



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 119 (2014) 247 - 256

27th IPMA World Congress

Key competences of public sector project managers

Beata Jałocha $^{a^*}$, Hans Petter Krane b , Anandasivakumar Ekambaram c , Grażyna Prawelska-Skrzypek d

^aJagiellonian University, Łojasiewicza 4, Kraków 30-348, Poland
^bNTNU, Department of Civil and Transport Engineering, NO-7491Trondheim, Norway
^cSINTEF, Technology and Society, NO-7460 Trondheim, Norway
^dJagiellonian University, Łojasiewicza 4, Kraków 30-348, Poland

Abstract

Project managers play a crucial role in all kinds of projects and influence projects' success (Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2005). Their role is unique in public sector projects, due to the fact that public projects always deal with multiple, different stakeholders whose opinions can strongly influence the project. Progress in projectification of public sector creates an increasing need for developing competences (knowledge, skills, attitudes) for public sector project managers. However, very little attention has so far been paid to the distinctive features of public sector project managers' competences, especially in terms of competences necessary for team and stakeholders management.

David Wirick (2009) highlights that project managers in public sector face team management challenges such as: the inability to clearly link performance and reward, compensation systems that are biased towards longevity, the inability to select project team members based on their expertise. In addition, public sector project managers work in environment which very often is not familiar with results-oriented project management, and are constantly dealing with political interference in the management of projects and the challenges of working with political appointees.

This paper's aim is therefore to identify the most important competences of public sector project managers. The authors, based on a literature study, propose a typology of competences, necessary for project managers dealing with specific circumstances of public organizations. The results can help to further develop training programs and academic curricula tailored to the needs of public sector employers.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the IPMA.

^{*}Corresponding author. Tel.:+48692117849; fax: 4812 6645859, E-mail address:beata.jalocha@uj.edu.pl

Keywords: project management; public sector; competences

1. **Introduction**

Project managers play a crucial role in all kinds of projects and influence projects' success (Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2005). Their role is unique in public sector projects, due to the fact that public projects always deal with multiple, different stakeholders whose opinions can strongly influence the project. Progress in projectification of public sector creates an increasing need for developing competences (knowledge, skills, attitudes) for public sector project managers. However, very little attention has so far been paid to the distinctive features of public sector project managers' competences, especially in terms of competences necessary for team and stakeholders management. David Wirick (2009) highlights that project managers in public sector face team management challenges such as: the inability to clearly link performance and reward, compensation systems that are biased towards longevity, and the inability to select project team members based on their expertise. In addition, public sector project managers work in environment which very often is not familiar with results-oriented project management, and are constantly dealing with political interference in the management of projects and the challenges of working with political appointees.

The purpose of this paper is to identify the most important competences of project managers within public sector. By proposing a typology of necessary competences, we believe that this article will provide a useful basis for developing training programs and academic curricula for public sector project managers.

Management of projects within public sector plays a key role in how well the society as a whole is performing. Project management research and project management literature have for a long time been dealing with different aspects of the critical competences of project managers. However, the research and literature have not been looking very much into what competences are needed for performing good project management within the public sector.

In order to educate and train better public sector project managers, we think it will be required to analyze the specificity of public sector, public sector management and public sector project management. And, based on this analysis, there must be developed a typology of the competences necessary for the project managers. This typology will then in turn serve as an important basis for developing training programs and academic curricula for public sector project managers.

The work presented in this paper is based on qualitative research. The basis of the paper is a study of the literature covering the relevant topics such as: public sector management and in particular project management, and competence requirements more or less specific for this management. The findings from the literature study are then used for constructing and proposing a typology of the key competence requirements.

In the following section of the paper, we will present our definitions of some of the key terms used in the paper. In the following section the specificity of public projects is discussed, and also what this will imply for the competence requirements. After this, we give a broader picture of project management competence and public management competence. In the following section a map of those competences is introduced, and the key competences are pointed out. Finally some conclusions are drawn, and we discuss possible limitations to our work and point out some possible further work.

