

Model of effective leadership in public administration

UDK: 35.008.2:342

Janez Stare

Fakulteta za upravo, Univerza v Ljubljani
janez.stare@fu.uni-lj.si

ABSTRACT

A large number of factors have an impact on leadership effectiveness. One of the most commonly cited is the leadership potential of the leaders themselves. Leaders as individuals are defined in this manner by their inherited qualities and the personality-trait development they have either received or actually achieved themselves. Furthermore leadership (the conduct of leaders) is closely connected to leaders' motivation, values and work ethic, and the power and authority that leaders acquire or build. To determine the extent to which leadership effectiveness is related to personality-trait based leadership potential, the paper presents a proposed model of effective leadership in the public sector, which covers the formation of personal leadership potential and identifying leadership effectiveness. The paper presents a trial application of the model in Slovenia, which offers a realistic representation of leadership potential and leadership effectiveness, which are at a relatively low level due to past neglect of this field in Slovenian central government units.

Keywords: leadership, competences, leadership effectiveness, personality-trait based leadership potential

1. Introduction

Both the theory and practice of organisational science offer examples of attempts to identify the characteristics of effective leadership through research and analysis of how successful organisations operate. This work has found that the quality (efficiency and effectiveness) of an organisation's functioning depends primarily on leadership¹, with leaders and their potential having a major

¹ Irrespective of whether an organisation is in the public or private sector. Cf.: Hyde (1992), Fivush Levine (2000), Chaudron (1992), Bennis (1989), Skansi (2000).

Janez Stare

Model of effective leadership in public administration

impact on leadership effectiveness. The results of research and studies by organisational science experts, psychologists, economists, sociologists, engineers and others involved in theoretical and practical work are all agreed on just one point: there is no simple answer to the question of what leadership potential entails and how to measure it. There is a range of approaches and content that are considered to have a significant impact on leadership, and which have proved beneficial when applied by effective organisations.

Increasingly rapid change and development demand corresponding changes in central government operations, and also increase the importance of public administration in general. Society can only change if the public administration is actively promoting change. In modern central government units and public administrations² there is a growing realisation of the importance of leadership for this issue. Furthermore, leaders have been identified as the key factor in terms of impact on the people within an organisation, whose actions then have an impact on the organisation's performance. This places them at the very centre of studies in this field. Scientific approaches are being used – following the best practice of effective organisations – to develop and upgrade this knowledge and create a system that will facilitate the best possible selection and development of leaders, and enable them to operate effectively.

The traditional understanding of leadership focuses on the importance of accomplishing tasks that are considered achievable by means of an approach grounded on the principle of autocratic leadership and respect for rules and power. More recent concepts of leadership within central government units take into account a wider range of operation-based contents. Operational excellence and leadership effectiveness are emphasised in this approach. Furthermore, the amount of change that has occurred in central government units and the need for a continual, up-to-date response to environment requirements has only served to enhance the role of leaders.

Leadership potential in the wider sense is defined as communicative expression, personality-trait based potential, motivation to lead, and intelligence. In the narrower sense it is defined primarily as personality-trait based potential. There are different definitions of the personality-trait based potential factor (or factors); many of them are inadequate, as they are limited to individual factors within the study of personality and individual behaviour. In the proposed model the expectations relating to the personality-trait based potential indicator are broader and include results from testing character and personality and behavioural

2 Experience (e.g. UK, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Finland, Sweden, France) has indicated a number of activities (e.g. developing competence systems, defining development systems) implemented by governments, ministries or other such bodies in these countries that have been promoting leadership.

patterns as indicators of possessing various potentials. This is intended to take into account "inherent and developed" leadership potential. Another strength of this model is that it is studied in relation to leadership effectiveness and efficiency. The model tests the personality-trait based leadership potential of leaders, assessing the effectiveness of their leadership and identifying the correlation between personality-trait based leadership potential and leadership effectiveness.

The initial section of the paper presents some theoretical views on leadership and the development of leadership competence models, followed by a presentation of the model and the methodology applied. The third section presents the application of the model in Slovenia.

2. Theoretical aspects of public administration leadership and competences

Leading other people is a field that historically has been subject to a great deal of study and investigation. The diversity of approaches and findings prevents the presentation of a uniform view of leadership. Furthermore, while some studies have been primarily practical or theoretical, some have attempted to create a universal leadership model by taking in account a range of approaches, while others have attempted to use a range of models and approaches to create and explain various leadership styles. Leaders themselves are naturally the key factor in leadership. Their actions or failure to act have a key impact on their attitude to co-workers, attitudes between co-workers and attitudes to work. The shared characteristic of most definitions of a leader is that a leader is someone that directs and leads something or someone by setting an example and giving advice. In organisation theory, the definition of a leader is usually connected to achieving objectives: a leader is a person who leads co-workers by means of example and advice to achieve a set organisational objective.

