Influential Managers in the Public Sector: How Can OD Prepare Managers in the Public Sector for Today's Challenging Working Environment

Henry Eric Williams
Benedictine University

Is there a greater need for leadership in the public-sector or is there a need for better management? The correct answer is maybe yes to both. Many theorists describe leaders and managers as two separate and different entities; but in the public-sector there may be a distinct need for both manager and leader as one. This paper will examine the complications faced by managers in the public sector, and how OD methods and intervention techniques can make a difference in the difficult political environment.

INTRODUCTION

During my 30 years of public sector service, 18 of those years were as a mid-level and senior level manager. Being an ambitious individual, prior to becoming a manager, I desired to move up in the agency in order to make a more significant contribution to the organization as a whole. As I pursued my goal, I found it a mystery as to how to qualify myself for various management positions. Prior to becoming a supervisor and shortly afterwards a manager, there was no formal training, educational requirements, organizational development activities or training initiatives in preparation for those leadership positions. Over time I realized that many of the organization leaders lacked the ability to be effective in their ability to motivate and inspire others to follow their vision and direction for the company's success. There were many managers that lacked leadership qualities. This prompt me to research and study various leadership styles in order to determine which skills, traits and behaviors may render a more effective and successful manager in the public sector. Even though there are some distinctive difference between leadership and management there are many similarities.

This study will focus on the similarities of the two. My background as a public-sector manager also provoked me to identify the methods that in my opinion may be more effective in developing influential managers in the future. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study, through current theory and my years of experience, this paper will attempt to determine some of the key ingredients to developing an effective-successful public-sector manager.

AN OVERVIEW OF MANAGEMENT IN THE PUBLIC-SECTOR

Public-sector like private sector managers both need to provide effective leadership to insure services that encourage the health, safety, independence, and quality of life for their constituents (Dorsey-Oresto, 2009). For this reason, it is of the utmost importance to identify, recruit, educate and retain good influential managers and leaders. This is where the knowledge base of an experienced skilled Organization Development (OD) professional can help any organization, public or private.

The aptitude and capabilities of managers have been connected to a wide range of performance measures and results of studies for some time (Dorsey-Oresto, 2009; Bass and Steidlmeirer, 1998; Howell and Avolio, 1993; Yukl and Tracey, 1992), and numerous measures have been used to categorize managers as well as leaders (Aviles, 2001; Clark, 2003; Hardy, 2004; Ibrahim, Soufani, Poutzious and Lam, 2004; Kaplan, 2001; Yessian, 1995). However, these studies are not being utilized by public-sector managers, HR departments, and OD practitioners, because they do not connect to the overt political environments that plague their agencies. These studies point out the competencies, values and behaviors; while, not pointing out the factors that dominate these agencies such as tenure, seniority, and patriotism which in my opinion, control many decision made by politically appointed leaders in these agencies.

Change in the public sector does not always come easy for individual or for groups. However, it has been found that it is accepted easier when it is administered and supported from the top down regardless of the circumstances. Without a plan on how to foresee future change and implementation when necessary, organizations can become stagnant, moral can suffer, customer satisfaction begins to fall and profits began to shrink. These are some of the obstacles OD professionals face in the public and private sectors when they are brought in to assist organizations with the need to strategically make changes with human capital. However, there are more systemic characteristic changes that public sector agencies face that may make OD interventions more challenging. For example, Alderfer suggests in the public sector systems there is a significant portion of the environment that is overtly political which may have strong norms against many of the values and practices associated with OD work (1977). This is as true today as it was in 1977. Yes, thirty-five years later and these public-sector agencies such as school districts, law enforcements, city halls, and municipalities are still controlled by politicians as opposed to independent managers with the goal of providing the best possible services for their stakeholders, the general public.

