

RESEARCH ON PERSONAL QUALITIES NEEDED FOR A MANAGER/LEADER IN THE TIME OF TRANSFORMATIONS

Ligita Šimanskienė

Klaipėda University

Abstract

The article describes the leadership theories, leadership styles and types. Leadership is basically a question of achieving the best fit between the leader's personal attributes, the expectations and needs of the subordinates, the needs of the task, and the environment in which the events take place. Leadership is a dynamic process, influenced by the changing requirements of the task, the group itself and the individual members. The implication of it is that there is no „one best way“ of leading, and leaders need to be able to exercise a range of behaviour to maintain their role effectively. The research shows that the hypothesis is in part corroborated that for Lithuanian managers: manager, leader should have the following traits: ability to take decisions, to solve conflict situations, skill of being organized, understanding other people, showing initiative, being informed, defending his/her own opinion, critical analysis.

KEY WORDS: manager, leader, organization, features.

Anotacija

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos lyderiavimo teorijos, vadovavimo stiliai ir tipai transformacijų laikotarpiu. Lyderiavimas priklauso nuo daugelio veiksnių: pavaldinių lūkesčių, paties vadovo asmeninių savybių, aplinkos, kuri veikia organizaciją ir vadovą, užduoties pobūdžio. Lyderiavimas – dinamiškas procesas. Nėra vieno „geriausio būdo“, kaip valdyti, todėl vadovai turi vertinti vaidmens efektyvumą iš daugelio pozicijų, ypač akcentuojant darbuotojų ir paties vadovo elgseną. Tyrimas parodė, kad iškelta hipotezė, jog vadovams Lietuvoje būdingos R. Blake ir J. Mouton nurodytos savybės iš dalies pasitvirtino: vadovai/lyderiai turi sugebėti priimti sprendimus, spręsti konfliktus, mokėti organizuoti veiklą, turi būti iniciatyvūs, suprasti kitus žmones, mokėti panaudoti informaciją, ginti savo nuomonę, būdinga kritinė analizė.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: vadovas, lyderis, organizacija, savybės.

Introduction

There are many methods to stimulate employees however all that work has to be done by a leader. As leaders are impacted by external and internal environment and a leader himself is influenced by his needs, intentions and values, the role of a leader only increases in the time of transformations. Therefore, no organization can work without good and proper leadership. In the most general sense the process of transformation is infinite because certain social-economic changes are taking place even in highly developed countries.

Melnikas (1998) emphasizes that Lithuania is as a bridge „East – West“. The transformation process here is constant, because the understanding of the phenomenon should be related not only with dissemination of Western experiences, models and standards Eastward but also with the opposite-direction process when the Eastern traditions influence the transformation process. The leadership style in the context of management is usual leader's manner of behaviour in regard of his subordinates in order to influence them and to stimulate their will to strive for organization's objectives. The level of authority delegation to subordinates, types of power, concern about subordinates or only about production – all these factors reflect the management style of a manager-leader. As each manager is a unique personality, it is very difficult to attribute certain leader to particular style in spite of many different theoretical classifications of management styles. The management styles and the personality of a leader himself are to be related to organization's success, i.e. organizational culture. The defined problem: impact of personal

qualities of a manager/leader when striving for effective work of organization in the time of transformations.

The objective of the article – to analyse personal qualities necessary for a manager/leader and the influence of such qualities to the effective work of organization.

The tasks of the article:

- 1) to analyse the management styles, taking into consideration their inter-relations with organizational culture;
- 2) to make research on attitudes towards the traits necessary to managers/leaders;
- 3) to prove or reject hypothesis.

The method – the analysis of scientific articles, comparison, the analysis of survey with the help of SPSS methodology, logic-based conclusions.

1. Definition of leadership styles and leaders

Traditionally leadership is classified into three styles: autocratic, democratic and liberal. As it was mentioned before, only few managers can be characterised as only one-style leaders however theoretically such styles can be described. Autocratic leader has sufficient authority to exert it on his subordinates; when it is necessary, he always uses the authority. If such type leader leads organisation, only he himself will form organisational culture and influence what values and how should be instilled to employees. One of the values should be obedience, because such leader cannot stand contradictions. The democratic leader gives employees opportunities to take part into organization's activities. He promotes cooperation, teamwork; he trusts employees and believes that under proper conditions employees are willingly taking responsibility. Leader of this type won't form organisational culture alone. He

will try to understand needs of all employees and let them speak up in order to influence employees properly and to strive for organisational goals together. In this case the result of organisational culture formation is teamwork guided by the leader. The third style leader will have little impact on formation of organisational culture. He – in the best case – will act as a generator of ideas, but the final result will depend on people working in the organisation. In this case the organisational culture will be formed contingently – depending on particular circumstances. The purposeful activity is hardly expectable because a leader does not want to intervene into the organisation's matters.