Of course, there is a large number of factors affecting the public administration's performance, but leadership is definitely of fundamental importance. Leaders have the highest competences and responsibilities as well as the power to launch the processes of change. If a leader stagnates, has no vision, or responds too slowly to change, the consequences may be serious. The more change there is, the greater the leadership role (Brejc, 1999). The (legal) definition of central government administration has a huge impact on leadership within central government units. The traditional, "well-worn paths" that

arise from legal provisions and define the administration's function generally restrict creativity and the possibility of promoting flexibility in the administration's work. Research carried out in Germany indicates that public administration employees are generally more oriented towards job security and job continuity than competition, risk and mobility (Cornelius, 1993). Furthermore the internal relationships and tasks are based on regulations, with constitutional provisions requiring their implementation.

The traditional view of leadership in central government units is that it is an organisational form for executing political decisions. This means that members of the executive in this organisational form do not set the operational objectives themselves, but are required to respect and achieve objectives set for them. It includes the theory that employees on principle avoid work, and their results are best if they are coerced in some way and closely supervised. The first leadership principles and models were designed on the basis of an autocratic leadership style. Noteworthy theoretical contributions include Weber, McGregor, and Fayol. Fayol's contribution explains the management function³ (1916) and defines it as an activity including planning (analysis, planning, forecasting, decision-making), organisation (material and human resources), commanding (commanding, leading operations), coordinating and supervising (control, analysis and measures with appropriate sanctions). It is an important part of leadership studies because he discussed principles that leaders have to consider depending on the appropriateness of the situation, rather than simply rules to be followed. This diverges significantly from Weber (1947, pp. 328-340) who links leadership in public administration to rules and the concept of bureaucracy. McGregor's contribution is significant to leadership studies because he set out another theory, "Theory Y", which offers a positive view of people (Dessler, 1986, pp. 52-53).

Nevertheless, public administration differs from the private sector in the approaches to people found in managing and leading people. Farnham and Horton (1996, pp. 32-33) state that the differences exist due to a different orientation towards people. In the public sector (including central government units) there is noticeably more (primarily social) responsibility towards employees than in the private sector. In the private sector employees are seen more as a resource, with managing them seen as a secondary operational function. More recent efforts to achieve operational efficiency in the public sector have related to all the major aspects of operations, from the organisation and implementation (technology) of administrative work to setting the operational objectives, strategies, vision and mission. The limited resources available in

3 Management in the sense of governance.

the public sector, the impact it has on social development and the increase in customer demands regarding services, has led to calls for management principles to be introduced to the public sector. This approach or movement emphasises the role of employees, particularly leaders, whose conduct influences the management of operations, development and implementing change.

Behavioural competences include personal characteristics that contribute to effective work performance (e.g. interpersonal skills, positions, motivation). Work-based competences include specific skills and aptitudes that ensure work output will meet specific standards. The beginnings of competence theory go back to 1967, when Argyle developed a competence concept that was intended to recognise excellence in the performance of individuals. The concept was aimed at the overall field of human characteristics and abilities. There was a special emphasis on the aptitudes of the individual, their habits, skills and knowledge, motivation, interests and disposition. A significant milestone in the application of competences came with the theories argued by McClelland in his work *Testing for Competence rather than Intelligence* (1973). He found (Spencer L. M., Spencer S. M., 1993, p.4) that tests of knowledge could not be used to predict an individual's work performance, and that tests were often biased against people from minorities, women, and people from a lower social class. He therefore started to develop a research method to define competency variables that could be used to predict work performance, and that would not be biased towards any specific social group. This was intended to demonstrate that an individual's work performance depends on his or her competences and not just on intelligence. Tomažič (2003) states that today there are almost as many definitions of competence as there are authors studying them. He also states that the great majority of authors want to use the competence concept to cover everything that either directly or indirectly has an impact on outstanding productivity by the individual.

3. Designing the effective leadership model and methodology

3.1 Starting points for model design

The design of the model to test effective leadership follows the pattern of models treating leadership as a process. Within this model, the leadership competence model becomes the linking factor between leadership potential

and leadership effectiveness, which is used as the basis for testing leadership effectiveness and determining how leader potential influences the effectiveness of their leadership. The leadership competence model must be designed so that is a factor in leadership, but also a criterion for leadership. In that way it can serve both as a basic criterion for measuring leader effectiveness (performance), and also as a tool for shaping leader development. A number of foreign leadership competence models were studied in order to develop the model⁴. This review indicated that the models used were generally designed for public administration and public sector, but related to various levels of leadership. The competence models usually comprise competences defined by various content-based factors or groups (e.g. intellectual competences with cognitive capacity and creativity) and verification criteria. It should be made clear that models used in practice by central government units around the world, and various foreign organisations, particularly in the public sector, in the field of leadership can offer a sound basis for acquiring an overview of the competences involved in public administration leadership, but no more than that, because a competence model must be designed for a specific environment, taking into account the specific work culture, values and characteristics.

