Transformational Leadership Styles in Slovenian Police

Džemal Durić

Purpose:
The purpose of this research was to examine leadership styles among managers at different organizational levels in Slovenian Police organization and to examine relationships between leadership styles and outcomes criteria (effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort).

Design/Methods/Approach:
The study took a quantitative approach to test the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) with Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Survey included police managers at local (290), regional (122), and state (74) level of Slovenian Police organization.

Findings:
There are more transformational leadership styles than transactional leadership styles and laissez-faire leadership styles demonstrated among Slovenian Police managers. Transformational leadership styles are expressed especially at higher organizational levels. Relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes criteria is stronger than relationship between transactional leadership and outcomes criteria. There is negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership styles and outcome criteria.

Research limitations/implications:
The results are comparable with similar studies which used MLQ for self rating or measuring self perceptions of leadership styles. Future research should include subordinate's perception of police manager's leadership styles. That would reflect more realistic picture about leadership practice and performance.

Practical implications:
Results indicate which leadership styles have positive relationships with outcome criteria and can be a useful input for police leadership training and development process.

Originality/Value:
This study contributes to the Police Leadership literature. Paper extends understanding of leadership styles in police organizations and supports the propositions of the Full Range Leadership Model that transformational leadership extends the results of transactional leadership toward results beyond expectations.

Transformacijski stili vodenja v slovenski policiji

Namen prispevka:

Namen te raziskave je bil preučiti stile vodenja med managerji na različnih organizacijskih ravneh v slovenski policiji in preučiti odnose med načini vodenja in rezultati kriterijev (učinkovitost, zadovoljstvo in dodatni trud).

Metode:

Pri študiji je bil za preverjanje »celostnega modela vodenja« (ang. »Full Range Leadership Model« - FRLM) uporabljen kvantitativni pristop, in sicer z anketo »večfaktorskega vprašalnika za vodenje« (ang. »Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire« - MLQ). Anketirani so bili vodje slovenske policije na lokalni (290), regionalni (122) in nacionalni (74) ravni.

Ugotovitve:

Med managerji v slovenski policiji so bolj izraženi transformacijski kot pa transakcijski in *laissez-faire* stili vodenja. Transformacijski stili vodenja so še posebej prisotni na višjih organizacijskih ravneh. Povezava med transformacijskim stilom vodenja in kriteriji je močnejša od tiste med transakcijskim stilom vodenja in kriteriji. Med *laissez-faire* stili vodenja in rezultati kriterijev pa obstaja negativno razmerje.

Omejitve/uporabnost raziskave:

Rezultati so primerljivi s podobnimi študijami, ki so za samoocenjevanje oziroma merjenje zaznave lastnih stilov vodenja uporabili MLQ anketo. Prihodnje raziskave bi morale vključiti zaznavanje podrejenih glede stilov vodenja policijskih managerjev, saj bi tako odražale bolj realno predstavo o praksi in uspešnosti samega vodenja.

Praktična uporabnost:

Rezultati kažejo, kateri stili vodenja so v pozitivnem razmerju do kriterijev in se lahko uporabijo tako pri usposabljanju policijskih managerjev kot tudi v razvojnem procesu.

Izvirnost/pomembnost prispevka:

Ta študija je prispevek k obstoječi literaturi o policijskem vodenju. Nadalje povečuje razumevanje načinov vodenja v policijskih organizacijah ter podpira predpostavke celostnega modela vodenja v smislu, da transformacijsko vodenje razširja in nadgrajuje rezultate transakcijskega vodenja do rezultatov nad pričakovanji.

1   INTRODUCTION

The topic of transformational leadership has been the subject of much theoretical and empirical effort in the field of leadership, organizational behaviour and industrial/

organizational psychology. The most prominent conception of transformational leadership is Bass's theory (Bass, 1985) which was extended to the Full Range Leadership Model/Theory (Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994, 1997; Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Sosik, 2006; Sosik & Jung, 2010). Several meta-studies showed that transformational leadership styles have positive relationship with outcomes criteria (effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort) at individual, group and organizational level. However, very little empirical work has been devoted in the field of police and other law enforcement organizations (Deluga & Souza, 1991; Singer & Singer, 1989; Densten, 1999, 2003). Especially there are rare empirical studies of transformational leadership styles within police organizations in transition countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Gašič & Pagon, 2007).

This study represents an attempt to fill in the empirical gap in the police leadership literature by testing transformational leadership styles of Full Range Leadership Model among police managers at different organizational levels in Slovenian Police organization and by examining relationships between leadership styles and outcomes criteria.

The following research questions have been posited for this study:
– Which leadership styles of full range leadership model are demonstrated at local, regional and state organizational level of Slovenian Police?
– What is the relationship between leadership styles of full range leadership model and outcome criteria: leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with leadership, and extra effort at different organizational levels of Slovenian Police?