Leaders are people who communicate and implement the culture in organisation (Seilius, 1998). They form this process through what they pay attention to, what value and control and particularly – what promote and foster. Leaders, if they are consistent, model and represent culture almost by everything what they do. Schein (1985) maintains that unique and essential management function is manipulation of culture. The author insists that organisations need more managers who would be able to break through the tyranny of old culture and to lead groups of people by new paths, to show new attitudes towards the world and new ways to experience it. The leader must raise the question „what are you doing?“ (Drucker, 1985), if strive for creating the culture which has any meaning. Any group must know where it is going and what it values, if people are to know their roles, if the methods of activities are to be acceptable and followed by them. The leadership function can be defined as a possibility and ability to optimise achievement of organisation goals in current and further stages (Ansoff, 1984).

Bennis, Nanus (1998) provide a lot of attention to research on traits of an ideal leader. In order to solve this task they as a basic strategy of leadership have chosen two types of leadership defined by Burns (1978): transforming and transactional (consensual) leadership. Burns (1978) describes the transactional leadership as „motivating subordinates primarily through conditional, salary based exchange. Typically, the main emphasis of transactional leader is directed to goal setting, finding out relationship between performance and salary and ensuring of constructive feedback information in order to keep subordinates at their work“. In articles by Jung, Avolio (1999) one can find different names of such leadership: consensual leadership or even minimum man. Such leader usually makes impact on his subordinates through punishment and reward, although the method of his activities is more moderate, liberal than authoritative one. In contrary, „transforming leadership includes formation of closer relations among leaders and subordinates; relations that are based on higher level of trust and commitment than consensual arguments. Transforming leaders help their subordinates to see the importance of subduing their personal goals for mission and vision of their group and/or organisation. Such leaders, having created trust, self-effectiveness and self-esteem of their subordinates, are

believed to have positive strong impact on the subordinates' identification, motivation and goal-striving levels“. Jung, Avolio (1999) maintain, that such leaders often are attributed to the authoritative style; such leaders also are called charismatic or maximum leaders (maximum man). Thus, there are two main types of management – directive management and leadership. The leadership, in turn, also can be classified under two main types – transactional and transforming. In the contemporary world, however, the most urgent task is to co-ordinate the most essential traits of these two leaderships. The ideal leader is a master leader. The essence of transactional leadership is best described by a concept of exchange deal, which in very simplified terms can be described as a scheme of reward for performance and punishment for non-performance. But this scheme is only simplification of transactional leadership. Such leadership is „a product of real or possible conflicts in organisation“. Zaleznik, Kets de Vries (1985) maintain that such a leader first of all is a good negotiator. He is able to listen to different opinions without their modification; he involves as many people as possible into decision taking process; he is also very rational and pragmatic, understands the essence of exchange, negotiations and reward assignment; and the decision he takes are maximally balanced. In Japanese organisations where believe in consultations and in power of consent is very strong, a leader as if becomes more dependent from subordinates than the subordinates from the leader. In the USA the consent mechanism is not as formalised, it is „more seeking for security and avoiding of increased risk – what creates climate for consensus leadership“ (Zaleznik, Kets de Vries, 1985). The leaders of such leadership type are so called minimal men, while leaders of transforming leadership type are so called maximum men. To the authors' opinion, usually a maximum man starts „the big business“, but leaves its future in the hands of a minimal man, who functions until crisis. Leaders of minimal man type are related to subordinates opinion, he perfectly well adapts in the environment but such dependence on others can lead to inability to take decisions. The maximum man is a great innovator however not always a good manager, he can lead the company to the highest prosperity thanks to his visions and persistence, but he is not able to delegate nor to wait for initiative from lower levels. In contemporary dynamic world cycles of crisis and stability are changing each other very intensively, therefore a need arises to combine at the same time the most essential traits of both maximum and minimal man. Therefore an ideal leader must be able to act both as a maximum and minimal man simultaneously.

Speaking about leaders, their important aspect is an ability to combine innovativeness and flexibility. These two traits interact with each other: in order to be implemented creatively innovativeness should involve certain flexibility; in order to be used flexibility requires innovativeness and organizations need both in order to act. Zaleznik, Kets de Vries, 1985 maintain that