DIFFERENCES IN MANAGING IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

To some degree the goals of private sector companies are different than the goals of public sector agencies; therefore, the abilities and qualities needed by company managers can and should be different. They are both governed by stakeholders that demand different results. Private companies answer to owners and stockholders, but public sector organizations and government agencies answer to politician or political appointees. These distinctive differences require managers to develop unique styles on how to succeed in their environment.

According to Baldwin (1987), researchers have found three major differences in managing in a public and private sector organization: (a) private sector goals are primarily set buy economic trends and analysis, as well as the benefits and the bottom line, profits, whereas public sector agencies have to please or fulfill the needs of stakeholders, including politicians and the general public; (b) leadership changes hands more frequently in the public sector than in the private sector due to term limits and political reasons; and (c) public sector employees have better job security due to laws and due process of grievance procedure. In many cases, public employees are given more recognition time credit for their seniority. Twenty-five years later, many of these differences still exist with the exception of how frequent those leadership positions change hands. A public-sector manager's tenure may largely depend on his or her political leverage with the politicians in office at that time.

Baldwin (1987) also stated other differences include how the private sector stresses market incentives and the public sector places more emphasis on the civil service system. In most cases, in private sectors organizations, the mission is well defined and identifiable with the stakeholders; however, in the public sector mission can be more flexible (Patnaik, 2008). If public-sectors missions were identifiable, there may be more accountability; therefore, a better connection to the needs of the public.

Boyatzis (1982) tested a variety of assumptions regarding public-private sector differences and found that managers in the private sector generally have better competency skills in areas such as oral presentation, their ability to express their concerns, and using business concepts effectively. This hinders public sector managers because they must use a more erratic or sporadic decision making process. In his research, Boyatzis found many similarities in both types of organizations; nevertheless, many public

sector agencies were found to be more formal in the functions of procurement and human capital than the private sector organizations. This may be largely due to due process and strong grievance processes in place.

When examining the operation of both private and public sector organizations, Kotter (1998) suggested that the leaders on both sides all had vision, motivated followers, and the kind of strategy needed to achieve certain guidelines, and operate well under public and media scrutiny. However, due to the economic condition and government uncertainty, it may be time for current public sector leaders to faces major challenges by being equipped to create ground-breaking and "visionary responsive organization" (Patnaik, 2008). However, even then, this goal can only be accomplished if those visionary public leaders are allowed to act on their visions.

Monetary rewards and other compensation factors are determined differently in the public sector than in the private sector. These factors can hinder the process of attracting and acquiring top level talent in every area including management stock to a public sector organization. Acquiring strong and influential leaders and preparing current employees to take on managerial roles is one of the key focal points of training for OD practitioners.

Internal structures differ between public and private sectors organizations as well. Many corporations in the private sector have oversight by a board of directors and the CEO/President. They are in-turn accountable to the stockholders. Public sector agencies that are subsidized by tax payer funding are governed by elected officials, or an appointed/elected board members. When appointing heads of these agencies they do not choose individuals based on the same qualifications used by private sector recruiters. In many cases, the decision to hire or promote are based on traits other than leadership ability, continuity, or match to a particular team. Some of those traits are loyalty and making political connections. According to Cummings and Worley, these unique abilities give them a distinct advantage over managers that lack the capacity or opportunity to gain the aptitude for these types of endeavors (2009).

SUCCESSFUL AND EFFECTIVE MANAGERIAL LEADERS

Now that we have discussed the difference in public and private sector management, let us take a closer look at what the skills, traits, and tangibles qualities look like in a good public-sector manager. For many years I have been consumed with the argument over what is the difference between management and leadership. The fact that there is a debate insinuates there is a difference, and being a manager does not necessarily make one a leader. During my stint as a public-sector manager, I always thought of myself as a leader, and being a leader was the expectations of my superiors. I often thought how can someone manage, train, motivate, and influence a group of individuals without functioning as a leader. While this was required of me as a manager, I do realize organization demand various duties of their managers and many do not require their managers take on such task.