In the following section, we will present differences and similarities between public and private sector organizations and managers. And then, we will provide definitions and descriptions of competences in the organizational context. This general description functions as a basic framework and helps us to discuss about competences related to public sector and (general) project management separately. And then, as a continuation of this discussion, we will present a table that illustrates the relevant competence areas and roles in a structured manner. Following this illustration, we will propose key competences of public project management. Finally, some conclusions are drawn, along with the description of possible limitations to our work and possible further work.

2. Differences and similarities between public and private organizations and managers

A central element of the concept of New Public Management is that public organizations should import managerial processes and behavior from the private sector (Vries & Nemec, 2013). Nowadays, a majority of public

sector scholars claim that the concept of New Public Management is passé. Macaulay and Lawton (2006) argue that it may be tempting to think that the advent of New Public Management has shifted the ethos of public managers entirely toward managerialism, efficiency and competence; and the example of local government potentially reinforces this view. However, according to Wal, Graaf and Lasthuizen (2008) the most important public and private sector values differ to some extent. In public sector the most important are 'accountability', 'lawfulness', 'incorruptibility', 'expertise', 'reliability', whereas the highest ranking private sector values are 'profitability', 'accountability', 'effectiveness', 'expertise , 'efficiency', 'honesty' and 'innovativeness'.

Differences and similarities between private and public organizations have been widely debated in the literature on public management. The similarities between the two sectors focus mainly on the functions of management, while the differences relate to the conditions or constraints under which management is required to operate (Schneider & Vaught, 1993). While there is a level of generality at which management is management, whether public or private, functions that bear identical labels take on rather different meanings in public and private settings (Allison, 1986, p. 219).

The main conventional distinction between organizations operating in public and private sectors is their ownership (Boyne, 2002). Unlike private companies, owned by entrepreneurs or shareholders, public organizations are owned collectively by members of political communities. Boyne (2002, p. 100) evokes some arguments, which support the statement that public organizations differ from business ones, among which we can mention:

- Complexity (public organizations face a variety of stakeholders, each of whom places demands and constraints on managers);
- Permeability (public organizations are 'open systems' that are easily influenced by external events);
- Instability (political constraints result in frequent changes in policy, and the imposition of short time-horizons on public managers);
- Absence of competitive pressures (public organizations typically have few rivals for the provision of their services. Even when competition is present, public managers frequently enjoy a dominant position in the market, for example in education and health).

It is also emphasized that the goals of public organizations are more vague than those of their private counterparts, because organizational purposes are imposed through the political process, rather than selected by managers themselves (Boyne, 2002). Another characteristic of public organizations is that usually they have more formal procedures for decision-making and are less flexible and more risk-averse (Boyne, 2002; Bozeman i Kingsley, 1998). The pathology of bureaucracy results is the commonness of the 'red tape' in public sector – which is excessive regulations or rigid conformity to formal rules that is considered redundant and hinders action or decision-making (Hal, Sanjay & Barry, 1995). Boyne (2002) argues that public sector is also characterized by lower managerial autonomy, but the main differences between public and private sectors are in his opinion the publicness of public sector and different managerial values. The distinctive set of values of public sector managers is characterized as a 'public service ethos' (Boyne, 2002).

Reichard (1998), based on the work of Farnham and Horton (1996), identifies some important differences between public and private managers. He states that whereas private managers typically strive to increase demand for their products, managers working in public sector must often suppress it in order to stay within their budget. Also, he stresses that economic efficiency cannot be used by public managers as the primary decision criterion, due to the mission that public organizations have. It means that public managers are expected to follow public service ethic in their activities. Next key difference between public and private managers is that public managers must balance different needs and expectations of multiple stakeholders, among which we can mention politicians (Reichard, 1998). Public managers are also believed to be less materialistic than private sector managers and demonstrate a stronger desire to serve the public. Research has shown that due to recruitment, self-selection, and the process of socialization, public-sector employees are less likely to be interested in extrinsic rewards and more likely to value intrinsic rewards than private sector employees (Park & Word, 2012). Public employees tend to be more affectively committed (i.e. committed to the organization's culture and values) and highly motivated by a concern for the community and a desire to serve the public interest or intrinsic values, although some are also motivated extrinsically. As Schneider and Vaught (1993) emphasize, generally public sector employees have

considered themselves underpaid but have stayed on the job for other factors, usually of intrinsic nature.