maximum leaders are inflexible. Being deeply committed to their inner standards and having high self-esteem, they oppose the adaptation to circumstances created by other people. It can turn into a catastrophe if a maximum leader does not react to reality. Minimal leader is flexible, easily adapts to situations but a lack of independence from others based on empty inner life as if protects such a leader from innovations. Organisations face a paradox: organisations take risk if follow maximum leader's dazing flight towards his goal, but experience problems if retreat to the minimal leader's uncertain, undefined flexibility. It is also interesting to evaluate other aspect of such leaders – their relation with subordinates when the latter are of different cultural orientations. Such research was conducted by Jung, Avolio (1999). The authors tend to assign subordinates by their cultural orientation to collectivists and individualists – they differently interpret their work environment. The collectivists are stronger attached to their organisation and they tend to sacrifice their personal objectives in favour of the group's goals; solidarity of the group is more important for them than specific work knowledge and skills. The individualists more tend to satisfy their personal interests than collective ones, they do not identify themselves with the group, they act on the basis of reward motivation, based on transactional consent. The authors detected an interesting tendency that „the collectivists with a transforming leader generate more ideas whereas the individualists generate more ideas with a transactional leader. Group performance was much more effective than performance of individualists working individually. Although in contrary to the expectations, the collectivists when working alone generated more ideas that required fundamental organisational changes“. This once more proves that leaders must take into account the needs of their subordinates and to be able to choose a proper course of action in different situations in order to motivate subordinates for efficient work. Egri, Herman (2000) before making research on leadership and environment assessed theoretical material. They came to a conclusion that most authors tend to think that only transforming leadership can be successful. The authors maintain that the leadership can be assessed through four models: openness of a system; human relations; internal processes and rational objectives. The findings revealed that the most essential courses of leader performance are: to act as a facilitator (conflict management, decision taking), adviser (personnel development) – these are the traits attributed to the transforming leadership; innovator (creative problem solving, changes and adaptation), coordinator (analysis and control of tasks, financial control), tutor/mentor (information management, critical thinking), producer (productiveness and effectiveness), director (planning, goal setting). Thus, the leader is required such traits that could ensure successful existence of organisations. The most essential traits both from the transactional and transforming leadership fall into the „trap“ of the traits. Waller (1999) made a research on group performance

and management of a group. The author maintains that the group members must gather and recognise information related to the necessity to take actions when facing non-standard situations. By data of the conducted research, although information compiling and communicating behaviour was positively related to performance, however it was the timing of adaptive behaviour but not the general level that had significant impact on performance and separated high-level performers from low-level performers among the group members. Therefore the impact of a leader is of high importance in the decision taking process and at the same time in the formation of organisational culture.

The separate management problem – workload of middle level employees. There is a tendency „to push away“ unprocessed information and instructions, saying to oneself, that these orders should be executed respectively by middle level employees (Muri, 1986). The middle level managers face the double burden of expectations and thus find themselves in ambiguity of the situation: is it better to adjust to the top-level managers or to the lower level managers? When and how to cope with two-level requirements? The middle-level employees accumulate applications, complains and claims therefore they receive particularly much negative emotion – everything that hinders work both at the top and at the lower level is directed to the middle level. Thus, responsibility of the middle level increases. Therefore it is necessary to make substantial revision of work organisation issues. It should be clearly specified who and how must prepare information, what objectives are given priority, who is actually responsible for one or other issue – organisational culture covers all these things; therefore in the course of formation of organisational culture the work load of middle level managers should be taken into account, because as research prove the middle level managers the most often suffer from stress. Cole (1997) maintains, that important factors of management are: leader's abilities, character of a task, availability of a good team and character of organisational culture – what values it represents, what leadership style supports. Kinard (1988) said, what influences leader's actions and at the same time – quality of management. Organisational culture affects a businessman's values (Šimanskienė, 2002). Managers mostly have already formed their own positive scale of values therefore it is easier following their example to form positive values of employees. However only a leader alone in very rare cases can change norms and values of all members of organisation. The leader's actions will highly depend on his ambitions, abilities, skills and in general, personality: whether only personal objectives or organisation's achievements are of importance. Such differentiation does not exist when an organisation belongs to a manager (he is an owner) or he is a major shareholder. In this case the manager always looks for the best solution for organisation, tries to create positive organisational culture and strives for effectiveness.

Role of a person, i.e. post and position of a person in the formal hierarchy of organisation (Morgan, Costello, 1984). The role is certain style, management manner characteristic for one or another person working in certain post. What constitutes the work role? Cole (1997) defined the following interrelations: work tasks, personal abilities of a company owner – it especially depends on his understanding about performance of certain role; value systems of organisations (in other words – organisational cultures); external environment which impacts the organisation. Handy (1976) defined several elements that should be taken into account by a leader: 1) how he is able to use authority; 2) what relations are established between the leader and the group; 3) norms of organisation; 4) what structure and employed technology exist in the organisation; 5) ability to distribute tasks; 6) what types of employees dominate (in order to apply proper motivation).