"Handling all of the complexity of organizational life is what management does" (Stringer, 2002, p. 105). Stringer (2002) also mentioned that effective organizations need managers who can handle the forever changing environments as opposed to just dealing with systems and day-to-day work of their staff. Even though the work and duties may be the same for managers and leaders, the difference is in how they perceive their duties, how they handle their responsibilities, and how they communicate with people (Stringer, 2002). This is why the most successful and most effective managers are good leaders. These are the type of bosses needed in the public-sector.

There are ways to describe a manager's achievements and accomplishments when being classified as a good manager. As we observe the specific qualities that are indicative of a good public-sector manager, one of the most common terms used is "success". Success is usually based on a set of measured accomplishments. Those measures are developed by companies or personal goals and a set of criteria's set forth by an individual or group. It can also be based on one's performance and achievements determined by a performance management tool such as an annual appraisal reviewing process. However, in my experience, successful management or being a successful manager does not mean you are an effective manager. Personal and organization success can be measured through promotions, bonuses and how

persuasive you are with the insiders and outsiders; but, these tactics do not necessarily convert into effectiveness within a leaders own group or when real decisions must be made. It has been found that when successful managers give little time and attention to the traditional management activities, it can have negative results. Human resource activities such as planning, decision making, and motivating cannot go unnoticed. Other important responsibilities are staffing, training/developing, and managing conflict (Head, Sorensen & Yaeger, 2007). The political climate within an organization may to a degree determine the level of socializing and political networking necessary to achieve goals in a complex public sector environment.

On the brink of "Financial Armageddon", the challenges of our time demand skills that are different and more complex (Lu, 2006; Burke & Cooper, 2004; Miles, 1999; Yukl, 2004). Past performances of organizations may not be enough to get the job done in today's climate. Organization's must produce a high level of competency and skill to be competitive, successful and effective in the current markets (Jackson, Farndale, & Kakabadse, 2003; Pernick, 2001; Ready & Conger, 2003). Effective and successful leadership is at the nucleus of management for organizational transformation (Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003; Burke, 2002; Cummings, 1999; Gill, 2003; Kotter, 2001; Miller, 2002; Nadler & Heilpern, 1998; Parry & Sinha, 2005). Due to the reluctance to cooperate with change initiatives, transformation in the public sector requires influential and effective managers. Organizations in need of transformation need leaders that understand how to get the job done and posses the ability to build teams with the competencies to facilitate the efforts of their vision (Francis, D., Bessant, J., & Hobday, M., 2003). Miles once wrote, "the ability to orchestrate the fundamental process of transformation in complex organizations has become the ubiquitous challenge of executive in our time (1999, p. 221)."

According to Head, et al, effectiveness is defined as the perceived quantity and quality of the performance of a manager's unit and his or her subordinates' satisfaction and commitment; however, the biggest relative contribution to a real manager effectiveness comes from the human oriented activities-communication and importance placed on human resource management (2007). While individual success can be measured through a promotion and dividends, effectiveness is measure by how well you can motivate and work with others. Managers that are true leaders must possess the ability to communicate his or her goals with others and to convince them to follow their direction. The literature suggests, in today's work force, effective managers must be diverse and possess the aptitude to stay in tuned with the day-to-day functioning of subordinates and peers (Head, et al, 2007).

A manager's effectiveness is measured in many ways. However, no way is as important as the achievements, accomplishment and the stability an influential manager brings to an organization. In order for a manager to be an effective leader, one must be influential, efficient and successful at accomplishing goals and tasks. "An effect leader is supposed to have a vision, whereas an ineffective leader lacks one". (DuBrin, P. 96) Vision is what connects effective management to charismatic leadership, because charismatic leaders motivate others to follow their vision and the organization's mission (DuBrin, 1997). An effective manager must also be able to offer guidance and direction when needed as well as being a good listener with an open mind to the opinions of others. He or she at times must be willing to forgo personal gain for the growth and prosperity of the organization as a whole. In turn, the accomplishments and company achievements that you are responsible for as a manager shall eventually materialize in personal growth and success.

