Leadership Practices in Public Sector in Selected Countries:
An Integrative Literature Review

Siti Fardaniah Abdul Aziz
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Abu Daud Silong
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Nor Akmar Abdul Karim
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Hazliza Hassan
Universiti Putra Malaysia

This paper examines leadership practices in public sectors in 15 selected countries across the world. It utilizes secondary data on Government Effectiveness Scores in 2008 to indicate the leadership effectiveness. Then, an integrative literature review of 44 empirical studies published between 1992 and 2011 were selected from electronic databases to examine and compare the leadership practices. Findings revealed that there are some similarities and dissimilarities of leadership practices in public sectors across countries. The leadership traits theory is suggested to be the most effective being practiced while balancing gender inequality in public sector leadership has become the most challenging issue.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is defined as the capability of leader to "influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization…" (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004, p. 184). According to Nahavandi (2011), leadership practices can be considered as effective if there is successful group performance, followers' satisfaction, and a large-scale change in organization. This demonstrated that the Government Effectiveness Score (GES) by Kaufmann, Kraay and Mastruzzi (2009) can be used to demonstrate leadership effectiveness in public sector (Samaratunge, Alam & Teicher, 2008).

Leadership effectiveness in public sector is important because it determine the citizens' satisfaction and trust, and organizational reputation (Vigoda-Gadot, Shoham, Schwabsky & Ruvio, 2008). However, little attention has been put to compare leadership practices across countries (Dawson, Garvin-Kester, Vollmuth & Waglund, 2001). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to examine leadership practices in public sector across various countries. Findings can be used to determine the similarities, dissimilarities,

and implications of leadership practices in various countries. Consequently, public sector can compare the leadership practices used by those countries that exhibited high GES.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership effectiveness is determined by the characteristics of leader, situation, and followers; whether in general leadership practices (Yukl, 2006) or in public sector leadership practices (Wart, 2011). Among these three characteristics, research on leaders' and situational characteristics has received impressive attention because it is more rational to improve situational and leaders' characteristics as compared to controlling over a large number of followers characteristics (Gill, 2006). Situational characteristics include the culture and structure of leadership practices that usually can be changed, shaped and controlled (Yukl, 2006; Northouse, 2010), in which bureaucracy can be seen as the ultimate organizational structure in the worldwide public sector (Kaufman, 2001). To cater with the weaknesses of bureaucracy, most of public sectors worldwide have been trying to shift from traditional bureaucracy to the new public management or NPM; or also referred as public sector reform or PSR, and new progressive-era public administration or PPA, (Wallis, Dollery & McLoughlin, 2007). Meanwhile, leaders' characteristics can be seen through various leadership theories.

Wart (2003) explained that the history of leadership theories used in public sector can be seen through six eras: the Great Man, followed by Trait, Contingency, Transformational, Servant, and Multifaceted. During the Great Man eras, leadership practices were learnt through successful leaders, such as Napoleon and George Washington, in which it was believed that leaders are born. During the Traits eras, the characteristics of effective leaders were investigated, in which leadership practices were based on selecting leaders with appropriate traits, such as individual traits and skills. It was believed that leaders' characteristics can be developed. During the Contingency eras, leadership effectiveness is determined by the variables leaders must deal with, such as performance, follower, cultural and structural effect. During the Servant eras, public sector was attached with the ethical responsibilities to followers, stakeholder, and society. During the Transformational eras, the capabilities of leaders to create organizational changes are emphasized to produce effective leadership. Finally, since 1990s until today, there are multi-facet theories of leadership practices used in public sector.

Nonetheless, Abu Daud Silong (2009) explained that there are four major leadership theories; these include the Trait, Behavioural, Situational, and Integrative. Situational is similar to Contingency as explained by Wart (2003), while, Integrative includes the Transactional, Transformative, and Servant theories. Additionally, Behavioural theory emphasized on the approach of leaders, whether it is people-oriented, task-oriented, or collaborative styles. Abu Daud Silong (2009) also discussed that the challenges for future leadership are to provide ideal leadership roles and competencies, women leadership, and moral leadership.

Further, in determining whether leadership practices in public sector is effective, it is credible to compare with the GES (Samaratunge et al., 2008). The GES was investigated each year since 1996 as an effort to compare the "perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies" (Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi, 2010, p. 4). The GES can be interpreted based on the following scores: from -2.5 scores as very ineffective to 2.5 scores as very effective government services.

METHODOLOGY

To explain the leadership practices across countries, secondary data on leadership research on 15 countries from six major world continents were used. These countries were chosen based on the availability of published articles about leadership in public sector. Countries selected were Australia and New Zealand from the Australian continent; United States of America (USA) and Canada from the North American continent; Chile and Argentina from the South American continent; United Kingdom (UK),

Italy and Portugal from the European continent; Malaysia, Singapore, China and Indonesia from the Asian continent; and South Africa and Egypt from the African continent.

