

Leadership And Public Management: The Life Cycle Of The Management Position

Finn Jude

University of Canberra

Email: jude66@gmail.com

Abstract

A growing body of research identifies the impact of leader characteristics on the strategy and results of organizations. This article, after carrying out a review of the literature on leadership, and in particular on the contributions of the literature on leadership in public management, concludes that the effects of leadership have been studied from a static perspective, in most cases. In order to overcome this limitation and include a dynamic and longitudinal analysis, it proposes to apply the concept of life cycle to the mandate of public managers, a topic that until now has not been addressed in the literature on public management. In the first place, it deals with the analysis of the horizontal career of the public manager throughout his term, as opposed to a traditional, vertical approach, of analysis of career promotion. That is, the life cycle during the management mandate. Secondly, the document identifies the key dimensions and stages in the public manager's life cycle during his mandate and makes the following proposals for the construction of an analysis model: 1) The public manager, at the beginning of his mandate, focuses its attention on achieving the objectives defined by its result indicators, with initial support from the political environment that appointed it. 2) In a second stage, he begins a period of exploration after having shown some achievements and not having endangered political trust. 3) It is in the third stage when the public manager can select the narrative by which his mandate in the organization will be recognized. To do this, he weaves internal information networks to develop a legitimate and feasible, long-term vision for the organization. 4) In the convergence stage is when the maximum results of the public manager are produced, since an inverted U-shaped relationship is manifested between the duration of the mandate and the results. 5) In the stage of dysfunction with the organization or managerial sclerosis, the power of the manager is maximum, as is the knowledge of the task. However, if the mandate is not limited in duration, the consequences for the organization can be lethargy or crisis. Finally, the article builds a research proposal that combines questionnaires based on scales recognized by the literature and semi-structured interviews for the exploratory analysis of the conceptual model and its propositions.

Keywords: Public Managers, Leadership, Management Attitudes, Performance, Management of Management Personnel, Proposal

A. INTRODUCTION

There is a need to dynamically and longitudinally model managerial careers. Most of the research on managerial leadership is temporally static and focuses on the concurrence between the characteristics of the manager, his behavior, the environment and organizational strategies (Miller, 1991). The few works that deal with time focus on the entire career of company managers (Cron and Slocum, 1986; Gunz and Jalland, 1996). This article addresses the literature gap from an intermediate approach, proposing a model of analysis of the public manager throughout a specific mandate. To do this, we start from the literature on the life cycle of organizations

(Chandler, 1962; Mintzberg, 1984; Smith...[et al], 1985; Lester...[et al], 2003; Filatotchev... [et al], 2006) and its adaptation to analyze the senior manager's life cycle in the workplace (Hambrick and Fukutomi, 1991; Miller and Shamsie, 2001). The objective is to carry out an analysis of the findings in business management, to propose an exploratory model in public management.

The focus of this document is professional public managers (Longo, 2004), who make decisions in the organizations they manage and have the ability to express their preferences and styles in organizational results. Professional public managers are subject to the political mandate, but they are recognized as having their own sphere of decision that is exercised in contractual frameworks, based on the principle of responsibility for results (Longo, 2002). It seeks to analyze, therefore, if there are stages in the life cycle of the public manager's mandate, if they show trends, and if they have significant consequences for the organizations in which they work. This research uses micro concepts from the life cycle literature to advance knowledge of macro issues of organizational outcomes and impacts. The public manager is currently a key piece in the design and implementation of public policies. Beyond his role as a two-way transmission belt between elected officials, public workers and citizens, public managers influence, through their decisions and actions, the objectives of the organizations they direct (Cook, 1998; Vermeeren...[et al], 2014). The public manager leads the selection of programs, objectives and aligns values (Bennis, 1993), and is key to overcoming the inherent complexities of the public sector (Behn, 1998; Fairholm, 2004). Moynihan and Ingraham (2004) point out that effective leadership is a key factor for organizational success, effectiveness and performance of public administration. Despite this, public management research has either been dominated by an operational perspective or, from a public administration perspective, has tended to underestimate the importance of managerial leadership (Terry, 1995; Van Wart, 2013) in order to study political leadership in depth.

The literature on leadership and public management begins its steps building on the most mature literature on leadership in the private sector, anchored in the areas of psychology and management (Bass, 1990). Throughout the 20th century, leadership literature and theories have evolved, focusing their analysis on the various determinants of leadership. The first theories, which originate at the beginning of the century and continue until the middle of the century, are based on the idea of the "great man", and focus on the psychological and personal traits of the leader: achievements, energy, ambition, tenacity, self-confidence, creativity or flexibility (Northouse, 2007).

