Dynamic
Relationships
Management
Journal

EXPLAINING LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC MANAGERS: THE PUBLIC–PRIVATE DISTINCTION EXPLANATION VERSUS THE GENDER EXPLANATION

Jon Aarum Andersen

Linneaus University, Sweden
jon.andersen@lnu.se

—————— *Abstract* ——————

This paper assessed the theoretical explanations for similarities and differences in managers' leadership behaviors as well as their empirical support based on data from 222 corporate managers in eight companies and 385 public managers in three public agencies in Sweden. Two explanations for similarities and differences in male and female public managers' leadership behaviors have been suggested in previous studies. The public–private distinction says that public and private organizations are distinctly different, and thus explains differences between public and private managers leadership behaviors. Gender theory argues that the ratios of male to female managers explain of differences in leadership behaviors. However, this explanation did not explain similarities in leadership behaviors in the three Swedish public organisations investigated. The leadership behaviors of public managers were the same even though there was a female majority in management in one organization and a male majority in the other two. It is suggested that the distinct characteristics of public organizations explain the similarities in leadership behaviors of both male and female public managers. The public-distinction explanation appears to outweigh the gender-based explanation.

Keywords: Private Management, Public Management, Gender, Leadership Behaviors

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership theories can be grouped into three main categories: (1) leadership as personality, (2) leadership as behavior and action, and (3) leadership as symbol. Three types of managerial behavior have dominated leadership scholarship: (1) leadership styles (e.g., Blake and McCanse 1991), (2) motivation profiles (e.g., McClelland 1990), and (3) decision-making styles, (e.g., Keegan, 1984). The *universal* theorists claim that there is one best way to lead, whereas the *contingency* theorists claim that leadership effectiveness is dependent on the situation (Blake and McCanse 1991).

To find similarities and differences between managers in terms of behaviors, three types were selected and were tested empirically with a large number of managers in Sweden. Leadership styles, motivation profiles and decision-making styles were measured using instruments frequently applied in leadership research (Table 1).

The concept of *prime beneficiary* (Blau and Scott 1962) captures the basic distinction between these organizations. Some organizations are established in which the owners are the prime beneficiary, namely business enterprises. In public organizations (service organizations) such as hospitals, educational institutions, and social-welfare agencies, the citizens are the primary beneficiaries. In private schools, the *goal* is profitability and the *means* are education. The goal of public schools is to increase the level of *knowledge* in society, whereas the means are *education*. The notions of prime beneficiaries inspired what is known as *the public–private distinction* research tradition (e.g., Rainey, Backoff, and Levine, 1976).

Table 1: Causes, study object (leadership behaviors), and measurements applied

Causes	Study objects (leadership behaviors)	Measurements
Attitudes	*Leadership styles*: Separated, dedicated, related, integrated	Management Style Diagnosis Test (Reddin, 1987)
Motivation (needs)	*Motivation profiles*: Achievement, affiliation, power motivation	Andersen Motivation Profile Indicator (Andersen, 2018).
Personality	*Decision-making styles*: Sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling	Keegan Type Indicator, form B (Keegan, 1982).

The main goal of a specific business enterprise is a description of a permanent, future state giving a specific degree of profitability and risk desired by the owners based on their investment time horizon. Public organizations also are based on goals, determined by the citizens through a democratic process. Shareholders, members of associations, and citizens are all "owners" or "principals" of organizations because they exclusively can decide on and change the main goals of their organizations. In other words, the goals of an organization are the goals of the prime beneficiaries.

The main task of managers, whether they are in charge of private or public organizations, is to contribute to organizational goal attainment, e.g., organizational effectiveness. To do so, managers need to act. Only by acting and behaving can managers influence others, whether subordinates, clients, customers, financiers, citizens, patients, or students. McClelland and Burnham (1976, p. 105) wrote "After all, management is an influence game." Goal attainment (effectiveness) is a basic issue for both private and public managers, and thus for management scholars. Thus, studies of behaviors and behavioral patterns of managers are called for, and have attached the attention of numerous scholars for years. Many behavioral concepts have been developed, defined, measured, and tested empirically (e.g., Yukl et al., 2019)

Comparing managers in three public organizations and one private organization in Sweden, Andersen (2010a) found significant differences in leadership behavioral patterns between private and public managers. However, no significant differences in leadership behaviors were discovered among the public managers.