1.1 Full Range Leadership Model

The most recent version of the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) model (Sosik & Jung, 2010) is based on Bass's (1985) seminal work on the transformational-transactional leadership paradigm. Bass and Avolio (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio, 1999) introduced the Full Range of Leadership (FRL) model which presents an integrated overview of full range of leadership styles or components of *transformational leadership*, *transactional leadership* and *laissez-faire leadership* (or nonleadership) (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational-transactional leadership paradigm was introduced by Burns' (1978) concepts of transformational and transactional leadership of political leadership. For Burns the difference between transformational and transactional leadership is in terms of what leaders and followers offer on another. Transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Transactional leaders, in contrast, focus on the proper exchange of resources. If transformational leadership results in followers identifying with the needs of the leader, the transactional leader gives followers something they want in exchange for something the leader want (Kuhrent & Lewis, 1987). Burns conceptualized leadership as either transactional or transformational. Transactional leaders are those who lead through social exchange. Transformational leaders, on the other hand, are those who stimulate and inspire followers to both

190

achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capacity (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 3).

As Judge and Piccolo (2004) noted, Bass (1985) based his *theory of transformational leadership* on Burns' (1978) conceptualization, with several modifications of elaborations. First, Bass did not agree with Burns that transformational and transactional leadership represent opposite ends of a single continuum. Bass argued that transformational and transactional leadership are separate concepts, and further argued that the best leaders are both transformational and transactional. Second, Bass elaborated considerably on the behaviours that manifest transformational and transactional leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004: 755). For Bass and Riggio transformational leadership is in some ways an expansion of transactional leadership. Transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues, and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfil those requirements. Transformational leadership, however, raises leadership to the next level. Transformational leadership involves inspiring followers to commit to a shared vision and goals for an organization or unit, challenging them to be innovative problem solvers, and developing followers' leadership capacity via coaching, mentoring, and provision of both challenge and support (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 4).

Early accumulated research evidence of transformational and transactional leadership (transformational leadership theory) supported the augmentation effect, which stipulates that transformational leadership adds to the effect of transactional leadership in contributing to the extra effort and performance of follower. Whereas transactional leadership is regarded as successful in itself, (additional) transformational behaviour can lead to extraordinary performance on the part of the followers. This is known as the augmentation effect (Hater & Bass, 1988). Due to unique contributions of both transformational and transactional leadership in predicting the various criteria Bass and Avolio extended transformational leadership theory to the Full Range of Leadership (FRL) model which presents an integrated overview of full range available leadership styles. "*The FRL model includes transformational leadership and its components as the most effective, or optimal, level of leadership, with transactional leadership (based on rewards and disciplinary actions) as the "mid" level, and laissez-faire leadership anchoring the ineffective, or suboptimal, level.*" (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 17). The model is supported and presented with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which measures leadership behaviours included in the model.

According to the most recent version of full range leadership development model (FRLD model) (Sosik & Jung, 2010) leaders display a repertoire of both passive and active forms of leadership. The more active forms of leadership (dimensions of transformational leadership) are associated with higher levels of effectiveness and satisfaction than the more passive forms of leadership (dimensions of transactional leadership). The most passive form of leadership in the FRLD model is laissez-faire leadership.

1.1.1 Transformational Leadership

There are four components of transformational leadership, which are called the 4Is of transformational leadership: Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Idealized influence (II). Transformational leaders behave in ways that allow them to serve as role model for their followers. The leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify with the leaders and want to emulate them; leaders are endowed by their followers as having extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination. Thus, there are two aspects to idealized influence: the leader's behaviours and the elements that are attributed to the leader by followers and other associates (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 6). When followers witness a leader's idealized influence behaviours, they attribute idealized influence to the leader. As a result, followers identify strongly with a leader, show high levels of trust in and commitment to the leader, and exert high levels of drive and motivation (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 15).

Inspirational motivation (IM). Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their follower's work. Team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. Leaders get followers involved in envisioning attractive future states; they create clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrate commitment to goals and the shared vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 6). By using inspiration, transformational leaders express confidence in followers and their shared vision. Through the content of this vision and behaviour that is consistent with the vision, inspirational leaders energize followers to exert extra effort in challenging situations. In addition, they champion collective action and team synergy (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 16).

Intellectual stimulation (IS). Transformational leaders stimulate their follower's effort to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. Creativity is encouraged. New ideas and creative problem solutions are solicited from followers, who are included in the process of addressing problems and finding solutions. Followers are encouraged to try new approaches, and their ideas are not criticized because they differ from the leaders' ideas. (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 7). While inspirational motivation triggers the emotions of followers, intellectual stimulation values followers' rationality and intellect (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 16). Intellectual stimulation is the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks, and solicits followers' ideas. Leaders with this trait stimulate and encourage creativity in their followers (Judge & Piccolo, 2004: 755).

Individualized consideration (IC). Transformational leaders pay special attention to each individual follower's needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. Followers and colleagues are developed to successively higher levels of potential. Individual consideration is practiced when new learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate. Individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized. A two-way exchange in communication

192

is encouraged, and "management by walking around" workspace is practiced. (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 7).

1.1.2 Transactional Leadership

The three components of transactional leadership are contingent reward, management by exception-active, and management by exception-passive.

Contingent reward (CR). Contingent reward is the degree to which the leader sets up constructive transactions or exchanges with followers: The leader clarifies expectations and establishes the rewards for meeting these expectations (Judge & Piccolo, 2004: 755). This constructive transaction has been found to be reasonably effective in motivating others to achieve higher levels of development and performance, although not as much as any of the transformational components (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 8). "*In essence, contingent reward is a carrot-and-stick approach to leadership that relies on extrinsic motivation to drive followers toward the goal.*" (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 13).

