells how well prepared the applicants are for the job. Not only relativity, but also quality of their experiences is important.

## 10. Hiring for nurturance

### *10a. Cooperative*

Working as a team is important to most CEOs. Business cannot survive only with individual efforts. It needs teams and teamwork. Through teamwork, employees can achieve more than they can individually. CEOs hire the people who say “we” a lot, not “I.”

Good communicators are the ones who can write, listen, and communicate effectively. They know how to present themselves well with good communication skills. Leaders want good communicators because they cause less ambiguity in presenting company plans.

### *10b. Affectionate*

Great company culture starts from respects. People who do not respect other people cannot become big because they will have too many enemies in the end. An applicant who has respect for people in different levels of jobs is a person who can work with teams harmoniously. A good way of testing this is asking receptionists how the applications treated them. If they treated receptionists with respect, they have higher chance of being hired.

### *10c. Honest*

Employees who lie are toxins in an organization. CEOs need someone who can tell the truth about what is going on. An organization needs people who do not lie about their performances. Without integrity, there are no trusting relationships. Without trusting relationships, there is no true teamwork.

## 11. Hiring for order

### *11a. Efficient*

Employees should know how to sift out important information from a myriad of unnecessary issues. Distracted workers cannot follow the right track and will not get to the finishing point in time. The more focused employees are, the more efficiently they can work. Also, leaders are busy people. They do not have enough time to listen to all the little things. They need someone who can tell them what they should pay attention to.

## REFERENCES

- Afsaneh, N. (1993). Integrating leadership and strategic management in organizational theory. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l' Administration/Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 10(4), 297-307.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: Detrimental effects of competition in a field setting. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 357–376.
- Amabile, T. M. (2000). Stimulate creativity by fueling passion. In E. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principle of organizational behavior* (331-341). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ancona, D., & Caldwell, D. (1987). Management issues facing new product teams in high technology companies. In D. Lewin, D. Lipsky, & D. Sokel (Eds.), *Advances in industrial and labor relations* (Vol. 4) (191-221). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range of leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

- Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Bowden, A. O. (1926). A study of the personality of student leaders in the United States. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 21, 149-160.
- Bowen, D. E., Ledford, G. E., Jr., & Nathan, B. R. (2001). Hiring for the organization, not the job. In R. Paton, G. Clark, G. Jones, J. Lewis & P. Quitas (Eds.), *The new management reader* (94-104). London: Thomas Business Press.
- Brown, A. (1992). Organizational culture: The key to effective leadership and organizational development. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 13(2), 3-6.
- Bryant, A. (2009). Times topic: Adam Bryant. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/adam\\_bryant/index.html](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/adam_bryant/index.html).
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 468-78.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294-311.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 546-561.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 648-657.

- Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *31*, 248-267.
- Castka, P., Bamber, C. J., Sharp, J. M., & Belohoubek, P. (2001). Factors affecting successful implementation of high performance teams. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *7* (7/8), 123-134.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.
- Charmaz, K., & Henwood, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In C. Willig, & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 240-262. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*, 459-484.
- Chatman, J., & Cha, S. (2003). Leading by leveraging culture. *California Management Review*, *45*(4), 20-34.
- Chatman, J. A., & Jehn, K. A. (1994). Assessing the relationship between industry characteristics and organizational culture: How different can you be?. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 522-533. Retrieved from [http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/chatman/papers/32\\_IndustryCharacteristicsCulture.pdf](http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/chatman/papers/32_IndustryCharacteristicsCulture.pdf).
- Chung, J., & Monroe, G. S. (2003). Exploring social desirability bias. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *44*(4), 291-302.
- Collard, B., Epperheimer, J. W., & Saign, D. (1996). Career resilience in a changing workplace. *Columbus: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education*, 396 (191).

- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group and Organization Studies, 13*(3), 245-274.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Cowley, W. H. (1931). Three distinctions in the study of leaders. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 26*, 304-313.
- Criswell, C., & Martin, A. (2007). *10 trends: A study of senior executives' views on the future*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/TenTrends.pdf>.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354
- Daft, R. L. (2005). *The leadership experience*. Mason, OH: Thompson.
- Damanpour, F., & Schneider, M. (2006). Phases of the adoption of innovation in organizations: Effects of environment, organization and top managers. *British Journal of Management, 17*, 215-236.
- Davis, S. (1984). *Managing corporate culture*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Dawis, R. (1992). Person-environment fit and job satisfaction. In C. Cranny, P. Smith & E. Stone (Eds.). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York, NY: Lexington.
- Day, D. V., & Bedeian, A. G. (1995). Personality similarity and work-related outcomes among African-American nursing personnel: A test of the supplementary model of person-environment congruence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*(1), 55-70.

- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Denison, D. R. (1990). *Corporate culture and organisational effectiveness*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- DiPiro, J. T. (2011). A culture of hiring for excellence. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75(5), 97.
- Edwards, A. L. (1954). *Manual: Edwards personal preference schedule*. New York, NY: Psychological Cooperation.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.). *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 283-357. New York, NY: Wiley,
- Edwards, J. R. (1996). An examination of competing versions of person-environment fit approach to stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 292-339.
- Edwards, J., Caplan, R., & Harrison, R. (1998). Person-environment fit theory: Conceptual foundations, empirical evidence, and directions for future research. In C. Cooper (Ed.). *Theories of Organizational Stress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cooper, C. L. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 293-307.
- Elenkov, D. S., & Manev, I. M. (2005). Top management leadership and influence on innovation: The role of sociocultural context. *Journal of Management*, 31(3), 381-402.
- Enz, C. 1988. The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 284-304.

- Fiedler, F.E. (1996). Research on leadership selection and training: One view of the future, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 241–50.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32-58.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1973). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research* (7th ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: AldineTransaction.
- Gleeson, B. (2013, January 22). Walking the walk: 3 Ways to ensure a team-oriented business culture. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/brentgleeson/2013/01/22/walking-the-walk-3-ways-to-ensure-a-team-oriented-business-culture/>.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 78-90.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1983). *The adjective check list manual: 1983 edition*. Mountain View, CA: CPP.
- Gough, H. G., Lazzari, R., Fioravanti, M., & Stracca, M. (1978). An Adjective Check List scale to predict military leadership. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 9(4), 381-400.
- Hagemann, B., & Chartrand, J. (2009). *2009/2010 trends in executive development: A benchmark report*. Oklahoma city, OK: Executive Development Associates. Retrieved from [http://www.hreonline.com/pdfs/02012010Extra\\_LeadershipStudy.pdf](http://www.hreonline.com/pdfs/02012010Extra_LeadershipStudy.pdf).
- Hannan, M. T., Burton, M. D., & Baron, J. N. (1996). Inertia and change in the early years: Employment relations in young, high technology firms. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 5, 503-537.

- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51(5), 469-477.
- Hogan, R. T. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist' Press.
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A Theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Hollander, M. A., & Parker, H. J. (1972). Occupational stereotypes and self-descriptions: Their relationship to vocational choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 2, 57-65.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
- John, O. P. (1990). The search for basic dimensions of personality. In P. McReynolds, J.C. Rosen, & C. J. Chelune (Eds.), *Advances in psychological assessment* (Vol. 7), 1-37. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-394.
- Judge, T., & Ferris, G. (1992). The elusive criterion of fit in human resource staffing decisions. *Human Resource Planning*, 15(4), 47-66.