The combination of an increasingly numerous list of features, together with the lack of conclusive results, lead to a gradual overcoming of this approach, and from the 70s and 80s the academy focuses on developing: a) situational or contingent models : Fiedler (1964), Hersey and Blanchard (1969); and b) models based on the interaction between leader and follower: Graen (1976), Graen and Scandura (1987), who consider that leadership is not a matter of hierarchical position, but of the ability to influence, through behavior and interaction, the relationship between leader and

follower. Therefore, the quality of this relationship is the determining factor of individual, group and organizational outcomes.

The 80s are characterized by an outbreak of models, which are the dominant ones today. In the first place, the models based on transformational leadership from the seminal works of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) stand out, as opposed to the transactional styles based on reward. These models theorize that transformational leaders inspire the follower through his vision and personality, and are capable of changing expectations, perceptions, and motivations in favor of the common goal. The four basic components of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) are: intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and influence.

Finally, starting in the 2000s, integrative efforts to conceptualize and analyze leadership in comprehensive frameworks such as the "full range leadership model" of Avolio and Bass (1991) and Bass and Avolio (1997) gain momentum. . The "full range model" combines three types of leadership: transformational, transactional (management by exception and contingent reward) and non-transactional (*laissez-faire*). These authors categorize these typologies based on their effectiveness and the activity of the leader. Thus, *laissez-faire* leadership is the most inactive and in a few situations perceived as effective. At the other extreme is transformational leadership, which allows followers to be motivated and results in greater productivity, higher morale and satisfaction, greater organizational effectiveness, less absenteeism and staff turnover, and greater adaptability to change (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Despite these advances in the literature, a certain underdevelopment of the discipline is found in public management, linked both to the normative debate on the role of the public manager and to the technical difficulties for empirical research on leadership (Selznick, 1957; Terry, 1995). Fortunately, this situation has been overcome in recent years thanks to a growing scientific production on the nature of leadership and its relationship with public management. Van Wart (2003 and 2013) evaluates the situation of public leadership theory in his work and identifies the following foci of reflection as agglomerating scientific production. In the first place, the content of the leader's work, adding to the direct provision of the task, the role of inspiring others. The second focus of the literature associates transactional leadership with the transformational in the public sector, where the distinction between a merely administrative approach to leadership ("*stewardship*": Redford, 1969; Terry, 1995) versus leadership of an entrepreneurial nature (Borins, 2002) plays a relevant role. The latter analyzes the innovative behavior of leaders and links the effectiveness of public services more to the creativity and dynamism of the leader than to the ability to act according to formal norms.

In the 90s, Kingdon (1995) develops the concept of public entrepreneur, which introduces entrepreneurship in public management as an individual action, which achieves that public solutions advance between the different conflicts of interest within the public sector. According to Kingdon, decisions in public management arise from a connection between three currents: the current of the problem, the current of Politics and the current of public policies. When these three currents are linked at

certain moments (elections, reactions to indicators or certain situations), windows of opportunity open between potential solutions and strategies. The entrepreneur is the one capable of aligning these three currents in favor of aligning an implementable solution that meets the characteristics of technical feasibility, adjustment to political and organizational values, and that anticipates possible blockages to advance the issue between conflicting interests. The effective public entrepreneur connects solutions to problems, using their expertise, negotiation skills, status and connectivity. Hence Moore (1995) defines public managers as small-scale statesmen, strategists and entrepreneurs. De Leon (1996) introduces a critique of the public entrepreneur: his tendency to focus excessively on specific issues and a certain inclination to not follow the rules.

The literature also analyzes the personal traits and qualities of the public manager (Fairholm, 2004), associates them with their typologies (transactional and transformational leadership) and compares them with the results in the private sector. In this line, the public management literature investigates the differences in the exercise of leadership between the public and private sectors. Andersen's (2010) analysis in Sweden reveals significant differences in leadership styles: change-oriented (public) vs. relationship oriented (private); and motivation: achievement-oriented (public) vs. power oriented (private). This author links his findings to three possible explanatory factors: the differences between the organizations themselves; the factors that incline the subjects to work in one or another sector; and the criteria for career promotion in each field. Added to these variables are those of Hooiberg and Choi (2001) on leadership effectiveness and focus (results orientation vs. facilitation and supervision orientation), and those of Rosenberg and Villadsen (2010), who conclude that the Differences in the work context between public and private managers determine that the former use a more participative leadership style, as opposed to a markedly more managerial style on the part of the private ones.