To lead people is the most important function of organization, ensuring its existence. In the market conditions only such organisations, which have employees with outstanding traits, inherent only for this particular company – what shows uniqueness of organisation, – are effective. Effective management of human resources is much more important than management of physical resources. The factors: search of employees, selection, training, education, formation of value orientations, communication culture – in one way or another determine uniqueness of organisation. However all the aforementioned factors depend on how individualities can express themselves in certain organisation, how managers (owners) treat them (Seilius, 1997). Activity of organisation members increases when each member precisely knows his/her role and place in the organisation. Then employees can take responsibility and partial risk when solving organisation's issues. In this case people understand that only acting together they can achieve organisation's success, which at the same time will be their personal success. Sense of pride in himself, in organisation is a great energy driver when striving for development and improvement. Sakalas (1998) interprets organisational culture as very important factor of success. Much more impact on organisational success is made not by „hard factors“ (company's policy, management structure, available technologies and equipment), but such „soft factors“ as management style, value system of employees – which are reflected in the company's culture.

Schein (1985) provides the stages of leader activities that form organisational culture and consequent consolidation mechanisms, which are reflected in the organisation's performance and environment. Firstly, in the initial enforcement mechanism it is important what is given leader's attention. Later – how leaders react to critical situations, how allot resources. On the other stage the roles of modelling, teaching and training are considered. On the next stage the criteria, which are used by the leaders when granting rewards and posts, are defined. The last stage is socialisation – at which

freshmen are accepted in compliance with new criteria, which correspond to new, emerging (being formed) organisational culture. Blake, Mouton (1990) created a single system which objectively assesses existing management types. Their grid aimed to define the managerial types evaluates conclusions of the main management theories, seeking for the highest production indicators and involving all members of organisation. Striving for maximum production results, creative attitude of employees to their work, satisfaction with performance of one's duties – these factors are of the highest importance. Applying this method a manager can find out the final consequences of one or another management style and to decide what changes are necessary in order to increase the contribution of each employee to the organisation's final results. The authors also defined managerial elements, that are extremely important to the effective management of organisation: these are the abilities: to show initiative, to handle information, to stand for one's opinion, to solve conflict situations, to take decisions and to conduct critical analysis. No one of them can replace any missing one or compensate one element by the higher level of the other.

Rodger (1991) gives advice to managers on how they should manage and communicate with subordinates: 1) to seek for creating the atmosphere of mutual trust where subordinates are not afraid of a manager; 2) to know his/her subordinates better; 3) to teach employees to do all works in order to have a successor prepared when one is promoted to the higher position; 4) to set priorities; 5) to emphasise feedback; 6) to trust employees and stimulate/promote them; 7) to communicate with employees in such way that they would feel their importance; 8) to build a team; 9) information should reach everyone, to find out whether everybody understands the contents of information; 10) to praise and protect his/her subordinates.

Ansoff (1984) emphasised that the management depends on several components, ones of the most important being the traits of manger himself/herself and the method how the authority is delegated. Managers are influenced by: their attitudes to solving of external or internal problems; orientation towards the past or the future; willingness to take risk; understanding of the reality model – what he/she considers as the most important factors for success and what behaviour corresponds to such factors; values, norms and personal objectives of a manager. The authority given to managers: certain power level in the organisation's hierarchy; striving for achievements and recognition and tendency to use his/her power; competence; abilities; problem solving skills; style (leadership experience based on the formulated policy, traditions, inspiration or personal charisma); understanding of organisation and its environment. Opportunities: personal work abilities and skills; work method. Organisation without a proper manager inevitably faces failure. The way a manager approaches all activities that are taking place in

organisation is the main key of the processes of socialisation, adaptation and identification. These processes are of extreme importance when seeking to diagnose the current organisational culture and to form a new appropriate one.

Hypothesis: manager, leader should have the following qualities: ability to take decisions, to solve conflict situations, skill of being organized, understanding other people, showing initiative, defending his/her own opinion, critical analysis.

2. Research on attitudes towards the personal qualities necessary for managers/leaders

1034 respondents filled in the questionnaire: 378 men and 654 women. By position at work the respondents ranged as follows: the top-level managers accounted for 5,59% of the total number of respondents, middle-level managers – 17,76%, lower level managers – 14,80%, specialists – 45,72%, technicians – 8,88%, workers – 7,24. By age the respondents ranged as follows: under 21 year – 4,28%, from 21 to 30 years – 29,61%, from 31 to 40 years – 29,28%, from 41 to 50 years – 27,63%, from 51 to 60 years – 8,55%, over 60 years – 0,66%. In order to assess what qualities are necessary for a manager, leader of a team, the questionnaire was prepared with the list of twenty different qualities; the respondents were asked to rate them, where 1 point went to the least needed quality and 7 points – to the most needed one. The average values of the results are shown in Table 1.