To solve the problem of behavioral differences between managers, a two-step approach has been applied. The first step is to present theoretical arguments and empirical studies regarding differences in leadership behaviors between male and female managers in public organizations according to the scholarship on the public–private distinction thesis. The second step addresses empirical support for the gender explanation of behavioral differences. The study of influences of national culture and socialization (society) on managers' behavior is a specific research tradition which was and is still to a large extent lacking the perspective of gender. It is based mainly on data from corporate managers. However, several studies across nations have shown significant national differences between managers' leadership behaviors (Hofstede, 1980a, 1980b; Smith, Peterson, and Schwartz, 2002; Smith and Peterson, 2005; House et al. 2014). All in all, these studies have shown that national cultures and cultural values explain differences in managers' behavioral patterns across nations. However, these international comparisons have no direct relevance for studies of gender in public organizations in a specific country.

Leadership behavior is a central theme in the literature on management, and still is regarded as a factor in explaining organizational effectiveness. McClelland and Burnham (1976) pithily stated that "management is an influence game." To influence other people, managers have to act. This is a basic point of departure, because leadership-behavior theories focus on behavior as such, and especially on the organizational consequences of leadership behaviors, and less on the reasons for the behaviors. Personality traits may explain behavior, but personality is an inborn and stable characteristic. In contrast, factors such as attitudes, experiences, values,

and needs (motivation) also explain leadership behaviors. Formal leaders (managers) can influence only others through their actions.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The Private–Public Distinction Explanation

Two competing perspectives are prominent in the study of public and private organizations. On the one hand, researchers advocating the generic perspective claim that public and private organizations face similar constraints and challenges. On the other hand, others argue that public and private organizations are distinct in important respects. The private–public distinction captures what some scholars address theoretically as "the nature of the organization."

Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) stated that there are indications of a number of important differences between private and public organizations that cannot be ignored in management research. Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) also claimed that there are significant differences in purposes, objectives, and planning; in selection, management, and motivation; and in controlling and measuring results between these groups of managers.

Bower (1977) claimed that public management is different not just in degree, but also in quality from corporate management. These differences have important implications for public managers and how they view their jobs. Rainey (1979) claimed that his study might be taken as support for the generalization that, compared with most business organizations, governmental organizations in the United States operate under greater procedural constraints on the administration of extrinsic incentives. Wittmer (1991) stated that previous research indicated that public managers and employees were different from their private-sector counterparts in terms of work-related values, reward preferences, needs, and personality types. Rainey, Pandey, and Bozeman (1995) found a striking difference between public and private managers in terms of personnel rules and constraints. Public agencies have sharply higher levels of formalization of certain functions, such as personnel and purchasing.

Cook (1998) argued that it is the character of public administration as a political institution that should be at the conceptual centre of public management. What makes public administration and public management *public,* and thus distinctive, is that politics of the most fundamental sort are at the heart of the enterprise. Rainey and Bozeman (2000) referred to the almost universal agreement among scholars that public organizations are marked by more complexity and ambiguity. If the conclusion that there are profound differences between public and private organizations is sound, then these differences may explain differences in leadership behaviors.

Researchers have found that the demands placed on public and private organizations vary to the extent that different practices are recommended for each sector (e.g., Nutt 2006). Public management scholarship suggests that public organizations are fundamentally different from private organizations as a consequence of the functions they provide to society. If public and private organizations are different in significant ways, these differences may explain the differences between male and female managers' leadership behaviors. Interestingly, Andersen (2010b) found when investigating 343 managers' behaviors in two public organizations and one private organization that public managers were more change-oriented than managers in business organizations.

2.2 The Gender-in-Management Explanation

2.2.1 Introduction

Some management studies are based on gender theory and address the behavioral patterns of male and female managers. A number of scholars have stressed the differences between women and men in formal leadership positions, claiming that female managers are inherently different from male managers. Brenner, Tomkiewics, and Schein (1989) asserted that women possess certain characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments that differ from those of male managers. Fondas (1997, p. 275) argued that "gender is part of the very conceptualization of management." Trinidad and Normore (2005, p. 574) claimed that "women leadership styles are

presented as alternative to traditional leadership models." The gender theory consists of both the argument that gender does determine leadership behaviors and the counterargument that gender does *not* (Pounder and Coleman, 2002).

Wilson (1999, p. 12) noted that "gender is something more than an individual characteristic or a certain set of social roles. The gender differences we can observe between men and women are not basic or essential for either of the sexes." The issue at hand is gender differences in public organizations in relation to leadership behaviors.

When studying the role of gender in management in one specific nation, it is important to assess first whether there are differences in behavior between public and private managers. Once this question has been answered, the study of gender in public managers can be addressed.

Pounder and Coleman (2002, p. 129) listed five probable influences on gender differences in management: (1) national culture, (2) socialization (society), (3) socialization (workplace), (4) nature of organization, and (5) organizational demographics, including factors such as "tenure in the organization and in the job, experience of senior management responsibilities, and the composition of the managerial peer group."