Finally, integrative models of the findings on leadership in public management have also emerged. Hanbury...[et al] (2004) propose a leadership prediction model ("fit model") that comprehensively integrates the following variables: leadership style, personal characteristics, own perceptions and the political government of the organization, as well as the demographic characteristics of the manager and the city in which he works. The model is capable of explaining 83% of the variance of the duration in the position. Moynihan and Ingraham (2004) propose an integrating framework that attempts to overcome the difficulties involved in analysis based on the leader's personal traits and/or political interactions with the context. His model is summarized in the contingent nature of the leadership of the public manager conditioned by the following variables: size of the organization, professionalization of the manager, level of government, role of the central administration in the management and dissemination of information, citizen demand and political factors. For their part, Trottier...[et al] (2008) apply the "full range" model of Bass and Avolio (1994) to the public sector, and conclude that the model also has explanatory power in the public sector. Van Wart (2015) introduces improvements to the Bass and

Avolio model, who extensively develop the transactional leadership part of their measurement scale. However, this scale lacks the same depth in terms of change management. To solve this weakness, Van Wart introduces this question based on Fernández and Rainey (2006).

B. METHOD

The latest currents in the analysis of public managerial leadership are gradually improving with the inclusion of new theories and analysis methodologies. As new theories, the PSM ("public sector motivation", motivation of the public sector), which analyzes how the motivation of working in the public sector and sharing its values (the public interest, doing something good for society) influences the performance (Moynihan...[et al], 2012). And the response to PSM by authors such as Van de Walle, Steijn and Jilke (2015), with the development of the concept of "extrinsic motivation". This concept contrasts the individual motivation provided by PSM with collective variables, at the country level (income, security, models based on career -seniority-, versus models based on position -merit-), to demonstrate that it is the combination of both (the extrinsic motivation and PSM) the one with the greatest explanatory power of the results in different countries. Regarding methodological innovations, the inclusion of experimental designs in recent studies stands out. As this exploration of the literature suggests, academic research on leadership and public management flourishes and continues to provide interesting results. Van Wart (2013) concludes that there is no single leadership of the public manager, because this is determined by the enormous variability of situations in which it is exercised and the skills required for it. Thus, this author argues, leadership in public management can no longer be exercised solely on the basis of an alleged natural talent, but rather requires a continuous effort throughout the career, if you want to avoid hitting the ceiling. In this article we contribute to filling the gap in the literature on the variability of situations in which leadership is exercised in the public sector, through the analysis of the key variables that affect the leadership of public managers that are linked to the life cycle in the position (dynamic model), to determine the causes that lead them to hit the ceiling.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A growing number of investigations identifies the impact of leader characteristics on the strategy and results of organizations (Esteve and Ysa, 2012). However, most of the literature is static, with synchronous measurements, where it is difficult to distinguish between cause and effect. The few longitudinal studies that exist analyze specific moments in the managerial mandate, such as the termination of mandates, staff turnover and its impact on the organization (Gordon and Rosen, 1981; Gabarro, 2007; Meier and Hicklin, 2008; Boyne . . .[et al], 2010; Boyne...[et al], 2011). Eitzen and Yetman (1972) establish a curvilinear relationship between the length of a coach's tenure and the effectiveness of a basketball team: the longer the tenure, the

better the team's results, up to a certain point in time (average 13 years in his study), where the results begin to diminish.

Hambrick and Fukutomi (1991), Miller and Shamsie (2001), and Davies and Thomas (2009) are three exceptions. They carry out a dynamic and long-term analysis, focused on the changes that occur to managers during the exercise of their position (in this article, position and managerial mandate are used interchangeably). They transfer the concept of "life cycle" from the analysis of organizations to the impact of the manager in the private sector. The life cycle is understood as the series of possible stages through which a manager can pass, from his acceptance of the position to his termination. It is not a deterministic prescriptive model, but a model that outlines the range of possibilities. The life cycle concept is relevant, because it allows analyzing changes (in managerial learning or strategic behavior) that have an impact on the results of organizations.

Commitment to the paradigm

The manager's paradigm is his model of interconnection between the environment and the organization. The paradigm is made up of managerial skills, which transcend technical knowledge, and depends on a set of attributes that include motivation, character traits, attitudes, values, skills and cognitive abilities. Given the complexity and ambiguity of the management function, the paradigm is limited and incomplete. There is research that indicates that, as managers learn on the job, they can modify the degree of involvement they have with their initial paradigm. In the literature there are two positions in this regard: that of those who defend that managers are more open to new ideas at the beginning of their mandates; and that of those who suggest that managers access their position with a relatively high commitment to their paradigm, and that it is only after the fact when they enter a period of opening and experimentation, that a gradual repositioning is generated, either with the original paradigm or a revised one. In this article we position ourselves with this second interpretation, given that the manager, when appointed to a position, is not generally a management apprentice, and has an established paradigm, which has formed part of the criteria to be chosen for the position and that help you believe that the paradigm is part of your success. Hence, many managers introduce immediate changes in the organization after their appointment, especially in those functional areas where they have more experience (Gabarro, 2007). In this situation, learning processes occur only after a wave of initial decisions. Most managers begin their terms with a commitment to their paradigms, and as they become more established, thanks to the first results obtained and the political trust placed in them, they experience an opening that can lead to a revision of the paradigm. Longevity in office tends to equate to a validation of the managerial paradigm.