1 Table

The average values of the leaders

Qualities	Average assessment
Showing initiative	6,63
Honesty	6,45
Fairness	6,61
Responsibility	6,70
Trust in others	5,92
Diligence	6,10
Modesty	4,04
Moderation	4,71
Individualism	5,41
Independence	6,29
Risk taking	5,65
Obedience	3,53
Conservativeness	3,49
Punctuality	6,35
Sense of humour	5,90
Solving of conflict situations	6,81
Ability to make decisions	6,87
Creativeness	6,42
Skill of being organised	6,75
Ability to understand people	6,72

As we see the respondents defined obedience (3,53) and conservativeness (3,49) as the least needed qualities for a manager, leader while the most needed qualities ranged as following: ability to make decisions (6,87), to solve conflict situations (6,81), skill of being organized (6,75), skill of understanding other people (6,72), responsibility (6,70), showing initiative (3,53). If to compare the results with the qualities necessary for a manager, leader as defined by Blake, Mouton (1990) – showing initiative, ability to handle information, solving of conflict situations, critical analysis – we can see that these results are quite similar. These are the qualities which respondents mentioned as the most needed for an effective manager, i.e. exactly these qualities except: critical analysis, being informed and defending his/her own opinion – as the latter were not included into the questionnaire. Perhaps independence, which was rated at 6,29 points is a similar feature and can in part correspond to defending of his/her own opinion; and responsibility (6,70) – to critical analysis. So, in part we can state that respondents' answers about effective management correspond to managerial elements defined by Blake, Mouton (1990). *It shows that the hypothesis is in part corroborated: manager, leader should have the following traits: ability to take decisions, to solve conflict situations, skill of being organized, understanding other people, showing initiative, being informed, defending his/her own opinion, critical analysis.*

The results are also interesting, if to compare differences in respondents' attitude towards traditions and changes depending on their posts. It should be emphasized that managers/leaders must react to changes in their environment, they should be interested in looking for and implementing of innovations, however in order to avoid mistakes it is necessary to learn from the past. Experience should help in striving for innovations but should not turn into the source of conservativeness.

Table 2

What do you value more?

	Traditions	Changes	When assessing changes one needs to look at the past
Top level manager	0	5,88	94,12
Middle level manager	1,85	20,37	77,78
Lower level manager	13,33	13,33	73,33
Specialist	3,6	17,27	79,14
Technician	7,41	25,93	66,67
Worker	13,64	9,09	77,27

So, as we see even 94,12% of the top level manager maintain that when assessing changes it is necessary to look at the past; no one top level manager was only on behalf of traditions. Workers (13, 64) and lower level

managers (13,33) are the most conservative while middle level managers (20,37) and technicians (25,93) more tend to emphasise only changes. The analysis shows that similar results should have been expected, because it is the top level managers who form the strategic trend of organisation therefore the broader approach is seen by them as more important, while the lower level personnel are performers who want clear regulations and as a rule when facing changes they fear uncertainty; although results of the research in general are excellent as representatives of all positions have positive attitude towards changes and even 77,27 workers and 73,33 of lower level managers state that when assessing changes it is necessary to look at the past.

Table 3

Competition

	Competition is necessary as it is a driver of development	I hate pressure	It's OK, when I am not involved
Top level manager	88,24	5,88	5,88
Middle level manager	77,78	16,67	5,56
Lower level manager	60	20	20
Specialist	61,15	23,74	15,11
Technician	48,15	29,63	22,22
Worker	63,64	18,18	18,18

Other investigated issue was how respondents' attitudes towards competition differ due to their position; it is showed in table 3. The results show that even 88,24% of top-level managers maintain that competition is necessary as it is a driver of development while technicians (29,63%) and specialists (23,74%) who maintained that hate pressure, were the most unsatisfied with competitive relations. Competition as a driving factor was rated with the highest points by the top-level (88,24%) and middle level managers – these results show that managers/leaders of organisations understands necessity of looking for ways leading to better performance and allowing for more effective decisions. It is worth to mention an interesting fact that workers' attitude towards competition is more favourable (63,64%) comparing to the attitude of lower level managers, technicians, specialists. It seems the middle-level managers are more afraid of losing their jobs.

Conclusions

1. Good managers/leaders are consistent; they model and represent culture almost by everything they do. Therefore managers/leaders must and can have impact on members of organisation through unique organisation culture. In today's

dynamic world cycles of crisis and stability interchange very intensively – what arise a need to combine the most essential qualities of both maximal and minimal leader simultaneously.

