



September 2024

A comparative study of Argentinean and Colombian employee perceptions of managerial behavioral effectiveness

Carlos E. Ruiz

Georgia Gwinnett College, cruiz@ggc.edu

Melinda K. Cline

Georgia Gwinnett College, mcline@ggc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/globe>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), and the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

This Case Study is brought to you for free and open access by the M3 Center at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Global Business Insights by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Ruiz, C. E., & Cline, M. K. (2024). A comparative study of Argentinean and Colombian employee perceptions of managerial behavioral effectiveness. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 9(2), 148-162. <https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2640-6489.9.2.1293>

A comparative study of Argentinean and Colombian employee perceptions of managerial behavioral effectiveness

Authors

Corresponding Author

Carlos E. Ruiz, 27406 Plantation Dr, 30324 , Atlanta, GA, United States.

Abstract

This study explores the similarities and differences among Argentinean and Colombian employees regarding their perceptions of effective and ineffective managerial and leadership behavior by conducting a qualitative multiple cross-case and cross nation comparative analysis of findings from two previous emic replication studies. The findings of this study suggest more similarities than differences in the perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian workers about effective/ineffective managerial and leadership behaviors and highlight important nuances. Although there are cultural differences among Argentineans and Colombians, the findings of this study suggest that culture may not play a substantial role in the perception of managerial behavioral effectiveness. These findings are relevant to human resource professionals training executives for assignments in Argentina and Colombia. Designing training programs that help managers understand what are perceived as effective/ineffective managerial behaviors by Argentineans and Colombians can improve the effectiveness of Argentinean managers working in Colombia and Colombian managers working in Argentina.

Keywords

effective, management, Argentina, Colombia, leadership

Revisions

Submission date: Jan. 16, 2023; 1st Revision: Apr. 23, 2024; 2nd Revision: Jun. 3, 2024; 3rd Revision: Aug. 19, 2024; Acceptance: Aug. 21, 2024

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

A Comparative Study of Argentinean and Colombian Employee Perceptions of Managerial Behavioral Effectiveness

Carlos E. Ruiz¹ and Melinda K. Cline²

School of Business Administration
Georgia Gwinnett College, United States

¹cruiz@ggc.edu

²mcline@ggc.edu

Abstract

This study explores the similarities and differences among Argentinean and Colombian employees regarding their perceptions of effective and ineffective managerial and leadership behavior by conducting a qualitative multiple cross-case and cross-nation comparative analysis of findings from two previous emic replication studies. The findings of this study suggest more similarities than differences in the perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian workers about effective/ineffective managerial and leadership behaviors and highlight important nuances. Although there are cultural differences among Argentineans and Colombians, the findings of this study suggest that culture may not play a substantial role in the perception of managerial behavioral effectiveness. These findings are relevant to human resource professionals training executives for assignments in Argentina and Colombia. Designing training programs that help managers understand what are perceived as effective/ineffective managerial behaviors by Argentineans and Colombians can improve the effectiveness of Argentinean managers working in Colombia and Colombian managers working in Argentina.

Keywords: effective, management, Argentina, Colombia, leadership

Introduction

Trade between Colombia and Argentina has a significant impact on the economy of both countries, contributing to economic growth, job creation, and social development (Palacios, 2024). The bilateral trade between these countries has steadily increased since 2015. In 2021, trade was up 86.5% from 2020, becoming the largest bilateral trade in the past nine years. In 2021, exports from Argentina to Colombia increased by 92.6% compared to 2020. Meanwhile, Argentinean imports from Colombia increased by 69.5% compared to 2020 (Arguello, 2022). Bogota, the capital of Colombia, and other major cities in Colombia have been the recipients from 2016 to 2020 of more than \$155 million from more than 30 Argentinean companies (Ceriotta, 2021). These investments led to the creation of more than 3,800 jobs. In 2020, investments from Argentinean companies in Bogota made Argentina the second largest foreign investor in this city, just after the United States. Regarding the future, trade between these two countries is expected to continue growing in the coming years, driven by the economic recovery after the COVID-19 pandemic and the implementation of trade and integration policies that encourage bilateral cooperation (Palacios,

2024). This increase in trade could be attributed to different reasons, such as the importance of international trade for the economic growth of the country (Ainscough & Shank, 2023).

As Argentinean and Colombian companies internationalize into Colombia and Argentina, Argentinean executives are assigned to lead Colombian employees and vice versa. Additionally, executives from the United States and Europe manage employees in these countries as their direct investment has steadily increased in Latin America (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2022). This study provides insight into similarities and differences to highlight effective and ineffective managerial and leadership behaviors in Argentina and Colombia, how they are similar, and how they are different.

These findings extend to research conducted in the United Kingdom (see Hamlin & Bassi, 2008; Hamlin & Cooper, 2007; Hamlin & Serventi, 2008) investigating perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in different countries across continents. This study examines perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian employees about perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Effective leadership is essential for an organization to improve competitiveness and helps organizations be better prepared to take advantage of the opportunities and face the challenges associated with globalization (Ireland & Hitt, 2005). “No matter what the organization’s activity, or country, the better the decisions of its managers and leaders, the more likely that the organization will thrive” (Rausch, 1999, p. 1). This article begins by providing a literature review about managerial effectiveness in Argentina and Colombia followed by a section which includes the theoretical framework, research questions, and data analysis. Lastly, the study's results are presented, and managerial implications are discussed.