2.2.2 Organizational Demographics

Pounder and Coleman's (2002) concept of "organizational demographics" included a gender-based explanation. They suggested that the organizational demographics have a probable influence on leadership behavior. This concept may include the distribution of males and females in the organization because both the proportion (ratio) of male to female managers and the male-to-female ratio of all employees are important. Korac-Kakadadse et al. (1998) and Hanbury, Sapat, and Washington (2004) argued that organizational demographics, such as tenure in the organization and experience of senior-management responsibilities, largely determines leadership behavior. Burke, Mc-Keen, and McKenna (1993) also included tenure in the organization and tenure in present job in their study of organizational demographics.

The foundation of research on organizational demography is based on theories that emphasize the importance of numbers and proportions of managers and subordinates in order to understand the interaction processes in organizations. These positions most often are defined by demographic attributes such as age, tenure, occupation, gender, and ethnicity.

Korac-Kakadadse et al. (1998) noted that some scholars have suggested that similarities between male and female managers far outweigh their differences because managers are a self-selected population. Those who choose managerial careers share a great deal in common. Within an organization individuals prefer to interact with those who belong to their own identity group rather than with those of other groups.

Group demography highlights similarity and dissimilarity among individuals, such as the level and extent of within-group communication, as well as outcomes of group dynamics, including such phenomena as the level of consensus within a group, innovation, and turnover of personnel within the organization. The degree of an individual's similarity or dissimilarity to others—in terms of the male-to-female ratio—in a work group may influence processes such as employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and level of communication.

O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991, p. 492) wrote that "new entrants are then further socialised and assimilated, and those who don't fit leave." One of the characteristics of strong cultures is the intensity on the part of the organization's members displaying approval or disapproval toward those who act in certain ways.

On the basis of the aforementioned references, it is reasonable to assume that the male-to-female ratio of managers and the gender ratio of all employees within an organization strongly captures the influences of organizational culture. It also may be an indication of organizational culture itself, especially in cases in which the ratios are distinctive and the ratios have been distinctive over a long period. Similarity in leadership behaviors of men and women thus are likely to outweigh gender-based differences.

2.2.3 Socialization (Workplace)

Theories on socialization at the workplace address the organizational structure and the prevalence of professions, specialist tasks, work experience, and period of employment in the same department or work group. Organizations and groups, according to Gibb (1969, p. 271), are characterized by "a set norms and values, which integrate rather than differentiate; that is, they are shared by all (or many) of the members of the system." Kanter (1977) showed that the proportion of men and women in corporations affected group processes and individual outcomes.

Katz and Kahn (1978, p. 385) used the terms *norms* and *values* to refer to common beliefs of an evaluative type. Group norms make explicit the forms of behavior appropriate for those who work in organizational departments or groups. Gardner (1987, p. 5) noted that "the group create norms that tend to control the behavior of its members, and these norms constitute the social order." Group norms are shared norms, and thus social norms. Group norms are most likely to reflect the composition of males and females in the groups. Additionally, subordinates and managers generally are prepared to comply with the group norms of their profession or in formal positions. Group norms and group cohesiveness impact the behavior of individuals at work (Katz & Kahn, 1978). The behaviors of male and female subordinates and those of managers thus are influenced by the process of socialization taking place in the organization. The work norms and values of the majority of managers and the majority of subordinates are what the minorities need to adjust to.

2.2.4 Person–Organization Fit

Theories of person–organization fit also address the antecedents and consequences of compatibility between people and the organizations in which they work. This approach often includes models of person–vocation fit and person–group fit (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Guyot (1962) assumed that there is a relationship between an individual and his or her occupational role. The person–vocation fit theories may predict vocational choice (Kristof, 1996).

However, other studies focused on the fit between specific characteristics of an organization and the people in it. The two major theories of vocational choice referred to by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) both postulated that an individual will select a career or occupation that is similar to or that fits that person's self-concept. Their study offers support for the validity of assessment of person–organization fit on the basis of value congruence. Hanbury, Sapat, and Washington (2004) found that leadership behaviors and personality were correlated strongly with years of service for city managers in the United States.

The choice of profession and career, according to McClelland (1990), is related to the power motive. Some professions and vocations give people more opportunity to exercise power and exert influence. According to McClelland (1971), the power motive may explain why some individuals are attracted to managerial positions. The differences found in work-related values may result from the personal characteristics of those selecting public service or from socialisation and organizational culture (Wittmer, 1991). Individuals have different values, orientations, and goals, and make organizational choices accordingly. Knowledge about the differences in work-related values can be useful, for example, in recruiting, selecting employees, and promoting managers (Wittmer, 1991).