3. **Competences – key definitions**

The term *competence* is one of those who in recent decades have become very popular. Interest in employees' competences is derived from the widespread belief that they are the most valuable asset of the company. According to Šiugždinienė (2006), the competency approaches were expected to help to identify the skills, knowledge, behaviors and capabilities needed to meet current and future personnel selection needs and to help eliminate the gap between the competences required by a project, job role, or enterprise strategy etc. and those available. However, despite the fact of the popularity of competences and competence based management (CBM), there is a difficulty in finding an unequivocal definition of the concept. Delamare Le Deist & Winterton (2005, p.29) write that 'there is such confusion and debate concerning the concept of 'competence' that it is impossible to identify or impute a coherent theory or to arrive at a definition capable of accommodating and reconciling all the different ways that the term is used'.

Boyatzis (1982) proposed an integrated model of managerial competence that explains the interrelationship of these characteristics and their relationship with both management functions and the internal organizational environment. Competence, according to Boyatzis, is defined as an underlying characteristic that could be a motive, trait, skill, an aspect of individuals' self-image or social role, or body of knowledge which individuals use. Hartle, cited by Delamare Le Deist & Winterton (2005, p. 29) argues that competency as 'a characteristic of an individual that has been shown to drive superior job performance' includes both visible 'competences' of 'knowledge and skills' and 'underlying elements of competences' (like 'traits and motives').

In studies on competence, particular attention is paid to core competences - the most important, both from the point of view of the individual and for the organization. Core competences of the organization are defined as 'the collective learning in the organisation, especially how to co-ordinate diverse production skills and integrate multiple streams of technologies' (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994). According to Herling and Provo (2000), core competences refer to the particular business expertise that an organization has developed. From a strategic perspective, the real potential of an organization is expressed in its core competences (ibid). From the point of view of the organization, core competences are considered to be what the organization knows best (know-how); and from the point of view of separate job positions, core competences are the most important skills for the tasks assigned to the position and role of the professional (Oleksyn, 2006, p.20). Outstanding level of key competences with a lower level of the other competences is better for the organization than the average level of all the competences required for a given position. The main component of an organization's competences is the competences of employees. Also important, though often ignored, are managerial competences. Oleksyn (2006) points out that competences are not the same for all managers. Depending on the organization and its functions, the structure of competences differ among production, projects or finance managers. Individual competency is commonly defined as a cluster of related factual knowledge, skills, experiences, attitudes, and value judgments directly related to one's job (Parry, 1998 cited by Herling & Provo, 2000). From this perspective, it can be assumed that individual or employee competence correlates with performance on the job, that it can be measured against well-accepted standards and that it can be improved with training and practice (Herling & Provo, 2000)

Delamare Le Deist & Winterton (2005) argue that 'a holistic typology is useful in understanding the combination of knowledge, skills and social competences that are necessary for particular occupations. The competences required of an occupation include both conceptual (cognitive, knowledge and understanding) and operational (functional, psycho-motor and applied skill) competences. The competences more associated with individual effectiveness are also both conceptual (meta-competence, including learning to learn) and operational (social competence, including behaviours and attitudes)'. Speed and changeability of the environment make risks and uncertainties permanently inscribed in the organization's actions. Therefore, it seems that meta-competences will become more and more useful. The holistic model of competence, represented as a tetrahedron, proposed by Delamare Le Deist & Winterton, reflects the unity of competence and the difficulty of separating cognitive, functional and social dimensions in practice. Meta-competence, as a key component of the model, is presented as an over-arching input that facilitates the acquisition of output competences at the base of the tetrahedron.

It is also important to distinguish generic and specific competences. Generic (also called universal) competences are those that are applicable across roles and organisations, whereas specific competences are those

particular to roles and organisations (Markus, Cooper-Thomas i Allpress, 2005).