Literature Review

Research that specifically compares managerial behavioral effectiveness in Argentina and Colombia is scarce. However, cross-cultural studies do suggest managerial practices that may be perceived as effective in these two Latin American countries. The findings of these studies are included in this section.

Managerial Effectiveness in Argentina

Hofstede’s cross-cultural study (1980) suggests that the effectiveness of specific managerial practices may vary among organizations based on the cultural dimensions of the country. For example, according to the study, Argentines score high on uncertainty avoidance, suggesting that employees in Argentina may feel more comfortable with rules and with managers who provide clear instructions. Moreover, Argentina’s score on power distance suggests that employees in the country may feel comfortable with managers who exhibit an authoritarian leadership style (Ruiz et al., 2016). Aimar and Stough (2007) indicate that in Argentinean companies, decisions are made at the top, and employees do not usually question these decisions. Employees avoid expressing disagreement with the decisions made by their managers. Hofstede’s (1980) study also suggests that Argentines tend to be collectivistic and that networking is critical in this country. People tend to rely more on individuals they know rather than on those they do not know. Aimar and Sought (2007) indicate that relationships take precedence over institutions in Argentina. Additionally, Hofstede suggests that Argentines highly value earnings, success, advancement, and recognition.

Trompenaar and Hampden-Turner's cultural study on Argentina (1998) provides additional insights into effective managerial practices. Unlike Hofstede's study, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found Argentines to be individualistic, suggesting that employees in Argentina may be inclined to take personal responsibility and achieve goals on their own rather than in groups. Moreover, Argentines tend to be achievement-oriented, and promotions are based on performance.

In addition to Hofstede's research and the study conducted by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) study (House et al., 2004) suggests Argentinean senior managers who are considered very effective exhibit the following behaviors and/or attributes: charismatic, human-oriented, participative, and team-oriented. In contrast, ineffective managers exhibit self-protective (self-centered, status-conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural) and autonomous behaviors (independent, individualistic, and self-centric; Center for Creative Leadership, 2014).

Regarding research that specifically explores managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness in Argentina, only one study was found. This study (Ruiz et al., 2016) explored behaviors related to effective and ineffective management as perceived by individuals (managers and non-managers) working in organizations located in Cordoba, Argentina. The findings of the study suggest that effective managers in Argentina are (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 276):

- Approachable, flexible and understanding of employee's needs and problems,
- Are fair decision-makers and take into consideration employees' suggestions as well as support employees' decisions,
- Are good motivators by providing rewards and recognition as well as procuring a friendly and respectful work environment,
- Care about employees doing a good job by supporting employees, providing guidance and professional development, providing recommendations for work improvement, and making sure employees have all the resources to do their work and
- Are concerned about the company's image by ensuring employees provide excellent customer service.

The present study builds upon the findings of this empirical study by comparing these findings with those of Colombia to highlight important similarities and differences.

Managerial Effectiveness in Colombia

As in the case of Argentina, studies about managerial behavioral effectiveness in Colombia are also scarce. However, the same cross-cultural studies that provide insight into managerial effectiveness in Argentina also provide insight into Colombia. Hofstede's (1980) study shows Colombia had a high score on power distance. This finding suggests that, as in the case of Argentina, employees may feel comfortable with managers who exhibit an authoritarian leadership style. A high score on power distance suggests that employees accept orders from their managers without questioning them (Luthans & Doh, 2012). Hofstede's findings about collectivism in Colombia suggest that relationships are very important for Colombians. In the workplace, this could translate into managers favoring employees with whom they have a good relationship over those employees who may perform better but who may not have a relationship with the manager that is as strong. Additionally, in collectivist societies like Colombia, managers may prefer to hire

individuals based on connections rather than qualifications. Similarly, managers may be inclined to promote employees based on relationships versus achievements (Torres et al., 2015).

Hofstede's findings about uncertainty avoidance in Colombia suggest that Colombians may prefer to avoid uncertainty and situations that could be ambiguous. They have a need for security, which may translate into more rules and regulations that limit uncertainty. Risk-averse employees may prefer a leadership style that provides clear directions over a style that lacks clarity regarding what employees are expected to do. Hofstede (1980) also found Colombians high on masculinity, suggesting that employees in Colombia value recognition and rewards. In addition, a high score on masculinity suggests that Colombians look for professional development and career advancement.

As is in the case of Argentina, another relevant study that furthers an understanding of managerial effectiveness in Colombia is the GLOBE study (House et al., 2004). According to the study's findings, to be an effective manager in Colombia, it is important to be team-oriented, involve employees in decision-making, be charismatic, and be human-oriented. It is important for managers to be able to inspire their subordinates, take into consideration the input from employees, promote teamwork, and be mindful of the well-being of the employees. On the other hand, managers who want to be successful in Colombia should avoid self-centered, autonomous, and self-protective behaviors.

The studies mentioned above suggest that certain behaviors and/or practices may lead to effective management in Colombia, but they do not specifically explore managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness. One study that does is Torres et al. (2015), which identifies managerial and leadership behaviors perceived as effective and ineffective by employees from Colombian companies located in Bogota, Colombia. The findings of this study indicate that Colombian employees perceive effective managers who (Torres et al., 2015, pp. 213-214):

- Are considerate of employee's points of view,
- Are fair decision-makers,
- Provide a professional and positive work environment,
- Promote and recognize hard work,
- Are flexible and open to new ideas,
- Are good listeners and support employees,
- Encourage employee development,
- Adapt to new situations,
- How empowerment, discipline, and organization,
- Guide proactively,
- Are effective problem solvers and
- Are considerate of employee's personal needs.