3. METHODOLOGY

Data on managers' leadership behaviors from 222 corporate managers in eight companies and 385 public managers in three public agencies in Sweden were collected using three instruments. Leadership style refers to the concept of leadership styles proposed by Reddin (1970), which consist of task-orientation and relationship-orientation with two main styles each, giving four overall leadership styles: separated style, related style, dedicated style and integrated style. These styles were measured by a forced-choice instrument (MSDT) consisting of 56 statement (Reddin, 1982).

McClelland applied the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) in all his empirical studies on motivation profiles. This instrument was described by McClel-

land and Steele (1972). The respondents to be tested must be present in the same room, which makes data collection time-consuming and costly. For this reason, an instrument (AMPI) was developed and applied by Andersen (1994). This measurement (1) measures achievement, affiliation, and power motivation; (2) measures the relative strengths of these factors; (3) rests explicitly on the definitions of McClelland (1990); and (4) measures managers' work motivation. The questionnaire has been described and tested for reliability and validity with responses from 580 managers (Andersen, 2018).

The Keegan Type Indicator Form B was applied, which measures decision-making styles in terms of sensation, intuition, thinking, and feeling using 44 statements/questions (Keegan, 1980, 1982). Sixteen items refer to the functions sensing and intuition, and 16 items refer to the functions thinking and feeling. Of the 32 items measuring the functions, 24 are bipolar statements, and eight items are statements to be ranked on a scale from 1 to 4.

4. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

4.1 Public Organizations

In leadership scholarship, the concepts of leadership style, motivation profile, and decision-making style are well established and are used widely in contemporary empirical research (e.g., Bass, 2008; Liebowitz, 2020). The explanations of similarities and differences in leadership behaviors between men and women in management can be divided into two groups. One group focuses on factors based on individuals and groups, whereas the other concentrates on organizational differences (private versus public organizations). The individual arguments are based on the fact that behavior is an individual characteristic.

The group and organizational arguments are found in gender theory, in the private–public distinction theory, the organizational demographics including the emphasis on male-to-female ratio, and theories of person–organization fit. The gender theory consists of both argument that gender does determine leadership behavior and the counterargument that gender does *not* (Pounder and Coleman, 2002). This research field includes studies of similarities and differences in managers' behaviors which are independent of gender.

Andersen and Hansson (2011) found no significant differences between male and female public managers in leadership behaviors (leadership styles, decision-making styles, and motivation profiles) based on responses from 385 managers (148 female and 237 male managers) in three public organizations. Martin (2015) found no differences between male and female public managers, but women were more likely to use idealized attributes and inspirational motivation. No differences were found in leadership styles by type of public institution. A strong correlation was found between the number of years of administrative experience.

4.2 Male-to-Female Ratios of Managers and of Subordinates

The gender distributions of all employees, of all subordinates, and of all managers in organizations also may offer an explanation. Kanter (1977) argued that the leadership style of the few women in leadership positions (at that time) should be studied as a function of membership in a male-dominated group in which men shape work behavior. If the masculine model represents the universal and dominant model of leadership, then women would understand that they would have to conform to it in order to rise through the ranks. Women repeatedly use the same strategies for gaining influence that have proven successful for men (Trinidad and Normore, 2005).

Male professionals are more likely to be similar to senior male managers than are female professionals when gender distribution is considered. The managerial profession involves a number of behaviors that appear to override the impact of gender (Fierman, 1990; Moss and Jensrud, 1995).

The male-to-female ratios of all employees and the male-to-female ratios of managers in organizations may explain gender differences in leadership behavior. This is an important observation because private organizations with mostly female managers are hard to find. No studies of gender differences are found which include such organizations. To explore the effects of organizational demographics, Table 2 lists data on three of the four possible categories of male-to-female ratios in public and private organizations.

Table 2: Public and private organizations: male/female ratio of all employees and all managers

Mostly men employed, with mostly male managers *Private sector:* Private corporations: 222 male managers in 8 companies (Andersen, 2010a).	Mostly women employed, with mostly female managers *Public sector:* Public schools: 171 school headmaster and deputy headmasters in 214 schools (Hansson & Andersen, 2007).
Mostly men employed, with mostly female managers *No such organization known*	Mostly women employed, with mostly male mangers *Public sector:* (1) Public insurance agencies: 61 managers in 61 regional agencies. (Andersen & Månsson, 2004). (2) State church: 153 vicars in 153 parishes (Andersen & Hansson, 2008).