On this basis and by analysing individual models (studies of factors and criteria within the model) one can formulate the content groups that are frequently mentioned in the case of leadership in central government units. These are the groups or competences:

- *Teamwork*; content (criteria) that relate to teamwork are linked to the leader's attitude to cooperation between all employees. This involves permitting and promoting diversity, ownership of ideas and results, and judging when teamwork is effective and when it is not;
- *Interpersonal relations*; the leader builds, works on and maintains good interpersonal relations. This includes being aware of difficult situations that could lead or have led to problems and conflicts. Leaders must be interested in subordinates' expectations in order to achieve this;
- *Communicating*; communicative expression and willingness to engage in two-way communication is the most important leadership criterion. It relates to clear verbal and non-verbal communication, respecting the principles of dialogue and keeping employees informed;

⁴ Including Senior Executive Leadership Capability (Australia), Public Services Commission of Canada (Canada), Bundesverwaltungsamt, Konzept VBS (Germany), ABD – Algemene Bestuursdienst (Netherlands) Verteidigung, Bevölkerungsschutz und Sport (Switzerland), Senior Civil Service Competence Framework (United Kingdom) and United States Office of Personnel Management, MOSAIC (United States).

Model of effective leadership in public administration

- *Vision and creativity*; leaders promote, co-create and implement a vision and strategy for future work that will contribute to achieving the organisation's objectives. To this end, leaders promote and enable employees to operate in accordance with the vision and strategy;
- *Environment*; the environment of an administration (interior and exterior) is an important factor in the operations of an organisation unit. The leader must be familiar with and understand the administration's operational system and links with formal and informal groups that affect work and attitudes to work;
- *Process creation*; knowledge and experience allow leaders to understand various aspects of work, and the creation of work processes. To ensure that leaders optimise the organisation of work, they provide conditions and respect the interests of key partners (employees, customers);
- *Action*; action is one of the most important characteristics of a leader. It relates to the implementation and progress of work and providing and coordinating all actions to achieve the set objectives;
- *Resource management*; leaders plan, provide and take charge of optimal utilisation of resources. This emphasises the importance of the leader's role in managing human resources both in recruitment procedures and employee development. Leaders ensure that employees have an appropriate work burden and adopt measures to assess their contribution to work;
- *Motivation*; leaders help employees to seek challenges in work, and motivate them to achieve standards and provide appropriate rewards, promoting independence and responsibility at work;
- *Cognition and development*; based on their knowledge and understanding of the situation, leaders recognise innovations and their impact on work. To make managing new content easier, leaders study and search for information, keep aware of trends and developments in the fields in which they operate;
- *Employee development*; leaders recognise the need for employees to gain new knowledge and qualifications. This is the basis for ensuring the development of employees. This includes clearly explaining matters to those affected, and openly discussing knowledge and skills they must develop to work effectively and enjoy a successful career;

Janez Stare

Model of effective leadership in public administration

- *Awareness*; leaders in the central government units must have an awareness of working in the public interest on the basis of a mission and common values;
- *Values*; in every situation leaders must act honestly, responsibly and respectfully;
- *Example*; leaders encourage responsible conduct by setting an example themselves. They do not use their position for their own private interests, and work to bring a sense of pride to the organisation;
- *Personality*; leaders exude energy. They are reliable and have established principles within which they generally operate. In stressful situations they retain their composure and maintain the effectiveness of their work.

These 15 groups of competences serve as the basis for creating a leadership competence model for central government units.

3.2 The effective leadership model

The model is based on studying two content groups, based on two questionnaires. The first questionnaire determines leadership effectiveness, the second determines personality-trait based leadership potential. The results of the two questionnaires are given separately in the middle section and are then combined in the joint analysis of the leadership effectiveness of the groups of leaders.

Personality-trait based leadership potential is determined by studying leaders' personalities. This study took place using personal characteristic tests to assess leadership potential. The Frančeškin character test (FTK-test) is used, which is intended to study and develop human potential in the workplace and in general. It represents a network of intersecting basic findings from several major researchers into human behaviour⁵. It is based on studying character and personal characteristics as the part of the personality with the most stable, long-term validity. It is the very stability of personal characteristics that allow them to serve as a basis for forecasting potential, as well as current and future opportunities (for more detail see Frančeškin, 2003).

⁵ R. Le Senne, C. G. Jung, R. B. Cattell, H. J. Eysenck, J. Makarovič, J. L. Holland, R. Plutchik, C. Myers and I. Briggs, R. McCrae and Paul T. Costa.

The definitions of the effectiveness of leaders and their potential in the model are based on two indexes: the leadership effectiveness index and leadership potential index.

The baseline for creating the leadership potential index is the FTK-test. The results are classified into seven groups (six types of test and a "quick fit" personality tester), making a total of 112 values. Creating the indicators for the leadership potential index was carried out using individual indicators from four tests used in the FTK-test, based on existing theoretical and experiential findings. These indicators were used to indicate development, ranging from character to social roles. Five factors (basic groups) for personality-trait based leadership potential were created based on similarities in indicator content. Each factor includes between two and four indicators. The indicators within each group are treated equally. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the personality-trait based leadership potential index.

The leadership potential index is calculated using factor analysis. For a given group of related questions (in this case, tests), the first step is to check and calculate the measurement characteristics of tests, and how well they represented the area being studied (potential). In effect this measures the internal consistency of the group of tests. Cronbach's alpha is normally used to measure internal consistency. For a value to be considered as indicating a relatively high level of reliability, it should be higher than 0.80 ($\alpha > 0,8$), however, lower values for this test are usually acceptable in social science research. In this case, the calculated value for Cronbach's alpha is: 0.866. The test indicates a relatively high level of reliability, and it was found that the test provided a good representation of the field being measured (personality-trait based leadership potential).