The power of influence is a key ingredient to a managers' effectiveness. These traits are often found in transformational and charismatic leaders. In many cases, managers have been known to use a variety of persuasive tactics to accomplish their goals; however, those tactics may be situational (Yukl, 1989).

Personal magnetism may help ones' chance of being chosen for a managerial position or position of power (DuBrin, 1997). Subordinates need to see their leader as being self-confident, not cocky, to ensure those that are following, things are under control. All these qualities are essential for an effective manager.

Finally, leaders that hold the qualities that are indicative of successful and effective traits make the ideal manager in most situations; however, there are just not a large percentage of individuals that have mastered both characteristics on the public or private sector sides. These characteristics require balance in

the managerial areas such as communication, networking, human resources management and traditional management responsibilities. In a study by Head, Sorensen and Yaeger, less than 10% of the sample that were both among the top third of successful managers and top third effective managers (2007). This may be largely due to the lack of training and the lack of importance placed on being a well rounded managers.

Two important characteristic traits that seem to be universal in assuring success of a manager in the role of leadership in any environment are ability and motivation. You must have the ability to handle the job, and inspire others to follow your vision; also, the motivation to carry out your vision through not only influence of others, but by showing there is the "desire to make something happen, to change the way things are, to create something that no one else has ever created before" (Kouzes and Posner, P. 15).

LEADERSHIP STYLES FOR EFFECTIVE SUCCESSFUL MANAGERS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

James McGregor Burns developed the theory of transformational leader in 1978 through his work with public sector leaders. Burns claimed that for a leader or manager to have a relevant impact on followers, he or she must motivate them to action by engaging to their sense of shared values and their need to be led (Dorsey-Oresto, 2009; and Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

Coggburn and Schneider (2003) states that transformational leadership in the public sector should connect with the vision of management and management must behave in a morally and ethically manner. This all sounds good in theory, but it does not appear to work in the "real world". Many managers take on the responsibility of these new positions with ambition and hope; eventually reality sets in and they realize that no matter what they do, in the end there will be very little change. In most cases, managers choose to fall in line with the status quo in order to hold on to their own position.

Even though transformational leadership may be more suited for self-motivated environments, where employees are empowered to take on greater responsibility, it can still be utilized in public sector environments where empowerment is usually not acceptable (Tucker & Russell, 2004). The core of transformational leadership fits in the context of agencies that are not for profit such as public sector organizations (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). The big question is will the public-sector allow their managers to be transformation in leading their perspective agencies?

Transactional leadership style is quite common in public sector organizations, particularly among line level managers and supervisors. Mangers that display this style of leadership encourage their subordinates to recognize their worth by clarifying their assignment and responsibilities. This is achieved by motivating individuals with rewards and punishments to get what they need from the employee. These antics were very popular in my workplace while working in the public sector. These types of social systems work best with authoritarian type leadership models where the employee's job requires they follow management's lead without question (House & Mitchell, 1974). Questioning authority and challenging the higher acre is not acceptable in the public-sector. In an organization that uses the transactional leadership method, it is understood that everyone involved understands the structure of their position within the agency and there are clear instructions so that the agency's culture remains unharmed (Vroom, 1964; House, 1971). This may be as a result of the constant need to focus on completing tasks which is a common practice in bureaucratic agencies such as public sector organizations (Stone, Russell and Patterson, 2004).

During my tenure in the public sector, I have not had the experience of working with many individuals that I would consider to be charismatic. Those that were viewed as charismatic during the early phase of their stint in public sector management, eventually changed their philosophy or to a degree gave up on creating a culture in the organization that inspire individuals to buy into a vision other than their own personal agenda. The politics of various agencies overwhelm their drive and charisma, which also hindered their ability to be successful and effective in their endeavors.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INFLUENTIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE PUBLIC-SECTOR

Now that we know what a good manager looks like in isolation, let us take a look at their benefits in totality. Good leaders allow themselves to be open to receive information from others. To have great influence one must allow ideas of others to inform them of alternative thoughts and viewpoints. "Influence is simply the process by which people successfully persuade others to follow their advice, suggestions, or orders." (Head, Sorensen & Yaeger, p. 275) With training these techniques can be thought to new managers and nurtured by experienced managers. In many cases, the public sector as well as private managers do not possess the ability for reinforcing these skills or lack the time to nurture a young upcoming executive. This responsibility falls primarily on the OD practitioner who may be the training specialist, someone in charge of talent management or an executive coach.