2. Although a serious body of research on managerial styles has already been conducted, the final solution to the problem of a manager's/leader's most necessary qualities still is open to discussions. In fact this answer can not be ever found, as each manager/leader is a unique personality and when trying to find the most effective qualities of a manager/leader we only can indicate some factors that influence manager's/leader's values, his/her needs and abilities. To understand the underlying causes of such factors is practically impossible, as in each separate case these causes differ and their investigation is difficult.
3. The results have shown that obedience and conservativeness were attributed by the respondents to the least needed manager's/leader's qualities while the most needed ones were: ability to take decisions, to solve conflict situations, skill of being organized, skill of understanding other people, responsibility, showing of initiative. If to compare the results with the qualities necessary for a manager, leader as defined by Blake, Mouton – showing initiative, ability to handle information, solving of conflict situations, standing for his/her own opinion, ability to make decisions, critical analysis – it was corroborated that in part we can maintain that the respondents' answers about effective management correspond to managerial elements as defined by Blake, Mouton.

Gauta 2004 10 01

Pasirašyta spaudai 2004 12 20

Spausdinti rekomendavo:

prof. habil. dr. J. Ramanauskas, dr. A. B. Knašas

References

- Ansoff, H. I. (1984). *Implanting Strategic Management*. Prentice/ Hall International.
- Bennis, W., Nanus, B. (1998). *Lyderiai. Atsakomybės strategija*. Vilnius: Algarvė.
- Burns, J. M. C. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cole, G. A. (1997). *Personnel Management*. Ashford Colour Press.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Egri, C. P., Hermas, S. (2000). Leadership in the North American Environmental Sector: Values, Leadership Styles, and Contexts of Environmental Leaders and Their Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 43, no. 4.
- Handy, C. (1976). *Understanding Organization*. Penguin.
- Jung, D. I., Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of Leadership Style and Followers Cultural Orientation on Performance in Group and Individual Task Conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42.
- Kinard, J. (1988). *Management*. D. C. Heath and Company. Lexington.

- Melnikas, B. (1998). *Baltijos regionas globalinių struktūrų sistemoje: galimybių modeliai. Ekonomikos reforma Rytų ir Vidurio Europoje*. Tarptaut. konf. medžiaga. Klaipėdos universitetas.
- Morgan, T., Costello, M. (1984). *Trainer Task Inventory*. MSC/ ITD.
- Muri, P. (1986). Tvarkyti aplinką, o ne valdymo darbuotojus. *Technische Rundschau* 8.
- Rodžersas, H. (1991). *Vienos skrybėlės principas*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Sakalas, A. (1998). *Personalo vadyba*. Vilnius: Margi raštai.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seilius, A. (1997). Vadovo pasaulėžiūra lemia vadovavimą organizacijai. *Tiltai* 2. Klaipėda: KU.
- Seilius, A. (1998). *Organizacijų tobulinimo vadyba*. Klaipėda: KU.
- Šimanskienė, L. (2002). *Organizacinės kultūros formavimas*. Klaipėda: KU.
- Zaleznik, A., Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1985). *Power and the Corporate Mind: how to Use Rather than Misuse Leadership*. Chicago: Bonus Books.
- Waller, M. J. (1999). The Timing of Adaptive Group Responses to Nonroutine Events. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 42, no. 2.
- Блейк, Р., Моутон, Дж. (1990). *Научные методы управления*. Киев: Наукова думка.

VADOVUI BŪTINŲ SAVYBIŲ TYRIMAS TRANSFORMACIJŲ LAIKOTARPIU

Ligita Šimanskienė

Santrauka

Nagrinėti įvairių autorių darbai lyderystės klausimu. Geri vadovai yra nuoseklūs, modeliuoja ir pristato kultūrą beveik viskuo, ką daro. Todėl vadovai turi ir gali veikti organizacijos narius per organizacinę kultūrą. Šiandienos dinamiškame pasaulyje krizės ir stabilumo ciklai sparčiai keičia vienas kitą, iškyla reikmė vienu metu derinti maksimalaus ir minimalaus lyderio pagrindinius bruožus. Nors atlikta daug vadovavimo stilių tyrimų, tačiau iki galo taip ir neišsiaiškintos būtinos vadovo savybės ir bruožai. Šie tyrinėjimai yra nesibaigiantys, nes kiekvieno vadovo asmenybė – unikali. Ieškant veiksmingiausių vadovo bruožų galima nurodyti tik veiksnus, nuo kurių priklauso vadovo vertybinė orientacija, kas lemia jo reikmes, sugebėjimus. Nustatyti šių veiksnų priežasčių praktiškai neįmanoma, nes kiekvienu atveju jos kitos ir sunkiai ištiriamos. Todėl problemą sudaro vadovo asmeninė įtaka, siekiant efektyvaus organizacijos darbo transformacijų laikotarpiu. Straipsnio tikslas – ištirti veiksmingai dirbančio vadovo būtinas savybes. Metodai – analizės, palyginimo, sintezės, anketinės apklausos, duomenų analizės, naudojant SPSS.