Management by exception-active (MBE-A). In general, management by exception is the degree to which the leader takes corrective action on the basis of results of leader-follower transactions (Sosik & Jung, 2010). In active MBE, the leader arranges to actively monitor deviances form standards, mistakes, and errors in the follower's assignments and to take corrective action as necessary (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 8). Here the leader's attention is on mistakes, complaints, failures, deviations from standards, and infractions of rules and regulations. "*While active management by exception may be effective in high-stakes or life or death situations (e.g. nuclear power plants, military operations) or in problem solving contexts (e.g. auditing, information system development and maintenance), leaders in other contexts who display this behaviour are likely to promote fear and stifle innovation among associate.*" (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 12).

Management by exception-passive (MBE-P). When a leader waits for mistakes to happen before stepping in to attempt to fix the problem, the leader displays passive management by exception. The leader's attitude is typically "if it's not broken, don't fix it." A leader who displays this form of leadership intervenes only when standards are not met. (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 11). MBE-P implies waiting passively for deviances, mistakes, and errors to occur and then taking corrective action. Leaders sometimes must practice passive MBE when required to supervise a large number of subordinates who report directly to the leaders (Bass and Reggio, 2006: 8). As noted by Howell and Avolio (1993), the difference between MBE-active and MBE-passive lies in the timing of the leader's intervention. Active leaders monitor follower behaviour, anticipate problems, and take corrective actions before the behaviour creates serious difficulties. Passive leaders wait until the behaviour has created problems before taking action.

1.1.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership (LF) is the avoidance or absence of leadership and is, by definition, most inactive, as well as most ineffective according to almost all research on the style. As opposed to transactional leadership, laissez-faire represents a nontransaction. Necessary decisions are not made. Actions are delayed. Responsibilities of leadership are ignored. Authority remains unused. (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 9). Laissez-faire leadership is associated with the lowest levels of performance and satisfaction (Sosik & Jung, 2010: 10).

Sosik and Jung (2010: 18) summarize that the FRLD model proposes the notion that leaders who achieve performance beyond expectations are those who build people up through transformational leadership. These leaders are exemplary role models, have an exciting vision, challenge the status quo and continually innovate (even at the peak of success), and coach and mentor their associates to achieve their full potential and performance. Effective transformational leadership is build upon a foundation of transactional contingent reward leadership, an exchange relationship between the leader and follower that sets well-defined roles and expectations and uses extrinsic rewards to achieve desired performance. Less effective leadership styles search for what's done wrong, not what's done right (active management by exception), patch problems and focus on mistakes only after they have occurred (passive management by exception), and avoid leadership and relinquish responsibility (laissez-faire).

Across a number of studies of the FRLD model as a predictor of a variety of outcomes in organizations (e.g., employee satisfaction, effort, or motivation: organizational effectiveness: performance), strong relationships have been found between transformational leadership and most positive outcomes (Bass, 2008). Transformational leadership has been shown to be effective with respect to different performance measures in several studies, as meta-analysis show (Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

The framework of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and non –leadership provides the opportunity to further understanding of the importance of leadership in police organizations, the negative behaviours of police leaders, and the unique aspects of the police leadership environment (Densten, 1999). In the following section is review of previous research studies of transformational leadership in police and other law enforcement organizations.

1.2 Previous Research

Singer and Singer (1989) examined the impact of situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behaviour, subordinates' leadership preferences, and satisfaction within police organization in New Zealand and three companies in Taiwan. Results showed that situational constraints affected actual leader behaviour, as well as leadership preferences scores. The results indicate that mechanistic organizations such as the police force do not necessarily foster transactional leadership. In police sample, actual leader behaviours were

194

significantly more transformational than transactional (Singer & Singer, 1989: 385). *"Because the police organization is more mechanistic than commercial companies do not necessarily foster transactional leadership style. A plausible explanation for this interesting finding is that the system of reinforcement in mechanistic organizations is thoroughly entrenched in the organizational structure, so that the leaders themselves do not need actively or overtly to provide contingent reinforcement."* (Singer & Singer, 1989: 394) The data also showed that in police sample, satisfaction ratings correlated significantly with the ratings of transformational factors (Singer & Singer, 1989: 391).

Deluga and Souza (1991) investigated the interaction of supervising officer leadership (download influence) and the influencing behaviour of subordinate police officers (upward influence) within a law enforcement setting. Based on previous Deluga's studies (1988, 1990) which showed that transactional leadership does appear to promote more subordinate upward influencing activity than transformational leadership in a manufacturing environment it was predicted that scenarios describing supervising police officers as transactional leaders will be more closely associated with subordinate police officer reported use of soft, hard and rational upward influence approaches than scenarios depicting transformational leaders. Contrary to the prediction, transformational leadership was determined to be more closely related with subordinate rational influencing behaviour than transactional leadership. Authors interpreted that these unexpected findings may be a reflection of contextual factors indicative of both the police officer personality and their male dominated organizational culture. *"The transformational supervising officer's responsiveness to individual officer needs (i.e. the individual consideration factor) may promote rational and discourage hard and soft subordinate influencing. Unlike perhaps the transactional supervising officer, the transformational supervising officer may be perceived as more approachable, less military in manner, and subsequently more likely to be sensitive to subordinate officer rational influencing attempts."* (Deluga & Souza, 1991: 54)