Once a manager has equipped him or herself with these skills, their ability to persuade and influence their subordinates will improve the effectiveness throughout the organization. When people feel they are being heard and their ideas matter they feel a sense of empowerment. They acquire a sense of ownership of not just their job but to the entire organization. Today, there is a strong need for transformational leaders who can allow the networks that funnel diverse views upward from the lower levels of the organization where a need for change is often first detected (Head, Sorensen & Yaeger, 2007). The need for transformational leaders has become a greater necessity due to the expansion of global business and the diverse workforce. Managers must become more diverse in their ability to function in environments that require them to make decisive decisions. To have earned the power and authority to make crucial decisions through a wide range of choices can make one a successful, effective and influential manager.

In order to become an influential manager in the public sector, it may be equally important to be well diverse and effective with your staff as well as with politicians. Training new manager to excel in both areas can be a difficult task when working with agencies that resist change. According to Yaeger and Sorensen, "any discussion of the role of values in OD needs to address the issue of power, politics and ethics in organizations. Developing political support is the recognition of assessing the power of the change agent, sources of power, and the identification and influencing of key stakeholders." (p. 128) Culture within the organization plays an important role as well. Understanding the culture and where you fit may take an extended amount of time and effort. The right fit is a necessary component in team continuity.

With the help of OD interventions, inter-organizational as well as individual changes may be an easier task; however, making external changes that affect the organization may be difficult. This can be due to political obstacles as well as lack of control by the manager that are pushing for the change. In a political environment change constantly takes place, but it is usually based on an election. When there is a new political official in charge, they may or may not support the previous regime vision; therefore, the process set forth by the OD practitioner may lose support or it may gain support and flourish. In the private sector, the decision-making process is much broader and accountability is more isolated than in public sector organizations. Cummings & Worley suggest that responsibility is more clear-cut in the private sector making the road to effectiveness simpler (2009).

OD's PLACE IN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING MANAGERS FOR THE PUBLIC-SECTOR

Many public sector agencies have trouble using OD methods that have worked in the private sector. Agencies such as police and fire departments, schools districts and transit authorities, libraries and government offices, often use qualifying exams and or certification programs for managerial and supervisor positions. However, departments and companies have still been found to be dysfunctional, lack effort, lack education and have low expectations. There is a belief that internal experience and loyalty are far more important than ethic, diverse experience, formal education and training. Alderfer's theories suggest the rise and fall of OD programs in public sector systems are subjected to the agenda of the politically appointed executives (1977).

To understand organizational development, it is important to understand the OD practitioner's role and where they stand within any particular organization. In many organizations, OD is a function within the human resources department in the form of a specialist or as part of the duties assigned to the HR generalist. Those organizations understand the need to manage their human capital responsibly, prepare for constant change and value OD concepts. This can be accomplished in-house as well as through the use of outside consultants. Due to the value that OD experts have brought to organizations, HR managers and OD managers have earned the opportunities for a seat at the table with other C-level executive. They are now a part of the long term planning and policy making teams. Their value will continue to grow as organizations, private and public realize the most important commodity their companies possess is in their human capital. This task can be more difficult for public-sector agencies due to the political ramifications of placing human capital importance over political agendas.