In each case the same method was used (mainly for consistency), i.e. the Kaiser criterion, where only factors with a value of over 1 are retained. Five factors were rejected using this criterion. These five factors explained 87% of variance. The results obtained, or the five factors obtained on the basis of the factor analysis correlate with the theoretically designed proposal of five factors (the basic groups) for personality-trait based leadership potential (based on the presented theory of leadership and experience with FTK-tests).

Table 1: Breakdown of personality-trait based leadership potential index

Factor	Indicator	Source (used in FTK)
INHERENCY	Primacy	Le Senne
	Extravita (extraversion)	Eysenck
	Extraversion	Myers-Briggs
	Surgency	Big5
DUTIFULNESS	Activity	Le Senne
	Judging	Myers-Briggs
	Conscientiousness	Big5
STABILITY	Unemotional	Le Senne
	Maturity (non-neuroticism)	Eysenck
	Emotional stability	Big5
PERCEPTIVENESS	Intuitiveness	Myers-Briggs
	Openness to experience	Big5
	Sociability	Eysenck
LINKAGE	Thinking	Myers-Briggs
	Agreeableness	Big5

A factor matrix was then calculated with the five factors labelled as: inherency (factor 1), dutifulness (factor 2), stability (factor 3), perceptiveness (factor 4) and linkage (factor 5). Varimax rotation was used to improve the factor analysis results, as the value increased for most tests (Table 2).

Based on the factor weightings defined for individual factors and personal scores a weighted arithmetic mean was calculated for each leader, with the weightings representing the personal scores for each factor. A leadership potential index was then calculated. The index values were ranked to place the leaders in order of their leadership potential.

Janez Stare

Model of effective leadership in public administration

Table 2: Rotated factor matrix (Varimax rotation) for potential testing

Test	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Inherency	Dutifulness	Stability	Perceptiveness	Linkage
LS1: Unemotional	0,33	0,17	0,85	0,20	-0,15
LS2: Activity	0,19	0,91	0,16	0,22	-0,14
LS3: Primacy	0,93	0,06	0,29	0,10	0,11
EY1: Sociability	-0,25	0,25	0,02	-0,16	-0,84
EY2: Extravita (extraversion)	0,88	0,00	0,21	0,24	-0,04
EY3: Maturity (non-neuroticism)	0,40	0,17	0,72	-0,07	0,40
MB1: Extraversion	0,93	0,06	0,29	0,10	0,11
MB2: Intuitiveness	0,13	0,33	0,07	0,85	-0,10
MB3: Thinking	-0,03	-0,10	0,05	-0,07	0,94
MB4: Judging	-0,29	0,78	0,17	0,14	-0,23
B51: Surgency	0,55	0,30	0,20	0,49	0,23
B52: Agreeableness	0,28	0,06	0,42	0,50	-0,36
B53: Conscientiousness	0,22	0,87	0,04	0,25	-0,04
B54: Emotional stability	0,27	0,12	0,81	0,40	0,02
B55: Openness to experience	0,18	0,28	0,33	0,76	0,27

Extraction method: Principle component analysis. Rotation method: Varimax method with Kaiser normalisation.

The leadership effectiveness index was taken as the arithmetic mean of scores for the 15 competences used most often in public administration (teamwork; interpersonal relations; communication; vision and creativity; environment; process creation; activity; resource management; motivation;

cognition and development; employment development; awareness; values; example; personality).

It was vital to ensure that the leader questionnaires (FTK) were coordinated with the questionnaires completed by subordinates to assess the leadership effectiveness of their superiors in order to check the correlation between personality-trait based leadership potential and leadership effectiveness. When testing the model in Slovenia, this coordination was effected by means of a six-digit code included on the questionnaire. The first two figures of the code indicate the first leadership level, the third and fourth indicate the second leadership level and the final two places the third leadership level. The codes were produced so the first two figures in the code represented a serial number indicating the administrative unit and the first level of management (head). The third and fourth figures of the code represent a serial number indicating the administrative unit department. The final two figures are a serial number indicating the organisational unit within the department (if it exists).

4. Research as basis for the model

The target group selected for study was leaders within the central government units. Since the aim was to acquire the best possible overview of leadership of people in central government units, the following conditions were applied when defining the research sample:

- the leaders selected had to operate in public administration units that geographically were implemented in various areas of the country to overcome any unique environmental impact on leadership
- the leaders selected had to operate in public administration units in which they all performed relatively similar tasks at the operational level (despite the fact that geographically the work was implemented in various parts of the country).

It is not possible to give an exact figure for the total number of leaders at all levels of central government administration based on data from the Directorate of Public Administration (January 2004). The estimated number is between 4000 and 4500. On 31 December 2003 there were a total of 33,529 employees in central government units. Given that individual central government units perform very different tasks or functions and that most central government units are located in one city (Ljubljana), administrative units

Janez Stare

Model of effective leadership in public administration

were selected as the most suitable for participation in the research. Slovenia's administrative units are the most geographically-spread form of central government unit and the tasks they perform are comparable.