Densten conducted two studies of transformational leadership within Australian law enforcement setting. First study (Densten, 1999) compared leadership behaviours (transformational, transactional, and non-leadership) of senior Australian police officers with leadership norms (MLQ) established by Bass and Avolio (1990). Comparison of leadership behaviour mean scores identified that leaders of senior Australian law enforcement officers used significantly less transformational leadership in comparison with the norm. *"Senior officers did not perceive their leaders as strong role models, inspirers or motivators, or providers of experiential learning and cognitive development."* (Densten, 1999: 50) The transactional leadership behaviour of management-by-exception was the most frequently observed and was significantly more than norm. *"In other words, leaders of senior officers emphasized control but only intervened when things went wrong or the status quo was broken."* (Densten, 1999: 49) Leaders of senior officers used contingent reward less frequently compared to the MLQ norm. *"Leaders of senior officers used negotiations less frequently to achieve objectives. This lack of negotiation is common in organizations where a rigid rank hierarchy is evident and where there is an authoritarian command system, typical in quasi-military organizations."* (Densten, 1999: 50) Leaders of senior officers used laissez-faire (non-leadership) less frequently compared to

the MLQ norm. Results regarding outcomes criteria showed that senior officers used extra effort less frequently compared to the MLQ norm, senior officers' assessment of their leaders' effectiveness was less than the norm, and senior officers were more satisfied with their leaders' behaviour compared to the norm. Based on Parry's (1996) suggestion that high levels of transactional leadership indicate only basic leadership competency among leaders Densten noted that in the current environment it appears that leaders only demonstrate basic leadership competency, which may reflect the lack of formal leadership training (Densten, 1999: 51).

In the second study (Densten, 2003), which was based on the same sample data in previous study (Densten, 1999), Densten used multi-regression to identify predictors of the leadership outcomes of leader effectiveness and extra effort. The study found that each rank of senior officers (organizational level) has unique sets of leadership behaviours that influence the perception of leader effectiveness and motivation to extra effort. The Stratified System Theory was used to explore why each rank had unique combinations of predictors. The following categories of ranks were used: senior sergeants (stratum II), inspectors (stratum III), chief inspectors (stratum IV), Executives and superintendents (stratum VII-V). Overall, 11 predictors of leader effectiveness were identified but varied according to the ranks of the senior officers. Idealized influence was a common predictor of leader effectiveness for chief inspectors, inspectors, and senior sergeants. Inspirational motivation was a common predictor of leader effectiveness for executives and superintendents, chief inspectors and senior inspectors but not inspectors. Contingent reward was unique negative predictor of leader effectiveness for chief inspectors. Laissez-faire was a negative predictor of leader effectiveness for executives, superintendents, and senior sergeants. Senior sergeants had two additional predictors of leader effectiveness, namely individual consideration and management-by-exception (Densten, 2003: 410-411). Five predictors of extra effort were identified. The most common leadership predictor of extra effort was intellectual simulation for chief inspectors, inspectors, and senior sergeants. Contingent reward was leadership predictor of extra effort for chief inspectors and inspectors who chose to exert effort beyond the ordinary but not for senior sergeants. Inspirational motivation was a predictor of executives, superintendents and senior sergeant choosing to exert effort beyond the ordinary. Laissez-faire was a positive unique predictor of extra effort for superintendents. For them laissez-faire (or the absence of leadership) may provide additional freedoms and opportunities to direct operations of complex systems. Superintendents may view this absence as a significant opportunity to act independently and on their own authority when their leader is absent and, consequently, exert more effort (Densten, 2003: 412-413). "*Each senior police rank had a unique combination of leadership predictors which highlights the importance of taking rank into consideration.*" (Densten, 2003: 409) Differences in the scope and scale of the work, along with cognitive processes of each rank, can be understood and provide guidance into understanding the leadership expectations of individuals (i.e. followers) within each rank. Such expectations influence how individuals recognize and understand the behaviours of their leader, and how these individuals ultimately act on their perceptions (Densten, 2003: 409).

Gašič and Pagon (2007) conducted first study regarding transformational and transactional leadership in the Slovenian police organization. They investigated interaction between different leadership styles and organizational outcomes: organizational commitment, job satisfaction, frustration, and cynicism. Study sample included 578 police officers from five police directorates. Questionnaires were distributed to 63 police stations (local organizational level) and four crime investigation departments (CID) (regional organizational level) with intention to collect data form police officers and their commanders. Results showed that police officers perceived that the transactional leadership is most rarely used by their leaders (M=2.84) (scale from 1 to 5) and that transformational leadership and laissez-faire are used equally (M=3.09). In contrast to the leadership styles perception of police officers their leaders – commanders of police stations think they use more transformational leadership (M=4.34) than transactional leadership (M=3.36) and laissez-faire (M=3.08) (Gašič & Pagon, 2007: 142). Similarly, CID officers perceived that transactional leadership is the most rarely used (M=2.42), but laissez-faire leadership (M=3.08) were used more than transformational leadership (M=2.51). Also heads of CIDs perceived themselves as more transformational (M=3.92) then transactional (M=3.42) and laissez-faire (M=2.89) leaders (Gašič & Pagon, 2007: 142). Correlation analysis between leadership styles and organizational outcomes showed that officers who perceive their leader's style as more transformational or more transactional are more organizationally committed and job satisfied. These officers express lower levels of frustration and cynicism. Laissez-faire leadership style was statistically significant and positively associated with frustration and cynicism, although this connection was weak (Gašič & Pagon, 2007: 144). Correlation analysis for the leaders sample showed that leaders, who perceive their leadership as transformational are more organizationally committed. Leaders, who perceive their leadership style as more laissez-faire, on average, showed lower levels of organizational commitment and higher levels of frustration (Gašič & Pagon, 2007: 144). In summary, more active and participative leadership styles are more positively associated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, while more passive or separated leadership styles are associated with higher levels of frustration and cynicism. "*It has been shown that police leaders hold the key in the leader-member relationships in police organizations. Therefore, police organizations must ensure that their leaders have proper leadership qualifications. Committed and satisfied officers, who are not frustrated and cynical, will probably, perform better at their job than officers with more negative attitudes.*" (Gašič & Pagon, 2007: 150).