The responsibility of the OD practitioner is to facilitate the process for individuals to obtain a clear understanding of what their capabilities are and where their talents and strength lie. This information allows them to pursue a career that fits their skills and the opportunity to make better choices over the short and long term. Whether filtered through human resources or through an external or internal OD consultant, OD professional's can have a large effect on the need for continues sustainability of an organization as well as continues change. All of which are grounded in human capital, which is the driving force the business.

Once OD is understood and their role is defined throughout the organization, the transformational process can begin. Even though there is a need for individual training to develop leaders for the future and interventions for organizations of all types to equip them to handle the diversity of the present and future, it appears there may be more intervention needed in the public sector. OD practitioners are trained to work with public and private organizations; however, public agencies such police departments, fire departments, school districts, city halls, etc. are not comfortable using methods that are often recommended by OD professionals. There is a sense that these methods and interventions are in conflict with the culture or what has worked for many years within their bureaucratic systems. For an example, giving a director or manager the authority to make decisions or changes without going through the proper channels can be catastrophic to his or her career even if their decision resulted in the best conclusion for the agency. The chain of command is of very importance due to the effects those decisions may have on the public; therefore, everyone must be aware and on board.

Management and leadership development programs are one of the most popular OD interventions aimed at developing talent and increasing employee retention. According to Cummings and Worley, these programs build an individual's skills, socialize leaders in corporate values, and prepare executives for strategic leadership roles (2009). Organizations have found these programs to bring positive short-term and long-term results. However, those positive results come with must less resistance in the private sector than the public sector. This may be due to resistance to change and inability to give up old traditions such as micromanaging.

True leaders have a vision and through their vision they create programs on how to accomplish goals. They have the natural aptitude to communicate with outsiders as well as insiders. These are also characteristics of successful and effective managers. Beer & Walton suggest, amongst their followers, they earn trust through positioning, being reliable, and sticking to their goals; and, they used their own optimism and self-confidence to inspire others (1987). Leaders are also counselors, motivators and innovative which are all qualities that are essential in the public sector. When working under budget and under staffed, it sometimes require creativity. When it is necessary to work through layers of bureaucracy, influential and persuasive talents can be useful. This has been found to be true, particularly in public-sector agencies at all levels

Traditional methods used by the many public sector agencies to hire new managers and to promote from within, maybe at odds with true OD practices. According to Cummings and Worley, OD practitioners need to completely understand the differences between public and private sectors and know OD applications may be challenging due to the complex political and bureaucratic environments (2009). This can also prevent or hinder the process of building a team of influential leaders, as well as persuading

promotions and the acquisition of quality human capital process which is a practice that is needed to staff managers with the capacity to lead in today's diverse workforce.

LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT INTERVENTIONS

Management and leadership programs, conflict resolution programs, team building and change management in a political environment are all areas that are in need of intervention by OD practitioners for public sector organizations. The affects from many of these interventions may give managers in the public the needed influence to push through programs to accomplish their goals. This type of influence and power gives them the tools they need to be effective and successful. Programs of this type can help provide collaboration for a more positive working attitude and interconnected atmosphere. The first area of attention should be career planning and the development of existing talent. Additional leadership development programs and executive coaching may be necessary as well. "Career planning and development help attract and hold such highly talented people and can increase the chances that their skills and knowledge will be used." (Cummings & Worley, p. 454)

Secondly, as the OD practitioner works to build efficiency and effectiveness within an organization, he or she understands team building starts with "intergroup relations". The better a group works with each other and relates to the whole organization, the more successful they can be. Total buy in to a leader's vision can assist the team building process. The third area of attention is leadership and managing the change process. Organizations have found it beneficial and cost effective to plan change. OD practitioners train and continue to advise manager on how to put into practice change processes throughout their organizations. According to Cummings and Worley, five of the major areas of activities used to managing change are motivating the change process itself, creating a vision, developing political support, managing transition and sustaining the momentum (2009). All these areas can assist managers in becoming more effective successful leaders.