task knowledge

The manager who accesses a new position finds himself at a disadvantage compared to the rest of the organization that he is going to lead, especially regarding knowledge of facts, contacts and procedures. A person who progresses in the same organization has fewer deficits in this sense (better information networks), but also

faces unknown actors, regulations, etc. In general, the new manager overcomes this handicap through the rapid acquisition of knowledge on the job. Evidence shows that on-the-job learning, after a certain time, seems to reach a plateau, and the absorption of new knowledge tends to decrease. Gabarro, in his analysis, concludes that after approximately 2.5 years in the position, managers reorient their learning strategy towards more incremental and routine knowledge.

Diversity in information

As knowledge about the task advances, the sources of information that the manager uses to receive information it seems that they are progressively restricted and diminished. The literature indicates that managers, at the beginning of their mandates, obtain information in a balanced way between internal and external sources. However, as they develop internal networks of reinforcement, managers significantly reduce the use of external sources. This reduction in communication with external actors is aggravated by the tendency of employees to adapt to the information preferences of the manager, which ultimately leads to a process of filtering and cooking the information that the manager has access to.

Interest in the task

Managers are not immune to the tedium of repetition and the growing mastery of their work, despite the traditional political shocks. The evidence shows that even the most demanding tasks and responsibilities become common practice and less interesting for the manager than at the beginning.

Can

Power can be understood as the ability of individuals or groups to influence and affect organizational outcomes (Mintzberg, 1984). The passage of time helps managers who remain in office to accumulate power. This increase has different sources, all reinforced by the passage of time: cooptation of politicians, institutionalization of power and accumulated success. There are some exceptions, such as managers appointed with the mission of making an organization disappear, those whose performance is poor, those who are close to retirement or the term limit of their position, or those who have a natural tendency to share. pull the power. Despite these exceptions, the most common pattern is the increase in power during the mandate. A newly appointed manager therefore faces a certain vulnerability that may explain the disproportionate number of CEOs. Operational management. Getting the organization to act effectively and efficiently to achieve the desired products (outputs). Assumption of responsibility for results. If the five key dimensions in the managerial life cycle are considered together and linked to Moore's (1995) strategic management model, it is possible to construct the different stages through which a manager's mandate can pass. public manager as interrelated dynamic flows. The concept of life cycle during the managerial mandate is useful to analyze the changes in a dynamic way and in the long term. The vision of cycles goes beyond the linear, sequential and cumulative models of the analysis of vertical careers, towards a pattern in stages of the horizontal evolution of the manager, insisting that these different stages can be discontinuous. These are transitions across tenure rather than between

roles, and therefore the focus is on shifts in power, along with changes in sources of information and other significant factors. For example, Blanchard and Hersey (1996) suggest that throughout the life cycle, and as managers become familiar with.

D. CONCLUSION

This article identifies the critical aspects that come together in the public manager's life cycle during his tenure and makes generalizable proposals through a stage model. In the first years on the job, most public managers feel the need to learn about their mandates and environments; and they approach this challenge partly by experimenting and partly by opening different channels of information, internal and external. In these early stages its results are still relatively poor. Over time, these undifferentiated channels become more qualified, and the cumulative effects of experimentation and other means of learning increase the manager's knowledge and skills. Managers expand their networks of contacts, their autonomy and confidence grow, and the level of experimentation decreases, focusing on the selection of a narrative. In these years, with the accumulated knowledge and experience, they reach their maximum performance. Later, in his position, some managers go into decline and so do the results. There is a lack of experimentation, limitation of the sources of information that are used, and fatigue in the position. The length of the tenure can be associated with good and bad results, but at different stages of the life cycle.