The research included all leaders in administrative units up to the level of heads of internal organisational units (head of administrative unit and heads of organisational units) and their first subordinates. The next step in the research was to gather data on the number of leaders (superiors) and their subordinates. According to data gathered in the research on 10 March 2004 there were 406 leaders in administrative units (heads of unit, heads of department, heads of offices), and 3234 subordinates to the group of 206.

Testing the competence model took place in a pilot group that included 11 leaders from different central government units. The leadership criteria were checked using the questionnaire, which included 150 statements. The statements were linked to a leadership effectiveness score on a scale of 1 to 5. A score of 1 means that the statement absolutely does not apply, which means that the leader does not have competence comparability. A score of 5 means that the leader possesses the described competence in full.

In the first part, the administrative unit head was sent a form by e-mail, which had to be completed with the name of the administrative unit, the number of leaders at individual leadership levels, and the number of people directly subordinate to them on 19 March 2004. The collection of data was concluded on 22 March 2004. The response to the first part of the questionnaire was 100%. The data gathered indicated that 406 individuals work as leaders in administrative units, and 3234 individuals work as leaders directly subordinate to the first group. The next stage was to implement the second (substantive) part of the research, for which we used two types of questionnaire – separately for leaders and co-workers. The leaders completed the FTK-test, and their subordinates the questionnaire on leadership effectiveness. In accordance with the sample defined from the administrative unit forms regarding the number of leaders and their subordinates, a total of 406 FTK-test questionnaires and 3234 questionnaires to assess leadership effectiveness were sent out. A total of 187 FTK-test questionnaires were returned (46.1% response) and 621 leadership assessment questionnaires (19.2 % response). Official data on the breakdown of the full research population could not be obtained (was unknown); data on the sample of leaders and their subordinates (sex, age, etc.) were gathered during the research.

As stated, 187 leaders completed the FTK-test questionnaire. Subordinates assessed the effectiveness of 109 of the 187 leaders. This is the group of leaders for which both variables were calculated: effectiveness index and the personality-trait based leadership potential index.

4.1 Calculating the effectiveness index

The model states that the total score for leadership effectiveness is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the scores for the 15 leadership factors. The value of the average aggregate index for leadership effectiveness, defined using a scale from 1 to 5, is 3.33. The score represents 58.25% of the maximum score (intervals from 1 to 5), which can be defined as a relatively low score for leadership effectiveness. The index scores for individual fields range from 2.93 to 3.7. Almost half (7 out of 15) fields of leadership can be defined as scoring poorly (Table 3).

Table 3: Leadership effectiveness index scores, ranked in descending order

RANK		TOTAL
XV.	M. Values	3,70
XIV.	N. Example	3,66
XIII.	J. Cognition and development	3,55
XII.	E. Environment	3,52
XI.	O. Personality	3,48
X.	L. Awareness	3,43
IX.	G. Activity	3,41
VIII.	C. Communication	3,40
<i>Leadership effectiveness (total)</i>		3,33
VII.	F. Process creation	3,29
VI.	D. Vision and creativity	3,23
V.	B. Interpersonal relations	3,16
IV.	H. Managing resources	3,14
III.	I. Motivation	3,10
II.	A. Teamwork	3,04
I.	K. Employee development	2,93

Model of effective leadership in public administration

The highest aggregate index score and hence the highest rated leadership field is for the "values" index. The score is 3.70 (67.5% of maximum score), which can be defined as good in respect to the set criterion. The "example" index can also be defined as good (scoring 3.66, 66.5% of maximum score). The lowest scoring leadership fields are the factors "employee development" and "teamwork". The "employee development" index has the lowest score, at 2.93 (or 48.25% of the maximum score; intervals from 1 to 5), while the "teamwork" index scores 3.04 (51% of maximum score; intervals from 1 to 5). The fields "motivation", "managing resources" and "interpersonal relations" can also be defined as very poor.

The results indicate that the most critical leadership field is the "employee development" factor, which is considered one of if not the most important factor in the development of public administration.

4.2 Calculating the personality-trait based potential index

The theoretical bases for calculating the personality-trait based potential index are presented in the description of the model. Based on the factor weightings defined for individual factors and personal scores, the leadership potential index is a weighted arithmetic mean calculated for each leader, with the weightings representing the personal scores for each factor. The index values are ranked to place the leaders in order of their leadership potential.

Differences between leaders relate to their length of service as leaders, level and field of study, amount of work or leadership-related training, leadership position, and personality-trait based leadership potential.

4.3 Correlation between leadership effectiveness index and personality-trait based potential index

The correlation analysis first considered the correlation between the factor indexes for leadership potential and for leadership effectiveness. The correlation coefficient indicates that the correlation is moderate and positive. Partial correlation analysis indicates that effectiveness fields have a high reciprocal correlation with the total effectiveness index (correlation coefficient between 0.90 and 0.93), so the values for the correlation coefficients are also similar between effectiveness fields and the personality-trait based potential index (Table 4). Potential has the highest influence on effectiveness in the field of

Janez Stare
Model of effective leadership in public administration

“vision and creativity” (correlation coefficient 0.62), and least influence in the fields of “values” and “example”.