This study expands the previous research conducted on the two aforementioned empirical studies in Argentina and Colombia about perceived managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness by exploring the similarities and differences between the perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian employees regarding attributes of effective and ineffective managerial behavior.

Theoretical Framework

As previously done in our other comparative studies (Ruiz et al., 2023), this study is framed by two main concepts: the *multiple constituency model of organizational effectiveness* and *reputational effectiveness*. These concepts have been commonly used in studies with the purpose of exploring worker's perceptions of managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness. *Multiple constituencies* refers to the fact that in organizations, multiple stakeholders, such as peers, subordinates are affected by the work of the manager. These stakeholders have expectations of the performance of the manager (Tsui, 1990). *Reputational effectiveness* refers to the reputation of the manager for effectively meeting the expectations of different stakeholders. According to Tsui and Ashford (1994), how managers are perceived by the stakeholders may have a negative or positive impact on the actual performance of the manager. For instance, when subordinates perceive that the manager is underperforming or not meeting the expectations, this can lead to subordinates not wanting to collaborate with the manager. In contrast, when subordinates perceive that the manager is doing an effective job, this may lead to subordinates supporting the manager in achieving his/her goals.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study examines similar and different perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian employees about managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness using interview data from indigenous studies conducted in Argentina and Colombia. The research questions guiding this study are:

- What are the similarities and differences between the perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian employees about *effective* managerial behavior?
- What are the similarities and differences between the perceptions of Argentinean and Colombian employees about *ineffective* managerial behavior?

Methods

Empirical generalization replication (Tsang & Kwan, 1999) and *derived etic* (Berry, 1989) involving multiple *cross-case analysis* and *replication logic* (Eisenhardt, 1989) are used for this study. This emic-etic method is appropriate for studies when the objective is to develop valid generalizations (Berry, 1989) from studies using similar methodologies that explore the same phenomena. Following this approach (emic-etic), this present study compares the findings of the Argentinean and Colombian studies previously discussed in the literature review.

Sampling

In 1988, researchers began an ongoing collaborative project to collect data on the perceptions of managerial behavioral effectiveness in different countries (e.g., Hamlin, 1988; Hamlin et al., 2012; Hamlin et al., 2022; Patel et al., 2019). Data is collected by interviewing a purposive sample of managerial and non-managerial employees working in a diverse set of organizations in both the private and public sectors. To date, interviews have been conducted in more than 20 countries. The purpose of gathering this data is so researchers can go beyond broad generalizations and understand managerial nuances in different countries. This study compares findings from prior studies of two individual countries (Ruiz et al., 2016; Torres et al., 2015) to identify the similarities and differences in the perceptions of managerial behavioral effectiveness among Argentinean and Colombian workers.

The empirical source data derived for this etic study is described in Table 1. As previously done in Hamlin's original and replica studies, Flanagan's (1954) critical incidents (CI) technique is used. The CIs are grouped into clusters based on their similarity in meaning. Subsequently, behavioral statements (BSs) are created to reflect the essence of the clustered CIs. Each cluster includes a minimum of three and a maximum of 12 CIs ($n = 3$ to 12). As shown in Table 1, the number of technique participants surveyed is 42 and 27 for Argentina and Colombia, respectively. The number of CIs collected is 302 and 267 for Argentina and Colombia, respectively, and the number of discrete BSs derived from the analyzed CIs is 69 for Argentina and 53 for Colombia.

Table 1. Empirical Source Data Used for the Present Derived Etic Study

Nation	Subject Focus	Male	Female	CIT Participant	CI Collected	Positive CCI	Negative CCI	Effective BS	Ineffective BSs	BSs <i>n</i>
Argentina	N, FL, S, M	21	21	42	302	155	147	32	37	69
Colombia	N, FL, S, M	18	9	27	267	134	133	26	27	53
Total		39	30	69	569	289	280	58	64	122

Note. N = Non-Managers; FL = First Line Managers; S = Senior Manager; M = Middle Manager; CIT = Critical Incidents Technique; CI = Critical Incidents; CCI = Coded Critical Incident; BS = Behavioral Statements.

Source. Argentina: Ruiz et al. (2015); Colombia: Torres et al. (2016).

Data Analysis

The BSs that emerge from the findings of the Argentinean and Colombian studies are analyzed through an inductive and deductive comparative procedure using *open* and *axial* coding. The first step is to identify and code the essence of the BSs for each study (Argentinean and Colombian). The next step is to compare the BSs of both studies. The purpose of this technique is to identify sameness, similarity, and congruence between the Argentinean and Colombian BSs. This is done by using *axial* coding. *Sameness* is determined when the sentences of two or more BSs are equal or near equal. *Similarity* is determined when the meaning of the BSs is fairly the same even though the sentences are not precisely the same or near the same. Finally, *Congruence* is determined to be present when similarity or sameness occurs in the keywords describing the BSs (Flick, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Findings

When comparing the Argentinean and Colombian BSs, a substantial number of BSs are close to identical or similar in substance and meaning. As shown in Table 2, 18 of the 32 Argentinean positive-effective BSs are convergent in meaning with 18 of the 26 Colombian BSs. Likewise, 32 of the 37 Argentinean and 21 of the 27 Colombian negative-ineffective BSs are convergent in meaning. Nevertheless, as shown in Table 2, the Argentinean and Colombian participants identified 14 and 8 perspective-specific positive BSs and 5 and 6 perspective-specific negative BSs of managerial behavior that are divergent in meaning.