4. Competences of public sector managers

Bowman, West, Berman & Wart (2004) argue that successful public manager must possess 'skills triangle', which comprises of three different types of competences: technical, leadership and ethical. Virtanen (2000) writes that we mostly discuss competences in relations to qualifications. The author draws attention to the fact that in today's public management qualifications are predominantly related to the doctrine of the New Public Management. He identifies five competence areas of public sector managers, which are: task competence, professional competence in subject area, professional competence in administration, political competence and ethical competence. Task competence seems to be the most concrete of all mentioned areas, because - as noted by the author - 'goals and means are given, and the task just has to be accomplished' (Virtanen, 2000, p. 335). Task competences also include all competences defined as skills or behavioral techniques (e.g. communication or data analysis). Professional competences (competences in subject area) are defined by Virtanen as competences either in substantive field of the line organization (e.g. social security) or in the specific task field in the techno-structure of the organization (e.g. HRM). Professional competences in the area of administration relate to execution of the policy given by politicians. Political competences are connected with values and power – the ideology and interests of a public manager set the value competences. Virtanen emphasizes that 'without political competence, public managers are not able to contribute to the politically acceptable outcomes, no matter how good the output is in terms of developing professional quality and performance' (2000, p. 336). The last but not least of the five competence areas are ethical competences. They refer to conforming to moral values and moral norms that prevail in culture. Without having ethical competence, public managers can not use their professional or political competences in right way. What is very important, according to Virtanen, every competence area identifies value competences and instrumental competences, whereas in the subject literature competences are mostly understood as technical or instrumental. This distinction seems to be crucial for defining competences of public sector managers. Value competences are here understood as commitments that have stabilized as relatively permanent attributes of individual action (which can include e.g. motivation, ideology, morality). It is therefore very important to include ethical competences in the model of competences of project managers working in public sector.

5. Project management competences

When we look at project competences, then it may be appropriate to look first at leadership styles. As we understand from our literature study, focus on various leadership styles led to the definition of competences in general and with respect to projects.

Müller & Turner (2007) present six modern leadership schools over the years. They are:

- Trait (1930s–1940s): Major idea: Effective leaders show common traits; leaders born not made. Example authors: Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991)
- Behavior or style (1940s-1950s): Main idea: Effective leaders adopt certain styles or behaviours;
 Leadership skills can be developed. Example authors: Blake & Mouton (1978) Tannenbaum & Schmidt (1958)
- Contingency (1960s–1970s): Main idea: What makes an effective leader depends on the situation. Example authors: Fiedler (1967), House (1971), Robbins (1991)
- Visionary or charismatic (1980s–1990s): Main idea depends on which of the two styles that are connected to this school transformational or transactional. For transformational: concern for relationships; for transactional: concern for process. Example author: Bass (1990)
- Emotional intelligence (2000s): Main idea: Emotional intelligence has a greater impact on performance than intellect. Example authors: Goleman et al. (2002)
- Competency (2000s): Main idea: Effective leaders exhibit certain competences, including traits, behaviors and styles Emotions, process, intellect Different profiles of competence better in different situations. Example authors: Dulewicz & Higgs (2003)

Let us now focus on the Competency school. Dulewics & Higgs (2003), based on their studies, present 15 competences that are categorized into 3 categories. They are:

- Intellectual competences (Critical analysis & judgment, Vision and imagination, Strategic perspective)
- Managerial competences (Engaging communication, Managing resources, Empowering, Developing, Achieving)
- Emotional competences (Self-awareness, Emotional resilience, Motivation, Sensitivity, Influence, Intuitiveness, Conscientiousness)

These leadership competences are identified for organizational change projects according to the authors. Muller & Turner (2010), by reflecting on the study conducted by Dulewics & Higgs (2003), suggest that these competences are applicable for other types of projects. In other words, we can consider these competences with respect to project management.

According to IPMA's competency model – called as IPMA Competence Baseline (ICB) – project manager's competences are described in three different ranges (IPMA, 2006):

- The technical competence range to describe the fundamental project management competence elements.
- The behavioral competence range to describe the personal project management competence elements.
- The contextual competence range to describe the project management competence elements related to the context of the project.

Furthermore, we see that ICB model encompasses the competences mentioned by Dulewics & Higgs (2003), and reflects the findings of Ingason & Jónasson (2009), at least to a certain extent.