There are four combinations of male-to-female ratios of all employees and of managers in an organization: (1) mostly men are employed, and mostly men are managers; (2) mostly women are employed, and mostly women are managers; (3) mostly women are employed, and mostly men are managers; and (4) mostly men are employed, and mostly women are managers. The fourth combination is hard to find, if it exists at all.

With respect to the effects of differences in gender distribution of all employees and gender distribution of managers in the organization, significant differences in leadership behaviors did not arise in the comparison of organizations in which "women lead women-intensive organizations"—e.g., schools—and few differences were found when "men lead more women than men"—e.g., social-insurance offices and the state church (Andersen & Hansson, 2011). These findings contradict what some researchers have suggested (e.g., Kantar, 1977; Trinidad & Normore, 2005). Marvel (2015) investigated the effects on work effort (not leadership behavior) when school principals and teachers were of the same gender and when they were not.

4.3 Experience of Management Responsibilities and Tenure in the Organization and Job

Korac-Kakadadse, Korac-Kakadadse, and Mayers (1998) and Hanbury, Sapat, and Washington (2004) argued that leadership behavior is determined largely by organizational demographics, such as tenure in the organization and experience of senior-management responsibilities. However, it is hard to find studies which contain this kind of data. The study by Hansson and Andersen (2008) is an exception with regard to data on years as manager in Swedish schools and vicars in the church. Among the vicars who responded, 50% had been in a managerial position for more than 10 years and 35% had been in a managerial position for more than 15 years. Among school principals, 35% had been in their present position for more than 10 years and 15% had been in their present position for more than 15 years.

The tenure in the organization and in the job of all employees and the experience of management responsibilities are variables that may contribute to the explanation of gender similarities and differences in public organizations. Data on managers' experience and subordinates' tenure in the job and organization are hard to find in management studies.

4.4 Gender Explanation Tested

Hansson and Andersen (2007) studied leadership behaviors of managers in three public organizations and identified three different types of organizations: (1) public schools, in which more females than males were headmasters; (2) social-insurance agencies, in which more males than females were managers; and (3) the Church of Sweden, in which more males were vicars than females.

Hansson and Andersen (2007) analyzed responses from 171 principals and deputy principals in primary and secondary schools in Sweden. Of the principals, 58% were women and 42% were men. The study by Andersen and Månsson (2004) contained data from 61 senior officials, constituting 31% of all officials in charge of local social-insurance offices in Sweden. Of the managers investigated, 56% were men and 44% were women.

Hansson and Andersen (2001) investigated leadership behaviors based on responses from vicars (rectors) employed by the Church of Sweden. At the time of data collection, Sweden had a state church which was a public organization. The vicars were civil servants and the local managers of parishes. At the time of data collection, there were 1,044 vicars, 240 of whom, randomly determined, received the questionnaires. Of the 153 vicars who responded, 76% were males and 24% were females.

As a consequence of the findings of differences in managers' leadership styles due to the private–public distinction, Andersen and Hansson (2011) focused exclusively on women and men—as indicated by the respondents' references to their gender—in managerial positions in public organizations. Data from 385 managers (223 males and 162 females) were analyzed. Of the 30 pair-wise comparisons of means for the samples of managers in three different public organizations, only five comparisons (17%) yielded significant differences in leadership behavior between women and men as managers ($p < 0.05$). Only one case was significant at a level of 1%. Andersen and Hansson (2011) concluded—as have other studies—that no or only small and inconsistent differences existed between male and female managers in terms of behavior.

Andersen and Hansson (2011) suggested that organizational differences and characteristics modify the phenomenon of leadership itself, which may explain the similarities of behavior regardless of gender. In this respect, a germane development is the rising trend that emphasizes the need to help women and men move away from gender stereotypes (Ferrario, 1991). The knowledge that there are no differences in leadership behaviors between female and male managers in the public sector may contribute to this movement.

Pounder and Coleman (2002) observed that education is dominated numerically by women, but managers in education are predominantly male, although there is some evidence of a growing willingness of women to take up leadership positions in education. Moss and Jensrud (1995) suggested that men and women in educational organizations have common conceptions of what headmasters should try to accomplish and of their ideal qualities. Now,

almost 20 years later, the situation has changed, at least in Sweden. The male-to-female ratio of headmasters in Swedish public schools who took part in the study by Andersen (2010a) was 65% female headmasters and 35% male headmasters in 2008.

In the school year 2018/19 the Swedish national figures for all headmasters and deputy headmasters in senior secondary schools were 57% female headmasters and 43% male headmasters. The gender ratio of teachers was 52% women and 48% men in senior secondary schools, whereas the ratio of teachers in primary schools the same year was 70% females and 30% males (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2018).