In many agencies, private and public, executive training and leadership development has become a top priority (Lu, 2006; Buus, & Saslow, 2005; Higgs and Rowland, 2002). These organizations have recognized the need to develop talent that match the organization's mission, vision, values and culture (Buus, & Saslow, 2005; Silzer, 2004). Therefore, these development programs must correlate with the organizational vision with a clear purpose, goal, and hopes (Gandossy & Effron, 2004). Knowing training and development can be a costly venture for any organization, the necessity to design a program with training objective are tied to the organizations goals are important to the program's success (Silzer, 2004). To excel in any environment, organizations must develop future leaders to guide organizations through change and doubt that has infested public sector and government agencies today (Buus, & Saslow, 2005).

Finally, the private sector first level of responsibility is to the shareholders and its team of executive managers. In many cases, the key to satisfaction of shareholders lie in the profits and stability. Accountability is more direct and usually easily followed through an organizational chart. In the public sector, an important area of concentration is the ability to work with and understand internal and external politics. Public sectors companies' first responsibility is to the good of the general public, and they are governed by laws that maintain their commitment to the public. These laws are established by federal, state and local elected officials who require a little more attention to be given to power and politics. The chain of accountability is not so direct, and is different based on many variables such as federal, state, city or what services the agency offers. However, the real responsibility is to the stakeholder, the public.

CONCLUSION

The need for effective leadership in the public-sector and better management is still prevalent today as it was decades ago. To describe leaders and managers as two separate and different entities may be a thing of the past in the public-sector settings. After examining the complications faced by managers in the public sector, and how OD methods and intervention techniques can make a difference in a difficult political environment, the next step would be to test these conceptual findings with empirical data. These

tests should be set to determine how success, influence and effectiveness of a manager can be measured. It may be more beneficial to analyze data through a mixed-methodology quantitative/qualitative collection model. More conclusive information can be determined by collecting data that offers the ability to quantify the traits, skills and personality characteristics of various management, and leadership competencies and values. This information will help researchers go beneath the surface to help organizations design programs to determine what it takes to acquire, develop, and retain good managers.

Another area for future research would be to collect data from both public and private sector organizations to determine if there is truly any difference in ability of managers in areas and which competencies, traits, values and skills of cross both entities. Finally, it may be beneficial to take a deeper look into the public sector and governmental agencies and compare small and large agencies to determine if there are any differences in the needs of their leaders and managers.

REFERENCES

Alderfer, C. (1977). "Organization Development," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 28, 197-223.

Aviles, C.B. (2001). A Review of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory: A potential training toll for human services organizations. Retrieved from ERIC Database.

Baldwin, J.N. (1987). Public versus private: Not that different, not that consequential. Public Personnel Management, 16.

Boyatzis, R. (1982). The competent manage: A model for effective performance. New York: Wiley.

Bass, B.M. & Steidlmeirer, P. (1998). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beer, M., Walton, A. (1987), "Organizational change and development", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 38, 339-67.

Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (2003). Learning to lead. New York: Basic Books.

Burke, W. W. (2002). Organization change – Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Burke, R. L., & Cooper, C. L. (2004). Leading in turbulent times: Managing in the new world of work. In R. J. Burke, C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Leading in turbulent times: Issues and challenges (p. 1-24). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper& Row.

Buus, I., & Saslow, S. (2005). The evolution of leadership development. *Strategic Human Resources Review*, 4(2), 28-31.

Clark, T. (2003). Celebration of public service. Public manager, 31(4), 3.

Coggburn, J., & Schneider, S. (2003). The quality of management and government performance: Am empirical analysis of the American states. *Public Administration Review*, 63, 2, 206-213.

Cummings, T. G. (1999). The leader's change handbook: An essential guide to setting direction and taking action. In J. A. Conger, G. M. Spreitzer, & E. E. Lawler III (Eds.), The role and limits of change leadership (p. 301-3200. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2009). Organizational Development & Change, 9th Ed. Canada: South-Western.