Based on the above presented results and in line with research questions for this study, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. *For the Slovenian police organization (all three organizational levels), transformational and transactional leadership styles would be demonstrated equally.*

Hypothesis 2. *For the Slovenian police organization, transformational leadership styles would be more present at higher organizational levels (state and regional level) than at lower organizational level (local).*

Hypothesis 3. *For the Slovenian police organization (all three organizational levels), transformational leadership styles would be strongly positive associated with leadership*

197

outcomes (leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with leadership, and extra effort) than transactional leadership styles, and laissez/faire leadership styles.

Hypothesis 4. For the Slovenian police organization, there would be unique combination of associations between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with leadership, and extra effort) for all three organizational levels (local, regional, and state).

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Organizational Setting

The Slovenian Police service is a body within the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Slovenia. Organizational structure of Slovenian Police is composed of General Police Directorate at state level, Police Directorates (11) at regional level, and Police Stations at local level (www.policija.si). *General Police Directorate* with the headquarters in Ljubljana is headed by the Director General of Police and consists of the following main organizational units: Service of the Director General of the Police, Uniformed Police Directorate, Criminal Police Directorate, Forensic Science Centre, Security and Protection Office, Operation and Communication Centre, Special Unit, Police Academy, Organisation and Personnel Office, Information and Telecommunications Office and Logistics Office. *Regional Police Directorate* (eleven headquarters) is headed by Director of Police Directorate and consists of the following main organizational units: Director's Service, Uniformed Police Division, Criminal Police Division, Operation and Communication Centre, Operational Support Service and Police Stations. *Police Station* is organizationally part of the Regional Police Directorate and is headed by Police Station Commander. There are different types of police stations: (general) Police station, Traffic police station, Border police station, Maritime police station, Airport police station, Mounted police station, Service dog handler station and Police station for compensatory measures.

The managerial positions at state level are Director General, Deputy Director General, Director(s) of Directorate(s), Director(s) of Sector(s)/Division(s), Head(s) of Units. Managerial positions at regional level are Director, Director(s) of Division(s), Chief(s) of Section(s), Shift Leader(s), and Team/Group Leader(s). Managerial positions at local level are Police Station Commander, Deputy Commander(s), Shift Leader(s), and Team/Group Leader(s).

2.2 Sample

The sample consisted of 290 leaders at local level (police station commanders and deputy commanders), 122 leaders at regional level (director, directors of directorates, directors of sectors/division from all 11 regional police directorates), and 74 leaders at state level (directors of directorates, directors of sectors/divisions,

198

heads of units). Sample size target was 407 leaders at local level, 165 leaders at regional level, and 118 leaders at state level. Response rate was of 70.7 %.

At local level there were 286 male and 4 female leaders. 169 (34.9 %) leaders at local level were in age category between 36 and 45. 226 (46.7 %) leaders at local level had a 3-year college degree or a 4-year university degree. 139 (28.6 %) leaders were in organizational tenure category between 11 and 20 years and 121 (24.9 %) in category between 21 and 30 years.

At regional level there were 108 male and 14 female leaders. 60 (12.4 %) leaders were in age category between 36 and 45 years and 49 (10.1 %) in age category between 46 and 55 years. 97 (20 %) leaders had a 3-year college degree or a 4-year university degree and 20 (4.1 %) leaders had master degree. 90 (18.6 %) leaders at regional level had more than 20 years of organizational tenure.

At state level there were 69 male and 5 female leaders. Most leaders at state level were in age category between 36 and 45 years (40) and between 46 and 55 years (24). 6 leaders were in age category between 56 and 65 years. There were 56 leaders with a 3-year college degree or a 4-year university degree, 14 leaders with master degree, and 2 leaders with doctoral degree. More than half leaders at state level had more than 20 years of organizational tenure.

2.3 Instrument

The current study used the self-administered multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) to record the frequency of non-leadership, transactional, and transformational leadership behaviours and outcomes (extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction). MLQ can be used by leaders themselves, their followers, peers, or supervisors. In the current study, police leaders recorded (self-rating) the frequency of leadership behaviour displayed by themselves and perception about their leadership outcomes (self-rating). The MLQ consists of 45 items that measure transactional leadership (12 items), transformational leadership (20 items), and non-leadership (4 items), extra effort (3 items), leadership effectiveness (4 items), and satisfaction with leadership (2 items). All variables are part of the MLQ and were calculated in accordance with the MLQ manual and had acceptable Cronbach alphas that were all above 0.70. The MLQ items are not presented because of copyright.