When the majority of headmasters are women, it does not seem appropriate to argue that women have adapted to a male culture or leadership behaviors. Moreover, it is incorrect to claim that male headmasters have adopted a female leadership behavior in Swedish schools, because no differences in behaviors were found. Analysis of the sample of principals yielded no significant differences regarding the leadership variables. The findings by Franzén (2006) on Swedish principals were in line with the results reported by Andersen and Hansson (2011). We are justified in asserting that all teachers in public schools (including principals, who are former teachers) have been influenced by the same organizational demographics for several years. This may explain the similar pattern of leadership behavior among the school principals.

In the social-insurance agencies, 56% of managers were male and 44% were female, according to data from 2002 (Andersen and Månsson, 2004). In 2017, the situation was reversed in the social-insurance agencies. That year, only 31% of the managers were male, and the majority (69%) were female. The gender ratio for all employees was 76% females and 24% males (Swedish Social Service Agency, 2018).

Of the Church of Sweden vicars who responded, 76% were male and 24% female vicars (Hansson and Andersen, 2001). On April 1, 2018, the proportion of male vicars had decreased to 63% and the proportion of females had increased to 37% (Matrikel, 2018). An update on the gender ratios in these three public organizations challenges the gender-based ex-

planation. The strong increase in the proportion of female managers in Sweden gives no support to the presence of gender discrimination suggested by Rowley et al. (2010) in the United States.

Thus we argue that specific studies need both to specify the male-to-female ratio of managers and of subordinates, and to specify whether the study relates to (1) an organization in which mostly men are employed with mostly male managers, (2) one in which mostly women are employed with mostly female managers, or (3) one in which mostly women are employed with mostly male managers. The quality of gender research also would be improved if data on the average tenure of managers and subordinates were collected and presented as a mediating factor for gender differences or similarities.

On January 1, 2000, the Church of Sweden was disestablished and ceased to be a public organization, becoming what Blau and Scott (1962) called a mutual-benefit association. The Church of Sweden is now an organization similar to a public organization because all citizens, not only church members, are beneficiaries according to the Church Order (the ecclesiastical constitution).

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The Swedish studies reported here showed significant differences between public and private managers with respect to leadership behaviors. Public managers appeared to have virtually the same behavioral patterns. These findings are explained in light of two prominent theoretical traditions—the public–private distinction, and gender theory—linked to the organizational demographic perspective. The argument here is that the proportion of males and females in an organization cannot explain the similarities in leadership behavior found in the Swedish studies.

Subsequent research on gender in public organization may benefit from the inclusion of the objective variable of tenure, that is, the average number of years in managerial or subordinate positions. This may increase the explanatory power of differences and similarities because it is based firmly on the organizational demographic tradition. In addition to the public–private distinction and the argument of person–organization fit, the criteria used when selecting applicants or promoting employees to managerial positions also may explain the similarities found. The public managers investigated in three different types of organizations appeared to have almost the same leadership behaviors, independent of the gender majority in management (Andersen, 2010).

Burke, McKeen, and McKenna (1993) noted that there is some support for cross-gender effects. Andersen and Hansson (2011) suggested that organizational differences and characteristics modify the phenomenon of leadership itself, which could explain the similarities of behavior regardless of gender. Differences in gender proportion of all employees and gender proportion of managers did not explain leadership behavior in the Swedish public organizations investigated. The knowledge that there are few or no differences in leadership behaviors between male and female managers in public organizations may contribute to this movement *away* from gender stereotypes. Bowling et al. (2006) noted more than 10 years ago the increasing trends of female access to and presence in governmental managerial positions in the United States. They found that women faced fewer blockages in attaining top positions owing to solid educational, career, and organizational foundations.

Burke et al. (1993) found that male professionals were more likely to be similar to senior male managers than were female professionals. Connell (2006) observed that gender divisions (i.e., the ratio of male to female managers) persisted in several forms, and that the rising number of women in public management resulted in local turbulence in gender relations. However, there are no studies from Sweden of these issues.

Regardless of whether there are more women or more men in public management, the consequences of leadership behaviors of public managers remain the same. The behavior of the managerial majority— whether they are male or female—becomes the leadership behavior of "all" managers. It is not female managers who adopt male managers' behavioral pattern or the converse. It is not male or female dominance in public organizations which induce managers to behave in specific ways. The behavioral patterns of the gender that is in the majority do not explain the leadership behaviors of public managers.

Kotter (1982) found that corporate managers typically spent most of their careers in one industry. It is extremely unusual to find a person who has held senior managerial positions in both the private and public sector. Theories of person–organization fit, which address the antecedents and consequences of compatibility between people and the organiza-tions in which they work, may contribute to the ex-planation of similarities in public managers' leader-ship behaviors. The leadership behaviors of public managers were the same, independent of a male or female majority of managers in the organizations in which they worked. The public-distinction explana-tion appears to outweigh the gender explanation.