Table 2. Comparison of the Argentinean and Colombian Positive (Effective) and Negative (Ineffective) Behavioral Categories

<u>Argentina</u> Positive Behavioral Statements	<u>Colombia</u> Positive Behavioral Statements
<i>Convergent</i> – Recognizes, praises, and shows his/her appreciation when employees hard work and perform well (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).	<i>Convergent</i> – Manager rewards deserving employees (e.g., for working extra hard; achieving company revenue goals; Torres et al., 2015, p. 210). – Manager gives public recognition to the successes/good performance of his/her employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).

<p>– Recognizes the hard work, good performance and exceptional achievements of individual employees through financial or non-financial reward (e.g., extra pay/bonus or pay rise or payment in kind; Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	
<p>– Makes sure employees have up to date resources/technology and are in a safe working environment (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager fights for and secures resources for his his/her employees, and/or acts as an advocate with higher management on their behalf (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager takes action to improve/optimize the efficient use of employee time and other resources (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p>
<p>– Manager delegates responsibilities for projects to employees and/or empowers them to make their own decisions in the way they operate (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager actively delegates to and empowers his/her employees to make their own decisions (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager gives space and flexibility that allows employees to use their initiative, develop ideas, and make their own decisions (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p>
<p>– Encourages and/or supports employees to study and learn more so as to develop themselves personally and professionally (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Provides or facilitates training and professional development opportunities (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager actively supports employees’ endeavors to develop and/or advance their careers and/or settle into a new job (e.g., giving promotional opportunities; helping with transfer/relocation within organizational; Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager encourages and supports employees to develop and broaden their skills, and/or actively arranges training for them and/or trains them personally (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager encourages and supports employees to attend work related (trade/industrial) learning events such s fairs, conventions, and conferences (Torres et al., 2015, p. 21).</p>
<p>– Actively listens to/talks with employees who have queries or doubts (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Seeks opinions of his/her employees before making decisions (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Gets employees together in departmental meetings and/or ad hoc meetings when problem situations arise to discuss specific and/or general issues and to share ideas and differences (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager is open to the ideas/suggestions of employees and listens to them (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager accepts and implements suggestions from employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager seeks and utilizes the views of employees in his decisions, and/or involves them in discussions and problem solving activities (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p>
<p>– Monitors the performance of employees (and of self) and takes action to maintain or improve it and/or to address identified sub-standard behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Takes action to check and maintain productivity and the quality of products and customer service (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Takes action to ensure customers/clients are properly taken care of by employees (or by self if necessary; Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager addresses problems with employees whose behavior or performance is below standard and takes action to discipline or even fire them if necessary (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager reacts fast to problems experienced by customers and arranges for them to be fixed (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager indirectly and/or directly helps/supports employees deal with problem issues arising with their customers or clients (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p>
<p>– Visits and/or contacts staff who are sick or have a close family member who is sick or check how they are and to offer all necessary help (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Allows employees ‘leave of absence’ to attend to domestic emergencies or personal health matters (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Shows care and consideration for the feelings and personal well-being of employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager shows care and concern for the health and well-being of his/her employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p>
<p>– Socializes with employees which builds a trusting relationship (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Sets and communicates clear objectives and outcome expectations, and gives clear directions/instruction on how to achieve them (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Provides advice, guidance and/or ideas to help/support employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	<p>– Manager instigates social interaction with employees outside of work (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).</p> <p>– Manager clearly explains to employees what needs to be done, and/or gives guidance on how it needs to be done (Torres et al., 2015, p. 209).</p>
<p>Divergent</p>	<p>Divergent</p>
<p>– Is fair in the way s/he treats her/his employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	
<p>– Pays all employees well, with regular incremental increases, and/or general benefits, or bonuses allocated according to seniority (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Always ensures employees are paid on time (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	
<p>– Is always seen in a good mood which also makes employees feel good at work (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Does things that make employees feel important and part of a team/community (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p> <p>– Takes every opportunity to say nice things about every individual employee (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277).</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recognizes and treats employees with respect as individuals and/or as equals (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). – Does and says things that make employees feel good about themselves and/or feel important (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). – Shows care and kindness for employees and other people (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Expects employees to exhibit a high standard of appearance and behavior to ensure the right image is sent out, and thereby protect the reputation of the business (e.g., impeccable dress, organization, cleanliness, confidentiality of information; Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). – Leads by example in ensuring a good image and reputation of self and of his/her company (e.g., in terms of dress, cleanliness, manners, demeanor, trustworthiness; Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Allows employees to work flexible hours provided their performance is not affected (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Helps employees learn from their mistakes (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). – Acts as mentor, coach and/or role model (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 277). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – When manager sees a subordinate or colleague in a pressurized/potentially stressful work situation he/she lends a hand and gives personal help/support (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – When confronted by imposed or emergent changes in objectives the manager adapts to the changed situation in a positive/proactive manner (Torres et al., 2015, p. 209). – Manager addresses directly conflict or other problematic interpersonal issues that arise between individual employees and/or between teams or departments (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager organizes well the roles, responsibilities and deployment of, and collaboration between employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 209). – Manager maintains good control of the agenda and/or proceedings of meetings (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210). – Manager runs regular meetings with employees to impart and/or exchange information and/or facilitate team planning and coordination (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager is honest in his communication with employees and keeps them informed on matters that affect them (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager shows empathy for and understanding of employees confronted by worrying situations at work, and takes action to relieve the worry or stress (Torres et al., 2015, p. 210).
Negative Behavioral Statements	Negative Behavioral Statements
Convergent	Convergent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Treats employees unequally (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Treats employees unfairly and/or is unreasonably harsh (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Exhibits favoritism (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager treats employees unfairly by showing favoritism and/or being influenced by political connections (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager treats employees unequally (e.g., assigning tasks; making concessions; applying rules; dealing with mistakes; Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Exhibits rude and/or impatient behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).. – Gets upset or furious over issues and then screams at employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Engages in unprofessional/unethical behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Instigates, solicits and/or engages in gossip about individual employees and/or customers (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Behaves without consideration of the negative impact on his/her employees including intrusion or undesired encroachment into their private lives (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager shows lack of respect and civility to employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Managers gets emotionally upset and loses control (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Undermines employees by ridiculing them (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Criticizes and/or says things to employees in ways that put them down and make them feel uncomfortable (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Reprimands/criticizes individuals or groups of employees in front of others (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager talks to employees, usually in front of others, in a way that demeans, humiliates and undermines their self-confidence (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Procrastinates in making decisions or taking agreed action (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manager procrastinates in addressing issues (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager ignores employee concerns or complaints and/or notification of potential problems, and takes no action to address or resolve the issues (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211)..