2.4 Procedure

The present study was conducted in February 2009. Based on the approval from the General Police Directorate MLQ questionnaires with cover letter were sent to police leaders in accordance with sample size target plan. Police leaders were asked to assess their leadership behaviours and their perception of leadership outcomes. They were assured of the confidentiality of their individual responses. The questionnaires were returned in envelopes enclosed with the questionnaires to Police Academy.

3 RESULTS

Table 1: Means analysis of leadership styles

	Overall		Local level		Regional level		State level	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Idealized influence (attribute)	3.4	.665	3.3	.648	3.3	.727	3.5	.621
Idealized influence (behaviour)	3.8	.528	3.8	.534	3.9	.508	3.9	.525
Inspirational motivation	3.9	.572	3.8	.582	4.0	.571	4.0	.499
Intellectual stimulation	4.2	.447	4.2	.451	4.3	.448	4.3	.399
Individualized consideration	4.0	.479	3.9	.485	4.0	.480	4.0	.427
TRANSFORMATIONAL	3.8	.391	3.8	.397	3.9	.386	4.0	.348
Contingent reward	4.2	.472	4.2	.480	4.3	.456	4.3	.479
Management-by-exception – A	3.1	.622	3.1	.572	3.0	.668	3.0	.695
Management-by-exception – P	2.5	.487	2.5	.499	2.4	.456	2.6	.492
TRANSACTIONAL	3.3	.328	3.3	.326	3.2	.337	3.3	.322
LAISSEZ-FAIRE	1.5	.600	1.5	.610	1.4	.598	1.5	.556

Means on a scale from 1 to 5

Table 1 presents means for all nine components and composite factors of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. Overall column presents data for all sample and shows that police leaders more frequently demonstrate transformational leadership (M=3.8) than transactional leadership (M=3.3), and that laissez-faire leadership is the most rarely used. Among transformational styles intellectual stimulation (4.2) and individual consideration (M=4.0) are prevailing. Contingent reward (M=4.2) is used more than management by exception (active and passive) among transactional styles. In summary, even that contingent reward and intellectual stimulation have equal means (M=4.2) results show that Slovenian police leaders (all three organizational levels) use more transformational leadership styles than transactional leadership styles and therefore data do not support hypothesis 1.

Results for leadership styles by organizational level (local, regional, and state) show that the means for laissez-faire leadership are very low for all three organizational levels (M=1.5, 1.4, 1.5), transactional leadership is demonstrated quite equally (M=3.3, 3.2, 3.3), and transformational leadership is increasing by organizational level (M=3.8, 3.9, 4.0). In other words, higher in the organizational hierarchy leaders are, more they perceive themselves as transformational leaders. Leaders at state level perceive themselves as more charismatic (idealized influence – attributes, M=3.5) than leaders at local and regional level. Leaders at higher levels (regional and state) are also more inspirational. Common for all three levels is similar expression of intellectual stimulation (M=4.2, 4.3, 4.3) and individual

consideration (M=3.9, 4.0, 4.0). Results for transactional leadership show that the values do not increase by organizational level. Only values for contingent reward (M=4.2, 4.3, 4.3) are increasing by organizational level. Interpretation may be that leaders at higher levels have more possibilities for material rewards because of the small sizes of units and more availability of financial resources for material rewards. Management by exception – active is demonstrated less at higher organizational levels (M=3.1, 3.0, 3.0). Management by exception – passive is demonstrated more at state level (M=2.6) than at regional (M=2.4) and local level (M=2.5). In other words, leaders at state level delegate more than leaders at regional and state level and use less passive management by exception. Laissez-faire is the most rarely used at regional level (1.4). Data support prediction for hypothesis 2.

	Overall		Local level		Regional level		State level	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
EFFECTIVENESS	4.0	.473	4.0	.475	4.1	.512	4.1	.379
SATISFACTION	3.9	.634	3.9	.627	3.9	.705	4.0	.513
EXTRA EFFORT	4.1	.515	4.0	.545	4.1	.477	4.1	.439

Means on a scale from 1 to 5

Table 2: Means analysis for leadership outcomes

It can be seen from Table 2 that police leaders at all organizational levels perceive themselves as very effective leaders (M=4.0), their followers are satisfied with their leadership styles (M=3.9), and their leadership style can influence followers' extra effort (4.1). Means values are increasing with organizational level. In other words, senior leaders perceive themselves as more successful leaders than leaders at lower organizational levels.

Overall sample	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire
EFFECTIVENESS	.574 (**)	.310 (**)	-.225 (**)
SATISFACTION	.413 (**)	.257 (**)	-.091 (**)
EXTRA EFFORT	.630 (**)	.349 (**)	-.230 (**)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Correlation analysis between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (overall sample)

Table 3 presents results of correlation analysis between leadership styles and leadership outcomes in Slovenian police organization (overall sample). It can be seen that transformational leadership is more positively associated with leadership outcomes than transactional leadership. There is weak negative association between Laissez-faire and leadership outcomes.