The literature shows that tenure life cycles affect job satisfaction, job attitudes, and how individuals describe their work and environment (Cron & Slocum, 1986). The life cycle model only analyzes general trends; it is not a normative model. We cannot say that emphasizing certain priorities at one stage is more effective. Findings from the literature are aggregated and the duration of each stage in the life cycle differs between individuals. Its explanatory capacity undoubtedly depends on the situations faced by each manager, his talent and personality, and the resources available. However, the evidence shows that great managers have gone through all the stages of the life cycle, but have managed to avoid decline for longer than their peers (Miller and Shamsie, 2001). And other managers retire before reaching the decline. The public manager tenure life cycle model has significant implications for organizational effectiveness. The literature has shown, in R&D projects and in Hollywood studios, how their results have an inverted U shape (Miller and Shamsie, 2001). That is why the manager experiences his maximum performance in the middle of the convergence stage, and tentatively (the existing data do not allow us to defend any estimate), according to Hambrick and Fukutomi (1991), as soon as after the year 4 in office. This is only applicable to managers whose titles span across all five stages. The manager who leaves office, for example in the third stage, can avoid the decline that comes with higher longevities. In the case of public managers whose terms may be very short (for example, only one or two stages out of five), lower efficiencies can be expected. However, it is not possible to establish trends on organizational efficiencies and executive results, especially in short terms, since other competing factors operate simultaneously: profiles of managers who are not suitable for the

position, positive versus negative learning curves, or managers who are capable of developing sustainable leadership over time (Boyatzis, Smith & Blaize, 2006). In fact, no condition can be more critical to maintaining the manager's continuous development than the caliber of the team that accompanies him.

REFERENCES

1. Andersen, Jon A. (2010), "Public versus Private Managers: How Public and Private Managers Differ in their Leadership Behavior", en *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 70 N° 1, pp. 131-141.
2. Avolio, Bruce J. y Bas, Bernard M. (1991), *The Full Range Leadership Development Programs: Basic and Advanced Manuals*, Binghamton, Bass, Avolio and Associates.
3. Avolio, Bruce J. y Gardner, William L. (2005), "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership", en *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16 N° 3, pp. 315-338.
4. Bass, Bernard M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*, New York, Free Press.
5. _____ (1990), *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: a Survey of Theory and Research*, New York, Free Press.
6. Bass, Bernard M. y Avolio, Bruce J. (1994), *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
7. Behn, Robert D. (1998), "What Right Do Public Managers Have to Lead?", en *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 58 N° 3, pp. 209-225.
8. Bellé, Nicola (2014), "Leading to Make a Difference: a Field Experiment on the Performance Effects of Transformational Leadership, Perceived Social Impact, and Public Service Motivation", en *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 24 N° 1, 109-136.
9. Bennis, Warren (1993), *An Invented Life: Reflections on Leadership and Change*, Reading, Addison-Wesley.
10. Blanchard, Kenneth y Hersey, Paul (1996), "Great Ideas. Then: Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership. Now: Revisiting the Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership", en *Training and Development*, Vol. 50 N° 1, pp. 42-47.
11. Borins, Sandford (2002), "Leadership and Innovation in the Public Sector", en *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 23 N° 8, pp. 467-476.
12. Hambrick, Donald y Fukutomi, Gregory (1991), "The Seasons of a CEO's Tenure", en *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 N° 4, 719-742.
13. Hanbury, George L.; Sapat, Alka; y Washington, Charles W. (2004), "Know Yourself and Take Charge of Your Own Destiny: the 'Fit Model' of Leadership", en *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 64 N° 5, pp. 566-576.
14. Herscovitch, Lynne y Meyer, Jonh P. (2002), "Commitment to Organizational Change: Extension of a Three-Component Model", en *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 N° 3,

15. Moynihan, Donald; Wright, Bradley E.; y Pandey, Sanjay K. (2012), "Can Transformational Leaders Alter the Experience of Red Tape?", en *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 15 N° 3, pp. 315-352.
16. Van de Walle, Steven; Steijn, Bram; y Jilke, Sebastian (2015), "Extrinsic Motivation, PSM and Labour Market Characteristics: a Multilevel Model of Public Sector Preference in 26 Countries", en *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, forthcoming.
17. Rosenberg, Jesper H. y Villadsen, Anders R. (2010), "Comparing Public and Private Managers' Leadership Styles: Understanding the Role of Job Context", en *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 13 N° 3, pp. 247-274.
Selznick,
18. Smith, Ken; Mitchell, Terence; y Summer, Charles (1985), "Top Level Management Priorities in Different Stages of the Organizational Life Cycle", en *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28 N° 4, pp. 779-820.
19. Terry, Larry D. (1995), *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: the Administrator as Conservator*, Thousand Oaks, Sage.
20. Trottier, Tracey; Van Wart, Montgomery; y Wang, Xiao Hu (2008), "Examining the Nature and Significance of Leadership in Government Organizations", en *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 68 N° 2, pp. 319-333