<p>– Deprives employees of desirable information, backing, and/or support (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager delays and/or withholds from employees information about organizational rules, regulations or changes that will directly affect them (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).</p>
<p>– Omits or fails to communicate clearly orders, instructions or concerns about employee performance (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager fails to give to employees clear, precise, and/or timely orders/instructions/directions on what is required of them (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).</p>
<p>– Autocratically bypasses the organization's spending rules and does what s/he wants (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Is closed to new ways of doing thing, and/or exhibits rigid thinking and inflexible behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Engages in manipulative behavior to get rid of and/or replace an employee s/he does not want (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Autocratic and overly controlling behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager acts in an autocratic manner (e.g., does not empower his employees; deprives them of decision-making power/autonomy; does not allow teamwork; Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager acts in a secretive and/or arbitrary manner (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>
<p>– Excludes any employee from being involved in decision making (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager does not seek the views of employees and/or ignores any suggestions/recommendations made by them (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>
<p>– Is unreliable in decision making and/or exhibits inconsistent/contradictory behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Periodically comes to work in a 'bad mood' and exhibits behavior which inhibits or prevents effective communication taking place with employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Never listens to and/or disregards the ideas and opinions of employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Is distant and/or disengaged with his/her job and shows no interest in participating and/or helping himself or his employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Exhibits selfish/self-centered behavior (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Engages in self-serving defensive behavior at the expense of others (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager exhibits inconsistent and/or unreliable behavior (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager displays a negative attitude or closed mind to new ideas or suggestion from his employees, and/or to working collaboratively with other departments (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).</p>
<p>– Shows lack of care and consideration when an employee (or a close family member) is sick (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Shows lack of interest, respect or feeling for employees or other people (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager shows lack of sensitivity to/care for the health and well-being of his employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>
<p>– Having delegated managerial responsibilities to a subordinate s/he finds difficulty letting go and/or still makes direct contact with employees over their heads (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager micro-manages with employees always needing to ask for supervisor approval (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>
<p>– Exhibits poor planning and self-organization (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager fails to fully plan and/or prepare for meetings (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager plans badly and/or takes action without checking the completeness or correctness of the facts (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager exercises weak/poor control of the convening and running of meetings (e.g., punctuality of attendees; keeping to the agenda; keeping to time; Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>
<p>– Avoids or ignores taking action to address sub-performance issues or problem situations affecting employees (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Exhibits behavior that reveals a lack of competence and/or a poor standard of appearance/performance (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Exhibits poor interpersonal and persuasive communications skills with employees, superiors, and/or clients (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	<p>– Manager tolerates employees who under-perform (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager exhibits a lack of key knowledge, skills, competence, and/or experience that subordinates expect their manager to possess (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).</p>
<p>Divergent</p>	<p>Divergent</p>
<p>– When asking employees to work extra hours or work extra hard does so in ways that makes them feel threatened/coerced (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	
<p>– Fails to recognize and reward employees for hard work and/or extra effort (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Fails to recognize and/or remunerate employees according to their specific individual contribution and/or worth to the organization (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278). – Deprives employees of positive and/or negative feedback on performance and/or of incentives to perform or funding for personal development (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	
<p>– Keeps to himself or tries to hide from employees most of the tips and commissions earned by them (Ruiz et al., 2016, p. 278).</p>	
	<p>– Manager does not take responsibility for his/her own actions; passes the buck and blames others (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211). – Manager exhibits bad judgment, makes bad decisions and/or gives bad advice to employees (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).</p>

– Manager avoids dealing with issues that are potentially contentious. (Torres et al., 2015, p. 211).