Table 4: Correlation between leadership effectiveness index and personality-trait based potential index

Factor index	Correlation Coefficients*	
	Factor index of potential scores	Leadership effectiveness
Factor index of potential scores (15)	1	0,596
I. Leadership effectiveness (total)	0,596	1
A. Teamwork (1-10)	0,586	0,906
B. Interpersonal relations (11-18)	0,548	0,937
C. Communication (19-29)	0,587	0,933
D. Vision and creativity (30-38)	0,622	0,914
E. Environment (39-46)	0,577	0,914
F. Process creation (47-56)	0,575	0,937
G. Activity (57-66)	0,572	0,925
H. Managing resources (67-77)	0,505	0,926
I. Motivation (78-87)	0,509	0,917
J. Cognition and development (88-98)	0,514	0,895
K. Employee development (99-110)	0,569	0,903
L. Awareness (111-117)	0,501	0,909
M. Values (118-129)	0,466	0,903
N. Example (130-140)	0,491	0,928
O. Personality (141-150)	0,523	0,923

*All correlation coefficients significant for $p < 0.005$.

The results also indicate the differences between the leadership effectiveness of groups of leaders in administrative units. For example, the leadership

scores increase according to total years employed, while there are smaller differences with respect to length of service as a leader. Nevertheless it was found that the highest average scores were achieved by those who had been in the position of leader for the longest period. There is no statistically significant difference between leaders grouped on the basis of length of service in public administration, nor between groups formed on the basis of age, although the youngest leaders were given the lowest score, with leadership scores increasing with leader age. There are also no statistically significant difference in leaders grouped according to either education level or field of formal education, but leadership scores for leaders with qualifications in the social sciences do score slightly higher. The results indicate that there are statistically relevant differences between groups of leaders defined according to the number of hours training they had had over the previous year. Leadership scores grow in correlation with the number of hours of work-related training, and this applies to all leadership factors. There are also statistically significant differences between groups of leaders defined according to leadership training, and groups of leaders defined according to the type of leadership position. In terms of leadership training, leaders that had had less than five hours score lowest, while those with over 15 hours score highest. Leadership scores are also higher in groups with very few subordinates or very many subordinates. It was also found that there are no statistically significant differences between leaders grouped according to number of hours per week spent on leadership outside their work in the observed population.

5. Conclusion

One of the most important reasons for studying this subject is the experientially acquired knowledge that leadership in Slovenian public administration is very poorly developed. A further reason is that leadership in the public administration has yet to undergo systematic study in the Slovenia. The consequences are evident in the fact that the selection and development of leaders, and the study of leadership effectiveness or performance are not noteworthy factors within public administration operations, as well as the fact that the selection and development of leaders does not take into account personality-trait based leadership potential. Furthermore, there is no leadership competence model or competence profile for leaders that could be used to check

Janez Stare

Model of effective leadership in public administration

competence. The consequences of this are evident in the lack of knowledge and qualification in the leadership field, and particularly leading people.

The testing of the competence model in administrative units presented in this paper indicates that there are significant differences between the factors that influence leadership effectiveness. The differences relate to their length of service as leaders, the level and field of education, amount of work or leadership-related training, leadership position, and personality-trait based leadership potential. The results also indicate that there are grounds for observing personality-trait based leadership potential on the basis of modelled leadership potential. The results indicate the need for changes in the leadership field. First, there is a need to organise the selection and development of leaders, primarily by determining personality-trait based leadership potential and creating a leadership competence model. The mere conviction that the two main criteria in selecting leaders should be formal education and proof of work experience is simply insufficient.

Dr. Janez Stare je magistriral leta 1999 na Fakulteti za organizacijske, leta 2005 pa kot prvi doktorand Fakultete za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani doktoriral na temo Povezanost osebnostnega potenciala za vodenje z uspešnostjo vodenja v organih državne uprave. Leta 1994 se je zaposlil na Fakulteti za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani. Leta 1995 je bil prvič izvoljen v naziv asistent, leta 2002 pa v naziv višji predavatelj. Od oktobra 2005 je na Fakulteti za upravo tudi predstojnik za dodiplomski študij. Svoje strokovno znanje je izpopolnjeval doma in na uglednih inštitucijah v tujini. Poleg tega kot sodelavec ali vodja sodeluje v različnih domačih in mednarodnih projektih ter na strokovnih in znanstvenih srečanjih. Težišče njegovih proučevanj je povezano z organizacijsko-kadrovskimi vidiki upravnega dela in poslovanja.