Dorsey-Oresro, V. (2009). Management is management or is it? A study of private- and public-sector managers in massachusetts using the most valuable performers (MVP) survey. Capella University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses., n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305161562?accountid=40667

DuBrin, Andrew J. (1997). Personal magnetism: discover your own charisma and learn to charm, inspire, and influence others., New York : AMACOM.

Francis, D., Bessant, J., & Hobday, M. (2003). Managing radical organizational transformation. *Management Decision*, 41(1), 18-31.

Gandossy, R., & Effron, M. (2004). Leading the way. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gill, R. (2003). Change management – or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 307-318.

Hardy, K. (2004). Self-leadership as a tool in management succession planning. *Public Manager*, 33(3), 41-45.

Head, T., Sorensen, P., and Yaeger, T. (2007). Organization Behavior and Change: Managing Human Resources for Organizational Effectiveness, 14th Edition. Champaign, Stipes Publishing.

Higgs, M. & Rowland, D. (2002). Does it need emotional intelligence to lead change? *Journal of General Management*, 27(3), 62-75.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.

Howell, J. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.

Ibgraham, A. B., Soufani, K., Poutziouris, P., & Lam, J. (2004). Qualities of an effective successor: the role of education and training. *Education & Training*. 46(8/9). 474.

Jackson, S., Farndale, E., & Kakadse, A. (2003). Executive development: Meeting the needs of top teams and boards. *The Journal of Management Development*. 22(3), 185-698.

Kaplan, R.S. (2001). Strategic performance measurement and management in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 11(3), 354.

Kotter, J.P. (1998). The leadership factor. New York: The Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11), 85-96.

Kouzes, James M., Posner, Barry Z. (2003). The leadership challenge., San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. L. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657.

Lu, H. (2006). The comparative study of leadership quality and development in nonprofits. Walden University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses., Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/304934974?accountid=40667.

Miles, R. H. (1999). The leader's change handbook: An essential guide to setting direction and taking action. In J. A. Conger, G. M. Spreitzer, & E. E. Lawler III (Eds.), Leading corporate transformation: Are you up to the task? (p. 221-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, D. (2002). Successful change leaders: What makes them? What do they do that is different? Journal of Change Management, 2(4), 345-368.

Nadler, D. A., & Heilpen, J. D. (1998). Navigating change. In D. C. Hambrick, D. A. Nadler, & M. L. Tushman (Eds.), The CEO in the context of discontinuous change (p. 3-27). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Parry, K. W., & Sinha, P. N. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International*, 8(2), 165-183.

Patnaik, D.G. (2008). Leadership behaviors of California public sector managers. (Pepperdine University), ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Retrieved from. http://search.proquest.com/docview/193722899?accountid=40677.

Pernick, R. (2001). Creating a leadership development programs: Nine essential tasks. Public *Personnel Management*, 30(4), 429-442.

Ready, D. A., & Conger, J. A. (2003). Why leadership-development efforts fail. MIT Sloan Management Review, 44(3), 83-88.

Riggio, R. E., Bass, B. M., & Orr, S. S. (2004). Transformational leadership in nonprofit organizations. In R. E. Riggio., & S. S. Orr (Eds.), Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations (pp. 49-62). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Silzer, R. (2004). The 21st Century executive: Innovative practices for building leadership at the top. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stringer, R. (2002). Leadership and organizational climate. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tucker, B. A., & Russell, R. F. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. 10(4), 1003-111.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Yaeger, T., Sorensen, P. (2008). "The heritage, the future, and the role of values in the field of organization development." in Special Issue of the Journal "Revue Sciences de Gestion [RSDG] - Management Sciences - Ciencas de Gestión," (Journal's 30th Anniversary issue, April 2008).

Yessian, M. (1995). Learning from experience. Public Welfare, 3(53), 34-42.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory research, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 15(2), 251-289.

Yukl, G. (2004). Leading in turbulent times: Managing in the new world of work. In R. J. Burke, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Tridimensional leadership theory: A roadmap for flexible, adaptive leaders (p. 72-89). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied*.