– Manager abdicates from performing critical tasks and/or roles (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).

– Manager fails to give guidance or other forms of support to employees prior to them performing assigned task, and/or fails to respond when they make a request for guidance (Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).

– Manager deprives employees of support they require to perform better in their current jobs and/or resolve a (e.g., remote worker support; opportunity to improve in the job or undertake education or training; Torres et al., 2015, p. 212).

The results of this study suggest that the behavior of managers in Argentinean and Colombian companies is perceived as effective when they:

- Provide reward and recognition,
- Make sure employees have good working conditions and the resources necessary to do their job,
- Empower employees by delegating responsibilities and allowing them to make decisions,
- Encourage and support employees' professional development,
- Listen and implement suggestions made by employees,
- Monitor performance and take action when expectations are not met,
- Care about providing good customer service,
- Show care and concern for the personal well-being of the employees,
- Promote socialization with employees outside of work, and
- Clearly communicate instructions and expectations and provide guidance to meet the expectations.

Moreover, from the Argentinean perspective, managers are also perceived as effective when they:

- Treat employees fairly,
- Provide appropriate compensation for the work being done,
- Are in a good mood, affecting positively the performance of employees,
- Recognize employees' good work by showing appreciation and making employees feel good,
- Are kind to their employees and other people,
- Care about his/her image and the image and the reputation of the company,
- Act as a mentor and role model, and
- Allow flexible working schedules.

From the Colombian perspective, managers are also perceived as effective when they:

- Are team players and help employees when needed,
- Solve problems effectively,
- Have good planning and organization skills,
- Communicate important information to the employees, and
- Show empathy when workers are over-stressed with work and act to alleviate the situation.

From the Argentinean perspective, managers are also perceived as ineffective when they:

- Show coercive or threatening behavior,

- Fail to recognize and reward hard work,
- Fail to provide feedback on performance and
- Hide tips and commissions earned by employees.

From a Colombian perspective, managers are also perceived as ineffective when they:

- Do not take responsibility for their actions,
- Avoid dealing with issues that are contentious and from performing critical tasks, and
- Exhibit bad judgment and fail to give guidance and support to employees.

These findings suggest more similarities than differences in the way Argentinean and Colombian workers perceive effective/ineffective managerial and leadership behavior; 62% (36 of 58) of the Argentinean and Colombian positive–effective BSs, and 83% (53 of 64) of the negative–ineffective, BSs are respectively congruent in meaning. These findings suggest that Argentinean and Colombian employees perceive, to a significant extent, managerial and leadership behavioral effectiveness and ineffectiveness in a similar manner. As shown in Table 2, of 122 identified behavioral categories, 89 are convergent in meaning. This study also reveals differences in Argentinean and Colombian perceptions of behaviors associated with effective and ineffective management. Argentinean participants prioritize the need:

- To show employee fairness and appreciation,
- To stress the importance of personal and company image,
- To allow flexible schedules, and
- To provide coaching and guidance.

In addition, Colombian employees consider effective managers to be those who:

- Solve problems effectively,
- Are team players,
- Are good planners and organizers, and
- Are open and honest in their communications.

A close comparison of the *effective* and *ineffective* Argentinean and Colombian BSs reveals that most of the effective behaviors not perceived to be effective by their counterparts are congruent with the BSs of ineffective managerial behavior derived from the Argentinean/Colombian data. For example, while Argentineans consider it effective for managers to make decisions fairly, Colombian respondents consider managers ineffective when they treat employees unequally by showing favoritism. Moreover, while Argentinean participants perceive those managers who treat employees with respect as individuals and/or as equals, Colombians perceive those managers who show a lack of respect and civility to employees. Likewise, while Argentinean participants perceive managers as effective when they are always in a good mood and make employees feel good at work, Colombian participants perceive managers who talk to employees, usually in front of others, in a way that demeans, humiliates and undermines their self-confidence as ineffective.

Conclusions and Discussion

This comparative study suggests that Argentinean and Colombian employees largely perceive managerial behavioral effectiveness similarly. While this study identifies many more similarities than differences in managerial behaviors that lead to the practice of effective management in these

Latin American countries, it also identifies differences that should not be ignored. These differences may be related to cultural nuances specific to Argentina and Colombia. The findings of this study align with those who suggest that certain managerial behaviors can be effectively used in different countries regardless of their culture (e.g., Caza et al., 2021; House et al., 2004). Nevertheless, these findings also suggest that there may be managerial behaviors that could be culturally contingent, as previously indicated in other studies (e.g., Afzal & Tumpa, 2024; Pagda et al., 2021).

Theoretical Implications

Latin American countries are traditionally treated as a single or homogenous group for the purpose of human resource management; however, research suggests that there is a lot of cultural diversity among Latin American countries (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002). For example, while Hofstede (1980) finds Colombia highly collectivistic, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) find Argentina more individualistic. This study does not support differences in perceived managerial behavioral effectiveness/ineffectiveness based on this cultural dimension.