6. Key competences of public sector project managers

A number of authors have discussed the different frameworks and their usefulness for building necessary competence within projects and thereby for project success – for instance (Morris et al 2006, Bartoska 2011, Madter et al 2012). For the purpose of this paper we choose IPMA's model of competence to build upon it a competence typology for public sector project manager – see Table 1. Within the framework of the IPMA's competency model we have distinguished three roles (Manager, Public Sector Manager and Project manager) and their corresponding key competences (divided into contextual, behavioral and technical competences). The framework is based on the scientific literature, as well as practical competency models review (e.g. "IPMA's Competence Baseline" or "Certified public manager competency model"). Some competences (i.e. leadership, creativity, personnel management) are embedded in the "portfolio" of competences necessary for all managers, regardless the sector in which they work. Therefore, we did not in our framework want to duplicate the set of presented competences. That is why we assume that both public manager and project manager must possess all the competences listed in the first part of Table 1 ("Manager"), and we do not replicate them in next parts of Table 1 ("Public Sector Manager" and "Project manager").

Table 1. Competence areas of Manager, Public Sector Manager and Project manager.

Contextual competences	Behavioral competences	Technical competences
	Manager	
 Permanent organization 	 Leadership 	Professional competence in subject area
 Business: competence on the branch / sector to which the organisation belongs 	 Engagement and motivation 	
 Systems, production & technology 	Self control	
 Personnel management 	 Assertiveness 	
• Health, security, safety and environment	 Relaxation 	
General finance	Openness	
General legal knowledge	 Creativity 	
	 Result orientation 	
	Efficiency	

	 Consultations Negotiations Conflicts & crises 	
	ReliabilityValues appreciationEthics	
	Public Sector Manager	I.
 Understanding of organizational mission, ethics and public good and being concerned with public trust Ability to analyze political support and opposition Exercise power, authority and influence appropriately to achieve office goals Keep current with laws, regulations, policies, trends Stakeholders analysis and management Collaboration with a variety of individuals and groups from both within and outside the office. Focus on partnering with multiple stakeholders: work to overcome barriers to partnering. Diversity awareness Professional competences in the area of administration relate to execution of the policy given by politicians Coalition building with understanding of community building and ability to establish collaborative relationships 	High standards of honesty and integrity, virtue Promoting ethical practices in all organizational activities. Accountability Motivation to serve public, including encouraging employees to believe in the spirit of public service and demonstrating a personal commitment to quality public service Change leadership	 Professional competence in public administration Ability to apply office policies in a consistent manner Inter-organizational learning competence: analyze and apply lessons learned from othe organizations Financial management including ability to demonstrate an understanding of the roles of the office, Division of Administration, and the legislature in the budget process Ability to take sound decisions on procurement of equipment, supplies or services and understanding of state and office procurement regulations Long range thinking: ability to recommend effective strategies . Ability to consider all factors when making decisions (e.g. legal aspects, political and organizational reality, media, special interests).
	Project Manager	
Project, Program and Portfolio orientation and implementation		 Project management success Interested parties Project requirements and objectives Risk and opportunity Quality Project organization Teamwork Problem resolution Project structures Scope and deliverables Time and project phases Resources Cost & finance Procurement & contract Changes Control & reports Information & documentation Communication Start up Close out

Ability to work under time pressure

Source: Own analysis based on: International Project Management Association (2006); North Carolina Office of State Personnel (2008); Wirick (2009).

Managerial competences are necessary for both, public manager's project manager's roles. These are general competences which are needed for a manager in every work environment. As it can be seen Table 1, a part of the competence areas for managers and project managers are mentioned in key words. Most of the keywords are self-explanatory. For further explanation of the keywords, ICB (IPMA, 2006) can be referred. There are also some specific competences that are desired from a public manager. Most of these competences are sector specific and not required in a business environment. What is really important is that these are not only technical competences that differ from sector to sector. Most of these competences are value oriented and come from the ethos of public sector.