EXTENDED SUMMARY/IZVLEČEK

Članek preučuje teoretična pojasnila o podobnostih in razlikah v načinu vodenja menedžerjev. Pojasnila temeljijo na podatkov pridobljenih s strani 222 menedžerjev, zaposlenih v osmih korpora-tivnih podjetjih, in 385 javnih menedžerjev, zaposlenih v treh javnih agencijah na Švedskem. V pre-jšnjih študijah sta bili predstavljeni dve teoriji podobnosti in razlik v vodenju: teorija javnega-zasebnega razlikovanja pojasnjuje, da razlike med načinom vodenja menedžerjev javnih in zasebnih organizacij izvirajo iz razlik med organizacijami. Teorija spola trdi, da razlike v načinu vodenja organizacij izvirajo v številu žensk in moških zastopnikov v vodstvu podjetja. Pomankljivost slednje teorije je, da ne pojasni podobnosti v načinu vodenja v eni iz med raziskav, v katero so bile vljučene tri švedske javne organizacije. Način vodenja v omenjenih javnih organizacij je bil enak, čeprav je bilo vodstvo v eni organizaciji sestavljeno večinoma iz ženskih predstavnic, vodstvo drugih dveh organizacij pa večinoma iz moških predstavnikov. Na podlagi teh rezultatov avtorji zaključujejo, da teorija javnega-zasebnega razlikovanja prevlada nad teorijo spola.

REFERENCES

Andersen, J. A. (2010a). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behaviour. *Public Administration Review,* 70(1), 131-41.

Andersen, J. A. (2010b). Assessing public managers' change-oriented behaviour: Are private managers caught in the doldrums? *International Journal of Public Administration,* 33(6), 335-345.

Andersen, J. A. & Månsson, J. (2004). *Försäkringskassor-nas effektivitet.* (Effectiveness of Social Insurance Of-fices) (Swedish). Vaxjo: Vaxjo University.

Andersen, J. A. & Hansson. P. H. (2011). At the end of the road? On differences between women and men in leadership behaviour. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal,* 32(5), 428-41.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership. The-ory, research & managerial applications.* Free Press, New York, NY.

Blau, P. M. & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal Organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler.

Bower, J. L. (1977). Effective public management. *Harvard Business Review*. March April, p. 131-140.

Bowling, C. J., Kelleher, C. A., Jones, J. & Wright, D. S. (2006). Cracked ceilings, firmer floor, and weakening walls: Trends and patterns in gender presentation among executives leading American State Agencies, 1970-2000. *Public Administration Review,* 66(6), 823-836.

Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewics, J. & Schein, V. E. (1989). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requi-site management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal,* 32(3), 662-69.

Burke, R. J., McKeen, C. A. & McKenna, C. (1993). Corre-lates of mentoring in organizations. The mentor's per-spective. *Psychological Reports,* 72(3), 883-96.

Connell, R. (2006). Glass ceilings or gender institutions? Mapping the gender regimes of public sector work-sites. *Public Administration Review,* 66(6), 837-49.

Cook, B. J. (1998). Politics, political leadership, and public management. *Public Administration Review,* 58(3), 225-230.

Ferrario, M. (1991). Sex differences in leadership style: Myth or reality? *Women in Management Review & Abstracts,* 6(3), 16-21.

Fierman, J. (1990). Do women manage differently? *Fortune*, 17 December, pp. 115-118.

Fleishman, E. A. & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behaviour related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology,* (15), 43-56.

Franzén, K. (2006). "Is i magen och ett varmt hjärta": konstruktionen av skolledarskap i ett könsperspektiv ["Keeping a cool head and a warm heart": The construction of school leadership from a gender perspective]. Umeå, Pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå University.

Fondas, N. (1997). Feminization unveiled: management qualities in contemporary writings. *Academy of Management Review,* 22(1), 257-82.

Gardner, J. W. (1987). Leaders and followers. *Liberal Education,* 73(2), 4-6.

Gibb, C.A. (1969). Leadership. In Lindsey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 4*. (pp. 205-282). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Guyot, J. F. (1962). Government bureaucrats are different. *Public Administration Review,* 22 (4), 195-202.

Hanbury, G. L., Sapat, A. & Washington, C. W. (2004). Know yourself and take charge of your own destiny: The "fit model" of leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 64(5),566 576.

Hansson, P. H. & Andersen, J. A. (2001). The Swedish Vicar and Change. A problematic mismatch. *Journal of Empirical Theology,* 12(1), 43-56.