Straipsnyje pateikti įvairių autorių tyrinėjimai lyderystės klausimu. W. Bennis, B. Nanus (1998) nagrinėja idealaus lyderio savybes. Vykdydami šią užduotį, kaip pamatinę lyderystės strategiją pasirinko J. Burns (1978) suformuluotus du lyderystės tipus: transformuojančią ir transakcionalią (susitarimo) lyderystę. J. Burns (1978) transakcionalią lyderystę apibūdina kaip „motyvuojančią pavaldinius pirmiausiai per santykius, atlyginimu grįstus mainus. Paprastai transakcionali lyderis akcentuoja tikslų nustatymą, ryšio tarp veiklos ir atlyginimo išsiaiškinimą bei konstruktyvios grįžamosios informacijos pavaldiniams

išlaikyti užtikrinimą darbo vietoje“. D. Jung, B. Avolio (1999) straipsniuose galima rasti skirtingų tokios lyderystės pavadinimų: *sutarimo*, *susitarimo lyderystė* ar net *minimalus lyderis* (angl. *minimum man*). Toks lyderis paprastai savo pavaldinius veikia bausmėmis ir atlyginimu, nors pats veikimo būdas yra labiau nuosaikus, liberalus nei autoritarinis. „Transformuojanti lyderystė apima artimesnių ryšių tarp lyderių ir pavaldinių sukūrimą, kuris grįstas didesniu pasitikėjimu ir išipareigojimu nei susitarimo argumentai. Transformuojantys lyderiai padeda pavaldiniams įvertinti savų tikslų atsisakymo svarbą dėl grupės ir/ ar organizacijos misijos, vizijos. Užtikrinę pavaldinių pasitikėjimą, savaveiksmingumą ir savivertę, tokie lyderiai, manoma, daro teigiamą įtaką pavaldinių identifikacijos, motyvacijos ir tikslų siekimo lygiams“ (Jung, Avolio, 1999). D. Jung, B. Avolio (1999) teigia, kad tokiems vadovams dažnai būdingas autoritarinis vadovavimo stilius. Jie dar vadinami charizmatiniais, arba maksimumo, lyderiais (angl. *maximum man*). Taigi galimi du pagrindiniai vadovavimo tipai – direktyvinis vadovavimas ir lyderystė. Lyderystė taip pat būna dviejų pagrindinių tipų – transakcionali ir transformuojanti, tačiau šiuolaikiniame pasaulyje derinami pagrindiniai šių dviejų lyderystių bruožai. Transakcionali lyderystės esmę geriausiai nusako mainų, sandėrio samprata, kurią itin supaprastinus galima pavaizduoti kaip atlyginimo už vykdymą ir bausmės už nevykdymą schemą. Tačiau tai tėra transakcionali lyderystės supaprastinimas. Tokia lyderystė „yra tikrų ar galimų konfliktų organizacijoje produktas“. A. Zaleznik, M. Kets de Vries (1985) teigia, kad toks lyderis pirmiausiai yra geras derybininkas. Jis sugeba išklauyti įvairias nuomones pats jų nekeisdamas, į sprendimų priėmimo procesą stengiasi įtraukti kuo daugiau žmonių. Jis yra racionalus ir pragmatiškas, supranta mainų, derybų ir apdovanojimų paskirstymo reikšmę, o jo priimti sprendimai būna maksimaliai suderinti. Japonijos organizacijose, kur tikima konsultacijų ir susitarimų galia, lyderis labiau priklauso nuo pavaldinių nei atvirkščiai. JAV susitarimo mechanizmas nėra toks formalus, čia jis yra „labiau saugumo ieškojimas ir didesnės rizikos vengimas, kas sudaro sąlygas susitarimo lyderystei“ (Zaleznik, Kets de Vries, 1985). Šio tipo lyderiai dar vadinami minimaliais lyderiais, transformuojančios lyderystės tipo lyderiai dar vadinami maksimaliais lyderiais. Autorių nuomone, maksimalus lyderis paprastai pradeda didįjį verslą, bet toliau jį plėtoja minimalus lyderis, kuris funkcionuoja iki krizės. Minimalus lyderis klausia pavaldinių nuomonės, jis puikiai pritampa prie aplinkos, bet priklausomumas nuo kitų gali lemti nesugebėjimą priimti sprendimus. Maksimalus lyderis yra didelis inovatorius, bet ne visada geras vadovas, jis gali išvesti organizaciją į klestėjimo viršūnę per savo vizijas ir užsispyrimą, bet negali nei deleguoti, nei laukti iniciatyvos iš apačios. Šiandienos dinamiškame pasaulyje krizės ir stabilumo ciklas keičia vienas kitą labai sparčiai, vienu metu reikia derinti pagrindinius maksimalaus ir minimalaus lyderio bruožus. Kitame

etape nustatomi kriterijai, kuriais remdamiesi lyderiai teikia apdovanojimus ir skiria pareigybes. Paskutinis yra socializacijos etapas, kai priimami naujokai, remiantis naujais kriterijais, kurie atitinka naują, kuriamą organizacinę kultūrą.