Table 4:
Correlation analysis between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (local level)

LOCAL LEVEL	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire
EFFECTIVENESS	.621 (**)	.348 (**)	-.226 (**)
SATISFACTION	.329 (**)	.242 (**)	-.077 (**)
EXTRA EFFORT	.637 (**)	.350 (**)	-.217 (**)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5:
Correlation analysis between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (regional level)

REGIONAL LEVEL	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire
EFFECTIVENESS	.587 (**)	.367 (**)	-.270 (**)
SATISFACTION	.525 (**)	.319 (**)	-.172 (**)
EXTRA EFFORT	.700 (**)	.450 (**)	-.266 (**)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6:
Correlation analysis between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (state level)

STATE LEVEL	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire
EFFECTIVENESS	.262 (*)	.080	-.052
SATISFACTION	.529 (**)	.233 (*)	.054
EXTRA EFFORT	.445 (**)	.247 (*)	-.188

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7:
Correlation analysis between leadership styles and effectiveness

	LOCAL LEVEL	REGIONAL LEVEL	STATE LEVEL
Idealized influence (attribute)	.350 (**)	.255 (**)	.152
Idealized influence (behaviour)	.428 (**)	.403 (**)	-.014
Inspirational motivation	.536 (**)	.436 (**)	.443 (**)
Intellectual stimulation	.537 (**)	.522 (**)	.189
Individualized consideration	.458 (**)	.546 (**)	.172
Contingent reward	.500 (**)	.492 (**)	.272 (*)
Management-by-exception – A	.129(**)	.208 (*)	-.107
Management-by-exception – P	.055	.016	.045
Laissez-faire	-.226 (**)	-.270 (**)	-.052

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It can be seen from Tables 4, 5, and 6 that there is a similar pattern of correlations between leadership styles and leadership outcomes at all three organizational levels (local, regional, state). There is strong positive association between transformational leadership and effectiveness and extra effort at local level. It can be seen that transformational leadership at regional level is very strong associated with extra effort but not at state level. Transactional leadership is strongly associated with extra effort at regional level and there is no correlation between transactional leadership and effectiveness at state level. Laissez-faire leadership is mainly negatively associated with leadership outcomes at all three organizational

levels. Data from tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 support prediction for hypothesis 3. Tables 7, 8, and 9 present correlation coefficients between all leadership styles and leadership outcomes by organizational level.

Table 7 shows that effectiveness is very positively associated with intellectual stimulation at local level and with individual consideration at regional level. At state level effectiveness is only positively associated with inspirational motivation and contingent reward. Results show that leaders at different organizational levels have different perceptions of relationship between leadership styles and effectiveness.

	LOCAL LEVEL	REGIONAL LEVEL	STATE LEVEL
Idealized influence (attribute)	.143 (*)	.210 (*)	.362 (**)
Idealized influence (behaviour)	.230 (**)	.384 (**)	.293 (*)
Inspirational motivation	.246 (**)	.409 (**)	.572 (**)
Intellectual stimulation	.291 (**)	.505 (**)	.406 (**)
Individualized consideration	.333 (**)	.433 (**)	.223
Contingent reward	.280 (**)	.353 (**)	.388 (**)
Management-by-exception – A	.102	.149	-.114
Management-by-exception – P	.088	.137	.242 (*)
Laissez-faire	-.077	-.172	.054

Table 8: Correlation analysis between leadership styles and satisfaction

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It can be seen from Table 8 that for leaders at local levels individualized consideration will bring to higher satisfaction, for leaders at regional level satisfaction is in relation with intellectual stimulation, and for leaders at state level satisfaction is result of inspirational motivation. Results show that leaders at different organizational levels have different perceptions of relationship between leadership styles and satisfaction.

	LOCAL LEVEL	REGIONAL LEVEL	STATE LEVEL
Idealized influence (attribute)	.284 (**)	.309 (**)	.292 (*)
Idealized influence (behaviour)	.485 (**)	.465 (**)	.196
Inspirational motivation	.524 (**)	.589 (**)	.511 (**)
Intellectual stimulation	.599 (**)	.622 (**)	.305 (*)
Individualized consideration	.507 (**)	.577 (**)	.268 (*)
Contingent reward	.532 (**)	.569 (**)	.510 (**)
Management-by-exception – A	.119 (*)	.240 (**)	-.120
Management-by-exception – P	.041	.078	.158
Laissez-faire	-.217	-.266	-.188

Table 9: Correlation analysis between leadership styles and extra effort

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The highest correlation coefficients from Table 9 indicate that leaders at different levels have different perception which combinations of leadership styles influence extra effort: intellectual stimulation and contingent reward at local level; intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation at regional level; inspirational motivation and contingent reward at state level. Results indicate that leaders at local, regional, and state level better perceive and understand relationship between contingent reward and leadership outcomes than relationship between elements of transformational leadership and leadership outcomes. Data from Tables 7, 8, and 9 support prediction for hypothesis 4.