Hansson, P. H. & Andersen, J. A. (2007). The Swedish Principal – Leadership style, decision making style and motivation profile. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning,* 14(1), 47-60.

Hansson, P. H. & Andersen, J. A. (2008). Vicars as managers revisited. A comparative study. *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society,* 21(1), 91-111.

Hofstede, G. (1980a). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.

Hofstede, G. (1980b). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics,* 9(1), 42-63.

House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J. & Sully de Lugue, M. (2014). *Strategic leadership across the culture: The Globe study of CEO leadership behaviour and effectiveness in 24 countries*. Sage Publishing, New York.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Woman of the Corporation,* Basic Books, New York, NY.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social Psychology of Organizations*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Keegan, W. J. (1980). *How to Use the Keegan Type Indicator (KTI) and the Keegan Information Processing Indicator (KIPI).* Warren Keegan Associates Press, New York.

Keegan, W. J. (1982). *Keegan Type Indicator Form B*. Warren Keegan Associates Press, New York.

Keegan, W. J. (1984). *Judgements, Choices and Decisions*. Wiley, New York, NY.

Korac-Kakadadse, A., Korac-Kakadadse, N. & Mayers, A. (1998). Demographics and leadership philosophy: exploring gender differences. *Journal of Management Development,* 17(5), 351-88.

Kotter, J. P. (1982). *The General Managers*. New York: The Free Press.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-Organization Fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology,* 49(1), 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D. & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: a meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology,* 58(2), 281-342.

Liebowitz, J. (Ed.). (2020). *Developing Informed Intuition for Decision-making.* Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton.

Martin, J. (2015). Transformational and transactional leadership: An exploration of gender, experience, and institution type. *Libraries and the Academy,* 15(2), 331-351.

Marvel, J. D. (2015). Gender congruence and work effort in manager-employee relationships. *Public Administration Review,* 75(3), 455-68.

Matrikel för Svenska kyrkan (2019). Verbum, Stockholm.

McClelland, D. C. (1971). To know why men do what they do. *Psychology Today,* January, pp. 35-75.

McClelland, D. C. (1990). *Human motivation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McClelland, D. C. & Steele, R. S. (1972). *Motivation workshops.* General Learning Press, Morristown.

McClelland, D. C. & Burnham, D. H. (1976). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review,* 54(2), 100-10.

Moss, J. jr. & Jensrud, Q. (1995). Gender, leadership and vocational education. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 33 (1), 6-23.

Nutt, P. C. (2006). Comparing public and private sector decision-making practices. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 16(2), 289-318.

O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J. & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, (34), 487-516.

Pounder, J. S. & Coleman, M. (2002). Women – better leaders than men? In general and educational management it still "all depends". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 23(3), 122-33.

Rainey, H. G. (1979). Perceptions of incentives in business and government: Implications for civil service reform. *Public Administration Review,* 39(5), 440-448.

Rainey, H. G., Backoff, R. W. & C. H. Levine. (1976). Comparing public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review,* 36(2), 233-44.

Rainey, H. G., Pandey, S-J & and Bozeman, B. (1995). Research Note: Public and private managers' receptions of red tape. *Public Administration Review,* 55(6), 567-73.

Rainey, H. G. & Bozeman, B. (2000). Comparing public and private organizations: Empirical research and the power of the a priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory,* 10(2), 447-469.

Reddin, W. J. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Reddin, W. J. (1987). *How to make your leadership style more effective*. McGraw-Hill (UK), London.

Rowley, S., Hossain, F. & Barry, P. (2010). Leadership trough a gender lens. How cultural environments and theoretical perspectives interact with gender. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 3(2), 81-87.

Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F. & Schwartz, S. H. (2002). Cultural values, sources of guidance and their relevance to managerial behaviour: A 47 nation study. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology,* 33(2), 188-208.

Smith, P. B. & Peterson, M. F. (2005). Demographic effects on the use of vertical sources of guidance by managers in widely differing cultural contexts. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 5(1), 5-26.

Swedish National Agency for Education (2018). *Annual Report 2017*, Stockholm.

Swedish Social Service Agency (2018). *Annual Report 2017,* Stockholm.

Trinidad, C. & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and gender: a dangerous liaison? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7), 574-90.

Wilson, F. (1999). *Organizational behaviour: A critical introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving the people or serving for pay: Reward preferences among government, hybrid sector, and business managers. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14(4), 369-383.

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R. & Prussia, G. (2019). Effectiveness of broad and specific leadership behaviors. *Personnel Review*, 48(3), 774-783.