Taking into consideration some specific competences that are necessary for project managers and public sector managers, along with some generic managerial competences, we have in Table 2 compiled the key competences. Table 2 may thus be seen as a proposition for a typology of competences for public sector project managers. In our opinion, this set of competences will build a portfolio of public sector project manager's skills, knowledge and attitudes.

Table 2: Competences of Public sector project manager.

Technical competences Contextual competences Behavioral competences Project management success Project, Program and Portfolio High standards of honesty and integrity, orientation and implementation Interested parties Stakeholders analysis and management Promoting ethical practices in all Project requirements and objectives organizational activities. Ability to analyze political support and Risk and opportunity opposition Accountability Quality Collaboration with a variety of Motivation to serve public, including Project organization individuals and groups from both within encouraging employees to believe in the and outside toffice spirit of public service and demonstrating Teamwork a personal commitment to quality public Problem resolution Execution of the policy given by service politicians Project structures Leadership: Ability to take decisions and Adequate understanding on legal and Scope and deliverables move the project forward towards its Time and project phases objective even under pressure from Understanding of organizational mission, different stakeholders Resources ethics and public good and being Engagement and motivation: Cost & finance concerned with public trust Self control Procurement & contract Exercise power, authority and influence Assertiveness: Ability to make decisions appropriately to achieve Changes office goals and and execute them firmly Control & reports Keep current with laws, regulations, Relaxation Information & documentation policies, trends Openness Communication Focus on partnering with multiple Creativity: Ability to think various, Start up stakeholders: work to overcome barriers possible future scenarios (challenges, to partnering. Close out opportunities, etc.) and to find creative Diversity awareness solutions Ability to work under time pressure Permanent organization Result orientation Ability to make right prioritization at right times. Efficiency: Among other things, ability to Business: competence on the branch / sector to which the organisation belongs deal with bureaucracy and red-tapes Ability to establish and implement reward systems that correspond Systems, production & technology Consultations effectively to performance.

- Personnel management
- Health, security, safety and environment
- General finance
- General legal knowledge
- Coalition building with understanding of community building and ability to establish collaborative relationships
- Negotiations
- Conflicts & crises
- Reliability integrety
- Values appreciation
- Ethics

- Ability to select project team members based on their expertise.
- Professional competence in public administration
- Ability to apply office policies in a consistent manner
- Inter-organizational learning competence: analyze and apply lessons learned from other organizations
- Financial management including ability to demonstrate an understanding of the roles of the office, Division of Administration, and the legislature in the budget process
- Ability to take sound decisions on procurement of equipment, supplies or services and understanding of state and office procurement regulations
- Long range thinking: ability to recommend effective strategies
- Ability to consider all factors when making decisions (e.g. legal aspects, political and organizational reality, media, special interests).

Source: Own analysis based on: International Project Management Association (2006); North Carolina Office of State Personnel (2008); Wirick (2009).

This set of competences combines the key skills, knowledge and attitudes that should be possessed by a successful Project manager, who is working in public sector. However, it should be noted, that even in public sector itself, there will most likely be quite some differences in competences required from the project manager. The competences will differ between e.g. public sector technical organizations and healthcare.

7. Limitations and future research

This study is a first attempt to create a typology of competences of public sector project managers, therefore there are some limitations in our presentation here. First, the study is only of conceptual character and should later on be enriched with empirical research. It is our belief that the results can help to further develop training programs and academic curricula tailored to the needs of public sector employers. Furthermore, we assume that if similar studies are made within private sector, then it would be possible to compare key competences of public sector project managers and of private sector project managers. We think that such comparisons will lead to transfer of project knowledge and experience between the two sectors, as well as improving private-public partnership projects.

References

Allison, G. T. (1986). Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? In J. C. Thomas Sergiovanni, Leadership and Organizational Culture. New Perspectives on Administrative Theory and Practice. (pp. 214-234). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision, Organ Dyn, 18 (3), pp. 19-31.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, S. J. (1978). The new managerial grid, Gulf, Houston (TX).

Bowman, J., West, J., Berman, E., & Wart, M. V. (2004). The Professional Edge: Competences in Public Service. New York: M.E.Sharpe. Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance. New York: Wiley.

Boyne, G. (2002). Public and Private Management. What's the Difference? Journal of Management Studies, 39(1), 97-122.