R. Blake, J. Mouton (1990) sukūrė sistemą, kuri objektyviai įvertina esamus valdymo tipus. Valdymo tipų nustatymo tinklainė remiasi pagrindinių valdymo teorijų išvadomis, siekiant aukščiausių gamybos rodiklių, dalyvaujant visiems organizacijos nariams. Ypač svarbus gamybinių rezultatų maksimizavimas, kūrybinis darbuotojų požiūris į darbą, pasitenkinimas savo pareigomis. Taikydamas šį metodą, vadovas gali išsiaiškinti valdymo stiliaus pasekmes ir nuspręsti, kokių būtinų pasikeitimai didinant kiekvieno darbuotojo indėlį į galutinius organizacijos darbo rezultatus. Autoriai išskyrė ir valdymo elementus, kurie ypač svarbūs siekiant efektyviai valdyti organizaciją. Nė vienas jų negali kompensuoti kurio nors trūkstamo elemento. Tai yra iniciatyvumas, informuotumas, savo nuomonės gynimas, konfliktinių situacijų sprendimas, sprendimų priėmimas, kritinė analizė. Taigi šiuos pagrindinius vadovui būtinus valdymo elementus ir lyginome su respondentų pateiktomis vadovui svarbiomis savybėmis.

Tyrimu nustatyta, kad mažiausiai vadovui, lyderiui svarbios savybės, respondentų nuomone: paklusnumas (3,53), konservatyvumas (3,49). Labiausiai būtinos: gebėjimas priimti sprendimus (6,87), spręsti konfliktines situacijas (6,81), organizuotumas (6,75), sugebėjimas pažinti žmones (6,72), atsakingumas (6,70), iniciatyvumas (6,63). Palyginę su R. Blake ir J. Mouton (1990) išskirtomis vadovui būtinomis savybėmis (iniciatyvumas, informuotumas, konfliktinių situacijų sprendimas, savo nuomonės gynimas, gebėjimas priimti sprendimus, kritinė analizė), matome, kad rezultatai panašūs. Respondentai nurodė, ko

labiausiai reikia produktyviam vadovui (išskyrus kritinę analizę): informuotumas, savo nuomonės gynimas, kas nebuvo įtraukta į klausimyną. Galbūt panaši savybė – savarankiškumas (įvertintas 6,29 balo) gali iš dalies prilygti savo nuomonės gynimui, o atsakingumas (6,70) – kritinei analizei. Taigi galime teigti, kad respondentų nuomonė apie veiksmingą vadovavimą sutampa su R. Blake, J. Mouton (1990) išskiriamais valdymo elementais. Taigi hipotezė iš dalies patvirtinta: vadovui, lyderiui būtinas gebėjimas priimti sprendimus, spręsti konfliktines situacijas, organizuotumas, sugebėjimas pažinti žmones, iniciatyvumas, informuotumas, gebėjimas ginti savo nuomonę, kritinė analizė.

Tyrimu taip pat nustatyta, kad net 94,12 procento aukščiausios grandies vadovų teigia, kad vertinant pokyčius būtina atsižvelgti į praeitį, vien tik už tradicijas nepasisakė nei vienas aukščiausios grandies vadovas. Konservatyviausi yra darbininkai (13,64) bei žemesnės grandies vadovai (13,33). Vien tik pokyčius labiau akcentuoja vidutinės grandies vadovai (20,37) ir techniniai darbuotojai (25,93). Analizė parodė, kad panašių rezultatų ir galima buvo tikėtis, nes aukščiausios grandies vadovai kaip tik ir numato strateginę organizacijos kryptį, taigi jiems aktualus platesnis požiūris, o žemutinėje grandyje – vykdytojai, kurie nori nustatyti taisyklių, pokyčiai juos paprastai išmuša iš vėžių. Vis dėlto rezultatai yra puikūs, nes visų pareigybių atstovai teigiamai vertina pokyčius ir teigia, kad būtina įvertinti praeitį (net 77,27 darbininkų ir 73,33 žemesnės grandies darbuotojų). Ištyrę vadovams būtinas savybes ir palyginę jas su R. Blake ir J. Mouton vadovų charakteristikomis, matome, kad Lietuvoje panašiai įsivaizduojama, koks turėtų būti vadovas, kas jam turėtų būti būdinga.