4   DISCUSSION

The current study further advanced our understanding of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles in police organizations. The purpose of the study was to examine leadership styles among managers at different organizational levels in Slovenian Police organization and to examine relationships between leadership styles and leadership outcomes (effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort). Contrary to the study's hypothesis 1, transformational leadership was found to be more presented than transactional leadership in Slovenian police organization. These findings are congruent with findings of previous studies (Singer & Singer, 1989; Gašič & Pagon, 2007) where police leaders used more transformational styles than transactional and incongruent with findings of Densten (1999) who reported more frequent use of transactional leadership styles. Even leaders perceive their leadership styles more transformational than transactional, results show high demonstration of transactional contingent reward which means that they use negotiations more frequently to achieve objectives. Findings of current study confirmed prediction of hypothesis 2 that demonstration of transformational leadership is increasing by organizational level. Higher in the organizational hierarchy leaders are, more they perceive themselves as transformational leaders. Results show that values for contingent reward are increasing by organizational level. Interpretation may be that leaders at higher levels have more possibilities and resources for material rewards because of the small sizes of units and higher budget for material rewards. At higher organizational levels leaders use less management by exception which indicates that leaders at state level delegate more than leaders at regional and state level and use less passive management by exception. Findings of current study support findings of previous research in that that all of transformational leadership behaviours and transactional leadership behaviours have significant positive relationships with the leadership outcomes (Lowe et al., 1996) and that laissez-faire leadership behaviours have significant negative relationships with leadership outcomes. Like Gašič and Pagon (2007) noted, more active and participative leadership styles are more positively associated with desired outcomes, while more passive or separated leadership styles are associated with higher levels of undesired outcomes. Similar, like study of Densten (2003) our study revealed a unique combination of leadership styles and leadership outcomes by organizational level. There is strong positive association

204

between transformational leadership and effectiveness and extra effort at local level. Transformational leadership at regional level is very strong associated with extra effort but not at state level. Transactional leadership is strongly associated with extra effort at regional level and there is no correlation between transactional leadership and effectiveness at state level. Laissez-faire leadership is mainly negatively associated with leadership outcomes at all three organizational levels. In summary, findings show that leaders at different organizational levels have different perceptions of relationship between leadership styles and leadership outcomes. Leaders at local, regional, and state level better perceive and understand relationship between contingent reward and leadership outcomes than relationship between elements of transformational leadership and leadership outcomes.

5   CONCLUSION

The current study provides insight to the nature of police leadership and extends our understanding of association between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles and leadership outcomes. Overall findings of the study support the propositions of the Full Range Leadership Model that transformational leadership extends the results of transactional leadership toward results beyond expectations. In line with our findings and findings of previous research (Singer & Singer, 1989; Densten, 2003) we can conclude that transformational leadership can contribute a lot to the effectiveness of police organizations and that there is a need for further investigation of leadership at different levels. One of the limitations of this study was that study examined only one side of the leadership equation: leaders' self-perception of leadership reality in police organization. Followers' perception of leadership in police organization would give us clearer picture about leadership practice in police organization "*Leaders need to understand how their followers perceive their behaviour in order to more effectively lead them.*" (Densten, 2003: 414). However, current study is one of the first systematic examinations of transformational leadership in Slovenian police organization and will hopefully encourage further research. Further research should focus on followers' perception of leadership behaviours and on interaction among different organizational or context variables (not only organizational level), leadership styles, and leadership outcomes.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *Full-range of Leadership Development.* Binghamton: Bass, Avolio & Associates.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set* (3rd ed.). Redwood City: Mind Garden.

205

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Full Range Leadership Development Basic Workshop Manual.* Binghamton: Center for Leadership Studies.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds,). (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full Range Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Palo Alto: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Deluga, R. J. (1988). Relationship of Transformational and Transactional Leadership with Employee Influencing Strategies. *Group and Organization Studies*, *13*(4), 456-467.

Deluga, R. J. (1990). The Effects of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership Characteristics on Subordinate Influencing Behavior. *Journal of Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *11*(2), 191-203.

Deluga, R. J., & Souza, J. (1991). The Effects of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on the Influencing Behaviour of Subordinate Police Officers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *64*(1), 49-55.

Densten, I. L. (1999). Senior Australian Law Enforcement Leadership under Examination. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *22*(1), 45-57.

Densten, I. L. (2003). Senior Police Leadership: Does Rank Matter? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *26*(3), 400-418.

Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A Meta-analysis of the Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension. In B. J. Avolio, & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead* (pp. 35-66). Amsterdam: JAI Press.

Gašič, D., & Pagon, M. (2007). The Interaction between Leadership Styles and Organizational Outcomes in the Slovenian Police. In G. Meško, & B. Dobovšek (Eds.). *Policing in Emerging Democracies – Critical Reflections*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(4), *695-702.*

Howell, J. M., & 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.*

206

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5): 755-768.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive Developmental Analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 648-657.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-analytic Review of the MLQ Literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 385-425.

Parry, K. W. (1996). Leadership Research: Themes, Implications, and a new Leadership Challenge. In K.W. Parry (Ed.), *Leadership Research and Practice: Emerging Themes and New Challenges.* Melbourne: Pitman Publishing.

Singer, M. S., & Singer, A. E. (1989). Situational Constraints on Transformational Versus Transactional Leadership Behavior, Subordinates' Leadership Preference, and Satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *130*(3), 385-396.

Sosik, J. J. (2006). *Full Range Leadership: Model, Research, Extensions, and Training*. In R. J. Burke, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Inspiring Leaders*. New York: Routledge.

Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full Range Leadership Development: Pathways for People, Profit, and Planet*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

About the Author:

Džemal Durić, M.Sc., Police Academy – Ljubljana, Slovenia. Author is a lecturer of Management and Leadership at Police College and PhD candidate at Faculty of Social Sciences – University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Contact: duric.dzemal@gmail.com.