Lenartowicz and Johnson (2002) also identify differences between Argentina and Colombia. In their study about comparative managerial values in Latin American countries, they compare 12 countries in Latin America on four managerial dimensions: civility, self-direction, integrity, and drive, with each of these dimensions representing different managerial values. Their findings indicate Argentinean employees consider integrity as the most important managerial dimension followed by civility, drive, and self-direction. Colombian employees also consider integrity the most important managerial dimension followed by civility, self-direction, and drive. In addition, while the Argentineans consider the least important dimension self-direction, Colombian employees consider drive as the least important dimension. The findings of this present study support Lenartowicz and Johnson's findings about the importance of integrity and civility as managerial values, considered important by both Argentineans and Colombians. Values associated with integrity include being honest and responsible. Values associated with civility include being cheerful, helpful, loving, forgiving, clean, obedient, and polite (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002). This study suggests that civility is relevant for both Argentinean and Colombians. For example, Argentineans consider it effective when the manager:

- Allows employees leave of absence to attend to domestic emergencies or personal health matters, and
- Shows care and consideration for the feelings and personal well-being of employees.

This type of behavior is related to civility based on Lenartowicz and Johnson's study. Similarly, Colombians consider it effective behavior when the manager *shows care and concern for the health and well-being of his/her employees*; this behavior is also related to civility. To a lesser degree, the findings of this study support self-direction and drive as managerial values relevant to Argentinean and Colombian employees. Values related to self-direction include being broadminded, imaginative, independent, and intellectual. Values associated with drive include being ambitious, capable, and courageous (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002).

Additionally, the findings of this study also provide both support for and diverge from findings of the GLOBE study (House et al., 2004). For example, both studies suggest employees in Argentina and Colombia consider participative leadership effective; whereas, differing from the GLOBE

study, these findings do not suggest that charisma is a behavior that is necessary to be an effective manager. Moreover, while autonomous behavior is significantly less desired in Colombia than in Argentina, according to the GLOBE study, this study suggests this type of behavior is equally disliked in both countries.

In summary, the findings of this study support studies that advocate for the existence of effective leadership practices that can be universally used across cultures. However, these findings also suggest that some managerial behaviors effective in Argentina may not necessarily be perceived as effective in Colombia and vice versa; this could be attributed to culture. Therefore, it is recommended that global managers recognize those managerial behaviors that may be perceived as more or less effective depending on the culture of the employees. As indicated by Warner et al. (2020), there are different ways to achieve leadership effectiveness, and the leader's success is influenced by his/her ability to understand the culture of the subordinates.

Practical Implications

This study offers a more comprehensive understanding of the similarities and differences in how Argentinean and Colombian employees perceive managerial behavioral effectiveness and ineffectiveness. The findings of this study are primarily relevant for those managing employees in Argentina and Colombia, regardless of their country of origin. Although there are significant similarities in perceived managerial behavioral effectiveness among the respondents, there are also some differences. Thus, caution is advised before replicating all the effective managerial behaviors that work in one country in another; doing this may not necessarily be the best approach to effectively manage employees in different Latin American countries.

The findings of this study may also be used by human resource professionals who coach executives, including international executives, who are responsible for managing employees in Argentina and Colombia. Realizing how managers and non-managers in an organization perceive effective managerial behavior may significantly impact the overall performance of the organization. Research (e.g., Testa, 2001) suggests that when managers and subordinates are in alignment in their views, this may lead to subordinates being more willing to cooperate with the managers, which can potentially affect the organization in a positive manner. Human resource professionals who train Argentinean managers for assignments in Colombia, and vice versa, should emphasize those managerial behaviors that are considered effective in both countries while highlighting the important nuances between the countries.

Limitations and Future Research

The present comparative study has two main limitations. The first one is an unbalanced sample. While the Argentinean study includes 69 BSs, the Colombian study includes only 53 BSs. This difference in the number of BSs is most likely related to the number of interview respondents for each study (42 and 27 for Argentina and Colombia, respectively). However, even though the number of Colombian respondents was smaller than the Argentinean respondents, the sample size is appropriate for qualitative studies (Cresswell et al., 2003). Future studies may include a more significant number of participants.

The second limitation of the study is related to the gender of the Colombian respondents. While the gender of the Argentinean participants was balanced (21 female and 21 male), this was not the case in the Colombian study, which included 18 male and 9 female respondents. For replica studies in Colombia, a more gender-balanced number of respondents is recommended. Furthermore, although the findings of this study suggest that culture may not play a substantial role in how employees perceive managerial behavioral effectiveness, it is suggested that replica studies be conducted to conclude that Argentinean and Colombian employees perceive managerial effectiveness in the same way.