- Judge, T., & Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2004). Personality, interactional psychology, and person-organization fit. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds.), *Personality and organizations*, 87-109. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4/5), 525-544.
- Kanter, R. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: structural, collective and social conditions for innovation in organizations. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 10), 169-211. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kavanagh, M. H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management*, 17, 81-103.
- Kilmann, R. (1984). *Beyond the quick fix*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kilmann, R., Saxton, M. J., & Serpa, R. (1985). Introduction: Five key issues in understanding and changing culture. In R. H. Kilmann, M. J. Saxton, R. Serpa & associates (Eds.), *Gaining control of the corporate culture*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kohs, S. C., & Irle, K. W. (1920). Prophesying army promotion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4, 73-87.
- Kotter, J. (1998). Cultures and coalitions. In R. Gibson (Ed.), *Rethinking the future: Rethinking business, principles, competition, control & complexity, leadership, markets and the world*, 164-178. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (2008). *Corporate culture and performance* (Reprint ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Krefting, L. A. & Frosel, P. J. (1985). Untangling webs, surfing waves, and wildcatting: A multiple-metaphor perspective on managing culture. In P. J. Frost, J. Peter, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organization culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 985-993.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 281-342.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.
- Kummerow, E. & Kirby, N. (2014). *Organisational culture: Concept, context, and measurement, volume 1*. Singapore: World scientific Publishing Company.
- Lewis, A. (2011, January 26). How my company hires for culture first, skills second. Retrieved from <http://blogs.hbr.org/2011/01/how-my-company-hires-for-cultu/>.
- Lievens, F., Decaestecker, C., & Coetsier, P. (2001). Organizational attractiveness for prospective applicants: A person-organisation fit perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50* (1), 30-51.
- Louis, M. R. (1983). Organizations as culture-bearing milieux. In L. R. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan & T. C. Dandridge (Eds.), *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- MacIntosh, E. W., & Doherty, A. (2010). The influence of organizational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Sport Management Review*, 13(2), 106-117. doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2009.04.006.
- Mani, B. G. (1995). Progress on the journey to Total Quality Management: Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Adjective Check List in management development. *Public Personal Management*, 24(3), 365-398.
- Martin, A. (2007). *The changing nature of leadership*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/NatureLeadership.pdf>.
- McIlvaine, A. R. (2010, February 1). The leadership factor. *Human Resource Executive Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/view/story.jhtml?id=330860027>.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424-432.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., Adkins, C. L. (1992). The measurement of work value congruence: A field study comparison. *Journal of Management*, 18, 33-44.
- Miner, B. (2000). Testing a psychological typology of entrepreneurship using business founders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1), 43-69.

- Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 175-199.
- Morley, M. J. (2007). Person-organization fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(2), 109-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940710726375>.
- Muchinsky, P. M., Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence?: Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277.
- Mumford, M., & Gustafson, S. (1988). Creativity syndrome: integration, application, and innovation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 27-43.
- Mumford, M. D., & Licuanan, B. (2004). Leading for innovation: Conclusions, issues, and directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 163-171.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ng, E. S. W., & Burke, R. J. (2005). Person-organization fit and the war for talent: Does diversity management make a difference?. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1195-1210.
- Nicholls, J. (1988). The transforming autocrat. *Management Today, March*, 114-118.
- Ogbonna, E. (1993). Managing organizational culture: Fantasy or reality?. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3(2), 42-54.
- Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies. *Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 766-788.
- Oktay, Julianne S. (2012). *Pocket guides to social work research methods: Grounded theory*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

- Orchard, L. (1998). Managerialism, economic rationalism and public sector reform in Australia: Connections, divergences, alternatives. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 57(1), 19-32.
- O'Reilly, C. (1989). Corporations, culture, and commitment: Motivation and social control in organizations. *California Management Review*, 31(4), 9-25.
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487-516.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In I. B. Weiner, W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Volume 12: Industrial and organizational psychology*, 565-594. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Park, J., & Kim, T. H. (2009). Do types of organizational culture matter in nurse job satisfaction and turnover intention?. *Leadership in Health Services*, 22(1), 20-38. doi: 10.1108/17511870910928001.
- Parker, R., & Bradley, L. (2000). Organizational culture in the public sector: Evidence from six organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(2), 125-141.
- Pascale, R. T. & Athos, A. G. (1981). *The art of Japanese management: Applications for American executives*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York, NY: Random House.