Bozeman, B., & Kingsley, G. (1998). Risk culture in public and private organizations. Public Administration Review, 109-118.

Chen, J. (1990). Confucius as a teacher, Foreign Language Press, Beijing (1990).

Collinson, D. (1998). Fifty major philosophers, Routledge, London.

Covey, S.R. (1992). Principle centred leadership, Fireside, New York.

Crawford, L. (2005). Senior management perceptions of project management competence, International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 23.

Deist, F. D., & Winterton, J. (2005). What is competence?. Human Resource Development International, 8(1), 27-46.

Dulewicz V. & Higgs M. J. (2003). Design of a new instrument to assess leadership dimensions and styles, Henley Working Paper Series HWP 0311. Henley-on-Thames, UK: Henley Management College.

Farnham, D., & Horton, J. (1996). Public managers and Private Managers: Towards a Professional Synthesis? In: J. H. D Farnham, New Public managers in Europe. Public Servants in Transition. London: MacMillan.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Ginnis, J. M. (2011). The young and restless; generation Y in the nonprofit workforce. Public Administration Quarterly, 342-362.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E.& McKee, A. (2002). The new leaders, Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge (MA).

Hal, R., Sanjay, P., & Barry, B. (1995). Research Note: Public and Private Managers' Perceptions of Red Tape. Public Administration Review, 55(6), 567-574.

Herling, R., & Provo, J. (2000). Knowledge, Competence, and Expertise in Organizations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 2000, 2(1), 1-7.

House, R. J. (1971): A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly (September), pp. 321-338

Ingason, H. T. & Jónasson, H. I. (2009). Contemporary knowledge and skill requirements in project management, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 2.

International Project Management Association. (2006). ICB - IPMA Competence Baseline, Version 3.0.

Kirkpatrick, S. S. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership traits do matter, Acad Manage Exec (Mar), pp. 44-60.

Markus, L. H., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., & Allpress, K. N. (2005). Confounded by Competences? An Evaluation of the Evolution and Use of Competency Models. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 34(2), 117-126.

Müller, R. & Turner, J. R. (2007). Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 25.

Müller, R. & Turner, R. (2010) Leadership competency profiles of successful project managers, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 28.

North Carolina Office of State Personel. (2008).CERTIFIED public manager competency model.[Online]. Available at: http://qa.performancesolutions.nc.gov/staffingInitiatives/successionPlanning/step3/docs/CPM_CompetencyModel.pdf (Accessed 2 June 2013).

Oleksyn T. (2006), Zarządzanie kompetencjami teoria i praktyka, Oficyna Ekonomiczna, Kraków...

Park, S. M., & Word, J. (2012). Driven to Service: Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation for Public and Nonprofit Managers. Public Personnel Management, 41(4), 705-734.

PMI (2002). Project manager competency development framework, Newton Square (NA): Project Management Institute.

Reichard, C. (1998). Education and Training for New Public Management. International Public Management Journal, 1(2), 177-194.

Robbins, S. P. (1997). Essentials of organizational behaviour, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Schneider, D., & Vaught, B. (1993). A Comparison of Job Satisfaction Between Public and Private Sector Managers. Public Administration Quarterly, 69-83.

Šiugždinienė, J. (2006). Competency Management in the Context of Public Management Reform. VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS, 26-33.

Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, K. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership style, Harvard Business Review (March-April).

Thomas, J. & Mengel, T. (2008). Preparing project managers to deal with complexity – Advanced project management education, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 26.

Virtanen, T. (2000). Changing competences of public sector managers: tensions in commitment. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(4), 333-341.

Vries, M. D., & Nemec, J. (2013). Public sector reform: an overview of recent literature and research on NPM and alternative paths. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 26(1), 4-16.

Wal, Z. V., Graaf, G. D., & Lasthuizen, K. (2008). What's Valued Most? Similarities And Differences Between The Organizational Values Of The Public And Private Sector. *Public Administration*, 86(2), 465-482.

Wirick D.W. (2009). Public-Sector Project Mangement. Meeting the Challanges and Achieving Results. Wiley, New Jersey.