References

- Afzal, F., & Tumpa, R. (2024). Exploring leadership styles to foster sustainability in construction projects: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 16(3), Article 971. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16030971>
- Aimar, C., & Stough, S. (2007). Leadership: Does culture matter? Comparative practices between Argentina and the United States of America. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 11(2), 9–43.
- Ainscough, T. L., & Shank, T. M. (2023). The impact of globalization on domestic growth in Africa. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 8(2), 168–178. <https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2640-6489.8.2.1245>
- Arguello, J. (n.d.). *El intercambio comercial entre Argentina y Colombia volvió a crecer en 2021* [Trade between Argentina and Colombia grew again in 2021]. *Economis*. Retrieved July 17, 2024, from <https://economis.com.ar/el-intercambio-comercial-entre-argentina-y-colombia-volvio-a-crecer-en-2021/#:~:text=Un%20an%C3%A1lisis%20de%20la%20C%C3%A1mara%20Argentina%20de%20Comercio,una%20cifra%20similar%20a%20la%20del%20a%C3%B1o%202010>
- Berry, J. (1989). Imposed etics-emics-derived etics: The operationalization of a compelling idea. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24(6), 21– 35.
- Caza, A., Caza, B. B., & Posner, B. Z. (2021). Transformational leadership across cultures: Follower perception and satisfaction. *Administrative Sciences*, 11(1), Article 32. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3387/11/1/32>
- Center for Creative Leadership. (2014). *Leader effectiveness and culture: The GLOBE study*. <https://studylib.net/doc/8410963/the-globe-study---center-for-creative-leadership>
- Ceriotto, L. (2021, March 19). *Las inversiones argentinas se mudan a Colombia: Ocupan el segundo lugar detrás de las de EE.UU. en Bogotá* [Argentine investments move to Colombia: They rank second behind those of the US in Bogotá]. *Clarín*. https://www.clarin.com/economia/bogota-iman-pensado-inversiones-argentina_0_GiO-DWTUs.html
- Cresswell, J. W., Plano Clarke, V., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advances in mixed methods design. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural sciences* (pp. 209–240). Sage.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327–358.
- Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Hamlin, R. G. (1988). The criteria of managerial effectiveness in secondary schools. CORE: Collected and original resources in education. *International Journal of Educational Research in Microfiche*, 12(1), 1-221.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Bassi, N. (2008). Behavioural indicators of manager and managerial leader effectiveness: An example of mode 2 knowledge production in management to support evidence-based practice. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 3(2), 115–130.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Cooper, D. J. (2007). Developing effective managers and leaders within healthcare and social care contexts: An evidence-based approach. In S. Sambrook, & D. Stewart (Eds.). *HRD in the public sector: The case of health and social care* (pp. 187–212). Routledge.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Patel, T. (2012). Behavioural indicators of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness within Romanian and British public sector hospitals. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(2/3), 234–261.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Serventi, S. (2008). Generic behavioural criteria of managerial effectiveness: An empirical and comparative study of UK local government. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(4), 285–302.

- Hamlin, R., Hye-Seung, K., Chai, D., & Kim, S. (2022). Deducing an emergent South Korean behavioural taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(1/2), 41–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-04-2020-0069>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage.
- Ireland, D., & Hitt, M. (2005). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 19(4), 66–77.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Johnson, J. (2002). Comparing managerial values in twelve Latin American countries: An exploratory study. *Management International Review*, 42(3), 279–307. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40835925>
- Luthans, F., & Doh, J. P. (2012). *International management: Culture, strategy, and behaviour* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage.
- Pagda, Z., Bayraktar, S., & Jimenez, A. (2021). Exploring culture and leadership after 23 years: A replication of GLOBE project in Turkey. *Journal of International Management*, 27(1), 1008–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2021.100822>
- Palacios, K. (2024, April 2). *El trasfondo económico del intercambio comercial entre Colombia y Argentina* [The economic background of trade between Colombia and Argentina]. AmericaRetail. <https://americaretail-malls.com/paises/colombia/el-trasfondo-economico-del-intercambio-comercial-entre-colombia-y-argentina/#:~:text=Exploraremos%20el%20impacto%20econ%C3%B3mico%20del%20comercio%20entre%20Colombia,influencia%20en%20el%20crecimiento%20econ%C3%B3mico%20de%20ambas%20naciones>.
- Patel, T., Salih, A., & Hamlin, R. (2019). Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness if UAE and Egypt: A comparison through the combined lenses of Islamic work ethics and Islamic leadership. *European Management Review*, 16(3), 647–666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12184>
- Rausch, E. (1999). Management/leadership decision guidelines: Critical ingredients for competitiveness. *Competitiveness Review*, 9(2), 19–27.
- Ruiz, C., Hamlin, R., & Carioni (2016). Behavioral determinants of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in Argentina. *Human Resource Development International*, 19(4), 267–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2016.1147778>
- Testa, M. R. (2001). Do they know how their employees feel about them? *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(6), 80–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804\(01\)81013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804(01)81013-2)
- Torres, L., Ruiz, C., Hamlin, R., & Velez, A. (2015). Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness in Colombia. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(3), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2014-0062>
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Tsang, E. K. K., & Kwan, K. (1999). Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 759–780. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259353>
- Tsui, A. S. (1990). A multiple-constituency model of effectiveness: An empirical examination at the human resource subunit level. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(3), 458–483.
- Tsui, A. S., & Ashford, S. (1994). Adaptive self-regulation: A process view of managerial effectiveness. *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 93–121.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2022). *Regional trends in Latin America and the Caribbean*. https://unctad.org/system/files/non-official-document/WIR2022-Regional_trends_LAC_en.pdf#:~:text=FDI%20to%20Colombia%20grew%20by%2026%20per%20cent,levels.%20In%20Central%20America%2C%20FDI%20reached%20%2442%20billion
- Warner-Soderholm, G., Minelgaite, I., & Littrell, R. F. (2020). From LBDQXII to LBDQ50: Preferred leader behavior measurement across cultures. *The Journal of Management Development*, 39(1), 68–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-03-2019-0067>