Bibliography

- Brejc M. (1999): Uspešno obvladovanje sprememb v slovenski javni upravi. Zbornik referatov, pp. 7–15. Visoka upravna šola, Ljubljana.
- Bennis W. (1989): On Becoming a Leader. MA: Addison Wesley, Reading.
- Chardon D. (1992): 'How OD can help TQM', OD Practitioner 24(1): 14–18.
- Cornelius P. (1993): Führung von Beraten in der öffentlichen Verwaltung. DUV, Deutsches Univeritäts-Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Dessler, G. (1986): Organisation Theory, integrating structure and behavior (2. izd.). Prentice-Hall International Editions, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Farnham, D., Horton S. (1996): Managing people in the public services. London: Macmillan Business.
- Fayol H. (1916): L'administration industrielle et générale. Dunod, Paris.
- Fivush, L. M. (2000): The importance of leadership: an investigation of presidential style at fifty national universities. University of North Texas.
- Frančeškin, A. (2003): Proučevanje osebnosti s pomočjo FTK. Gradivo za srečanje psihologov dela. Kromberk.
- Hyde, A. (1992): »The Proverbs of Total Quality Management: Recharting the Path to Quality Improvement in the Public Sector« Public Productivity and Management Review 16(1): 25–37.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973): Testing for Competence Rather Than for Intelligence. American Psychologist, January 1973, str. 1-14.
- Spencer, L. M., Spencer, S. M. (1993): Competence at Work, Models for Superior Performance. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore.
- Tomažič, E. (2003) Prikaz metodologije za identifikacijo učinkovitih in neučinkovitih vzorcev organizacijskega vedenja menedžerjev. [Http://www.obalnokadrovsko drustvo.si/Egon%20Tomazic%20Kompetence.doc](http://www.obalnokadrovsko-drustvo.si/Egon%20Tomazic%20Kompetence.doc).
- Weber, M. (1947): The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Oxford University Press, New York.

POVZETEK

Model uspešnega vodenja v državni upravi

Vedno hitrejša spreminjanja in razvijanje okolja narekuje spremembe na področju delovanja državne uprave, hkrati pa krepi njen pomen. Družba se lahko spremeni le, če so aktivnosti državne uprave ustrezno spodbujene. V modernih državnih in javnih upravah se zavedajo pomena, ki ga ima pri tem samo vodenje. Še več. V središče proučevanja je postavljen vodja kot tisti dejavnik, ki ima s svojim delovanjem ključen vpliv na ljudi, na njihove aktivnosti, pa tudi na poslovanje organizacije. Zato podobno kot v uspešnih organizacijah z znanstvenimi pristopi nadgrajujejo vsa ta spoznanja in skušajo izoblikovati sistem, ki bi omogočal optimalno selekcijo in razvoj vodij ter njihovo uspešno delovanje.

Vodilno osebje ima največje pristojnosti in odgovornosti in tudi moč, da sproži procese spreminjanja. Dejavnikov, ki vplivajo na uspešnost vodenja in s tem vodje, je veliko. Med pogosteje omenjenimi je potencial, ki ga ima vodja za vodenje. Potencial za vodenje v najširšem smislu je opredeljen kot komunikacijska izraznost, osebnostni potencial, motivacija za vodenje, inteligentnost, v ožjem smislu pa predvsem kot osebnostni potencial. Obstajajo različne opredelitve kazalca (oziroma kazalcev) osebnostnega potenciala; mnoge med njimi so pomanjkljive, saj se omejujejo na posamezne dejavnike proučevanja osebnosti in vedenja posameznika.

Izhodišče oblikovanja modela preverjanja uspešnosti vodenja je model, ki pojmuje vodenje kot proces. V tem modelu je kompetenčni model vodenja tisti povezovalni dejavnik med potencialom za vodenje in uspešnostjo vodenja, na osnovi katerega je mogoče preverjati uspešnost vodenja ter ugotavljati, kako potencial vodje vpliva na uspešnost vodenja. Kompetenčni model vodenja je treba izoblikovati tako, da bo eden izmed dejavnikov in hkrati tudi kriterijev vodenja. Na tak način lahko služi kot osnovno merilo za ugotavljanje uspešnosti vodje, pa tudi kot orodje za oblikovanje razvoja vodij.

V predlaganem modelu uspešnega vodenja se upoštevata tako osebnostni potencial za vodenje kot uspešnost vodenja. Kazalec osebnostnega potenciala zajema rezultate tako testiranja (preverjanja) karakterja in osebnosti, vedenjskih vzorcev kot meritev posedovanja različnih potencialov. Pri tem se upošteva »prirojeni in razviti« potencial za vodenje. Prednost modela je prav v tem, da potencial za vodenje proučujemo v povezavi z

uspešnostjo in učinkovitostjo vodenja. Model tako temelji na proučevanju dveh indeksov: indeksu uspešnosti vodenja in indeksu potenciala za vodenje. Indeksa temeljita na dveh anketah. Prva anketa se nanaša na ugotavljanje uspešnosti vodenja, druga pa na ugotavljanje osebnostnega potenciala za vodenje. Izhodišče za oblikovanje indeksa potenciala za vodenje je FTK-test. Njegovi rezultati so razporejeni v sedem vsebinskih sklopov (šest vrst testov in varčni sistem proučevanja osebnosti), skupno gre za 112 vrednosti. Za oblikovanje kazalnika indeksa potenciala za vodenje so bili na osnovi teoretičnih in izkustvenih spoznaj upoštevani posamezni kazalniki štirih v FTK-testu uporabljenih testov. Na tej osnovi izbrani kazalniki kažejo razvoj od karakterja do socialnih vlog. Z vidika vsebinske povezanosti predstavljenih kazalnikov je izoblikovanih pet gradnikov (temeljnih skupin) osebnostnega potenciala za vodenje in sicer »izvirnost«, »skrbnost«, »stabilnost«, »zaznavnost« in »povezljivost«. Posamezen gradnik zajema od dva do štiri kazalnike. Kazalniki znotraj posamezne skupine so obravnavani enakovredno.