- Piedmont, R. L., McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T. (1991). Adjective Check List scales and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 630-637.
- Prahalad, C. K. & Bettis, R. A. (1986). The dominant logic: A new linkage between diversity and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 485-501.
- Prajogo, D. I. & Ahmed, P. K. (2006). Relationships between innovation stimulus, innovation capacity, and innovation performance. *R&D Management*, 36(5), 499-515.
- Quick, J. C. (1992). Crafting an organizational culture: Herb's hand at southwest airlines. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(2), 45-56.
- Ravlin, E. C., Meglino, B. M. (1987a). Issues in work values measurement. In W. C. Frederick (Ed.). *Research in corporate social performance and policy*, 9. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ravlin, E. C, Meglino, B. M. (1987b). Effects of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work value measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 666-673.
- Reed, R., & DeFillippi, R. J. (1990). Causal ambiguity, barriers to imitation, and sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 88-102.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2009). *Organizational behavior* (13th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Rowe, G., & Nejad, M. H. (2009). Strategic leadership: Short-term stability and long-term viability. *The Ivey Business Journal*, September/October.
- Saffold, G. 1988. Culture traits, strength, and organizational performance: Moving beyond “strong” culture. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 546-558.
- Sarros, J. C., Cooper, B. K., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Building a climate for innovation through transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15, 145-158.

- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437.
- Schneider, B. (2001). Fits about fit. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 141-52.
- Scholz, C. (1987). Corporate culture and strategy: The problem of strategic fit. *Long Range Planning*, 25(Winter), 3-16.
- Seong, J. Y., Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2012). Testing multidimensional models of person-group fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27 (6), 536-556.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Simms, J. (1997). Beauty queen, *Marketing Business*, March, 48-51.
- Simonton, D. K. (1986). Presidential personality: Biographical used of the Gough Adjective Check List. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 149-160.
- Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 89-103.
- Spokane, A. R., Meir, E. I., Catalano, M. (2000). Person-environment congruence and Holland's theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 137-187.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature.

*Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Terman, L. M. (1904). A preliminary study in the psychology and pedagogy of leadership.

*Journal of Genetic Psychology, 11*, 413-451.

Tolor, A. (1961). The relationship between insight and intraception. *Journal of Clinical*

*Psychology, 17*(2), 188-189.

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research, 11*, 98.

Tsai, Y. & Wu, S. W. (2010). The relationships between organisational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 19*, 3564–3574.

Tsui, A. S, Zhang, Z. X., Wang, H., Xin, K. R., & Wu, J. B. (2006). Unpacking the relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organizational culture. *Leadership Quarterly, 17*(2), 113-137.

Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1997). *Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Uttal, B. (1983). The corporate culture vultures, *Fortune, 108* (8), 66.

Valle, M. (1999). Crisis, culture and charisma: The new leader's work in public organizations.

*Public Personnel Management, 28*(2), 245-257.

Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 473-89.

Van de Ven, A. (1986). Central problems in the management of innovation. *Management Science, 32*, 590–607.

- Van Vianen, A. E. M., De Pater, I. E., & Van Dijk, F. (2007). Work value fit and turnover intention: Same-source or different-source fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(2), 188-202.
- Vidoni, D. O. (1977). Factor analytic scales of the Adjective Check List (ACL) replicated across samples: Implications for validity. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, 37, 535-539.
- Waterman, R. H., Jr., Waterman, J. D., & Collard, B. A. (1994). Toward a career-resilient workforce. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4), 87-95.
- Weiner, Y. 1988. Forms of value systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 534-545.
- Werbel, J. D., & DeMarie, S. M. (2005). Aligning strategic human resource management and person-environment fit. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15, 247-262.
- Werbel, J. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (1999). Person–environment fit in the selection process. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 17, 209–243.
- West, M. A. (2012). *Effective teamwork: Practical lessons from organizational research* (3rd ed.). London: BPS Blackwell.
- Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L. A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person–organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12 (3), 252-261.
- Westerman, J. W., & Vanka, S. (2005). A cross-cultural empirical analysis of person-organization fit measures as predictors of student performance in business education: Comparing students in the United States and India. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, 409-420.

- Wheeler, A. R., Buckley, M. R., Halbesleben, J. R., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2005). The elusive criterion of fit revisited: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, 265-304. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 308-315.
- Zahra, S. Z. (1999). The changing rules of global competitiveness in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(1), 36-42.