Indeks uspešnosti vodenja je oblikovan kot aritmetična sredina ocen petnajstih kompetenc, ki se najpogosteje uporabljajo v državni upravi (timsko delo; medosebni odnosi; komuniciranje; vizija in ustvarjalnost; okolje; oblikovanje procesa; aktivnost; ravnanje z viri; motiviranje; kognitivnost in razvoj; razvoj zaposlenih; zavest; vrednote; zgled; osebnost).

Ciljna skupina, ki smo jo za potrebe oblikovanja modela želeli proučiti, so vodje v državni upravi. Ker želimo dobiti čim relevantnejši pogled na področje vodenja ljudi v organih državne uprave, sta bila pri določitvi vzorca raziskovanja postavljena naslednja pogoja: vodje morajo delovati v tistem delu državne uprave, ki se, geografsko gledano, izvaja na različnih področjih države, s čimer želimo preseči morebiten enoznačen vpliv okolja na pojmovanje vodenja, ter vodje morajo delovati v tistem delu državne uprave, ki (navkljub temu, da se, geografsko gledano, aktivnost izvaja na različnih področjih države) na operativnem nivoju svoje dejavnosti opravljajo razmeroma identične naloge.

Raziskava je zajemala vse vodje v upravnih enotah do nivoja vodij notranjih organizacijskih enot (načelnik upravne enote in vodje organizacijskih enot) ter njihove prve podrejene sodelavce. Izvedena je bila v obdobju marec 2004 - december 2005. Vodje so izpolnjevali FTK, njihovi podrejeni sodelavci pa vprašalnik o uspešnosti vodenja. Vrnjenih je bilo 187 vprašalnikov FTK (46,1 % odzivnost) in 621 vprašalnikov o ocenjevanju vodij (19,2 % odzivnost).

Model določa, da je skupna ocena uspešnosti vodenja izračunana kot aritmetična sredina iz ocen 15 dejavnikov vodenja. Vrednost povprečnega agregatnega indeksa uspešnosti vodenja, ki je opredeljen s pomočjo stopenjske lestvice od 1 do 5, znaša 3,33. Ocene področnih indeksov se gibljejo od 2,93 do 3,7. Skoraj polovico (7 od 15) področij vodenja lahko opredelimo kot slabo (tabela 3).

Rezultate smo povezali z indeksom potenciala za vodenje. Korelacijski koeficient kaže, da je povezanost zmerna in pozitivna. Parcialna analiza kaže, da so področja uspešnosti medsebojno visoko povezana s skupnim indeksom uspešnosti (korelacijski koeficienti med 0,90 in 0,93), zato so podobne tudi vrednosti korelacijskih koeficientov med področji uspešnosti in indeksom osebno-stnega potenciala. Potencial najbolj vpliva na uspešnost na področju vizije in ustvarjalnosti (korelacijski koeficient 0,62), najmanj pa na področjih vrednot in zglede.

Rezultati kažejo tudi na razlike med uspešnostjo vodenja skupin vodij v upravnih enotah. Tako npr. ocene vodenja naraščajo z leti zaposlitve, manjše razlike pa so glede na delovno dobo na položaju vodje. Vseeno pa lahko ugotovimo, da najboljše povprečne ocene dosegajo tisti z daljšo delovno dobo na položaju vodje. Med skupinami vodij, oblikovanimi glede na delovno dobo v državni upravi, ni statistično značilnih razlik, prav tako ne glede na starost, čeprav so bili najslabše ocenjeni najmlajši vodje, ocene vodenja pa naraščajo z višanjem starosti vodje. Statistično pomembnih razlik ne zaznamo tudi v skupini vodij, opredeljenih glede na stopnjo izobrazbe oziroma smer formalne izobrazbe, so pa ocene vodenja tistih z družboslovno izobrazbo nekoliko višje. Iz rezultatov je razvidno, da so se med skupinami vodij, opredeljenimi glede na število ur usposabljanj v preteklem letu, pokazale statistično značilne razlike. Ocene vodenja rastejo glede na število ur usposabljanj povezanih z delom, to pa velja prav za vse dejavnike vodenja. Statistično značilne razlike so se pokazale tudi med skupinami vodij, opredeljenimi glede na usposabljanja v zvezi z vodenjem, in skupinami vodij, opredeljenimi glede na vrsto vodstvenega položaja. Glede na usposabljanje v zvezi z vodenjem so najslabše ocenjeni tisti, ki so imeli manj kot 5 ur, najboljše tisti z več kot 15 ur usposabljanja. Ugotovimo lahko tudi, da so ocene vodenja najboljše v tistih skupinah, kjer je zelo malo ali zelo veliko podrejenih sodelavcev, ter da statistično značilnih razlik med skupinami vodij, oblikovanimi glede na tedensko število ur vodenja izven službe, pri opazovani populaciji ni zaznati.