First, data of GES 2008 as produced by Kaufmann et al. (2009) was used to compare and reflect the leadership effectiveness across countries. Second, a comprehensive and integrative literature review as outlined by Torraco (2005) was used to explain leadership practices and implications to particular countries. Publications between the year of 1992 and 2011 that reported about leadership research in these 15 countries were selected as enclosure characteristics; an extensive database search in EBSCOHOST, Sage Publication, Emerald, Proquest, and Wiley InterScience using the keywords *leadership in public sector* was performed. The preliminary search hit 13562 articles; however, only 745 articles were related to leadership in public sector, in which studies specifically on the enclosure characteristics resulted in 44 final publications for review and inclusive in the research for this article.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings revealed that there are some similarities and dissimilarities of leadership practices in public sector across countries (See Table 1). According to secondary data from GES 2008, Singapore was found to demonstrate the highest level of leadership effectiveness, followed by Canada, Australia, New Zealand, UK, US, Chile, Malaysia, Portugal, South Africa, Italy, China, Argentina, Indonesia, and Egypt. Most of countries such as Australia and the North American regions had higher GES as compared to other continents in the world; while, the level of GES across different countries in Europe, South America, Asia, and Africa continents were not consistent. This has also demonstrated that leadership effectiveness in public sector for most of developed countries were higher as compared to developing, and undeveloped countries across these 15 countries.

On the other hand, findings from the integrative literature review revealed some similarities of leadership practices across these 15 countries. Firstly, public sector across countries has clearly used bureaucracy as the structure of organization (e.g., Huang & Yang, 2002; Kaufman, 2001; Haque, 2004). Secondly, countries with moderate to very effective GES have been practising NPM as their situational characteristics in leadership practices (e.g., Charlesworth, Cook & Crozier, 2003; Samaratunge et al., 2008; Currie, Humphreys, Ucbasaran & Mcmanus, 2008). However, most of countries with low to ineffective GES did not practice effective NPM. (Hyden, Court, & Mease, 2003; Antwi, Analoui & Nana-Agyekum, 2008; Lippi, Giannelli, Profeti & Citroni, 2008). Thirdly, cultural effect affected leadership practices in various countries (e.g., Hope, 2003; Pillay, 2010; Peters & Kabacoff, 2010) and this has led to multifaceted leadership practices across these 15 countries. Fourthly, most of countries are facing the same challenges to provide better leadership, such as providing better roles and competencies of leaders, balancing the gender inequality among leaders, and providing better NPM. Finally, most of countries were suggested to practice Traits theory as the ultimate leadership practices (e.g., Hopkins, O'Neil & Williams, 2007; Yasin, Gomes & Miller, 2009; Hamlina, Nassarb & Wahba, 2010).

Despite the similarities of leadership practices in various countries, there are also dissimilarities. It was shown that each country is based on different and unique leaders' characteristics, used specific NPM, and used different leadership practices. For example, in the Australian continent, leadership practices were based on multifaceted theories, in which the Traits theory was dominant as compared to other theories. In Australia, Perryer and Jordan (2005) indicated that supportive leadership among Federal Government increased organizational commitment, while Lindorff (2009) found that there were gender differences towards the perception of leadership effectiveness among officials involved as members of Australian Institute of Management. Wyse and Vilkinas (2004) found that leaders in public sector in Australia should act as vision setter, analyser, and task master. Some researchers such as Rindfleish (2002), North-Samardzic and Taksa (2011), and Collard (2001) stressed the existence of gender inequality, in which the ratio of women appointed as leaders in public sectors were much lower than men because of the masculine gender culture in the organization.

Meanwhile, in New Zealand, Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2003) found that the effect of leaders' characteristics on organizational effectiveness was higher as compared to cultural effects among the

members of National Institute of Management and the National Institute of Public Administration. Boston and Eichbaum (2005) explained that NPM in New Zealand was referred as PSR, and it was found to be very systematic and successful. Junor, Hampson and Smith (2009) stressed that PSR in New Zealand did not includes the strategy to achieve equality in gender proportion for the number of leaders in public sector. Hence, it is suggested that an approach to valuing a particular set of experience-based work process skills, wherever they are found, independently of educational qualifications and job status should be useful to close the gap of pay and employment inequality according to genders.

On the other hand, in North America such as in Canada, Javidan and Dastmalchian (1992) found that leadership effectiveness was related to attributes reflecting senior manager's mobilizer role; while, Meinhard and Foster (2003) suggested that collaborative leadership is essential to close the gender inequality gap in leadership in public sector. In USA, Wright and Pandey (2009) found that higher hierarchical authority structure will decrease transformational leadership among officials in various public sectors. Helton and Jackson (2007) found that systematic succession planning was very important in appointing leaders among the officials in The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania while Hopkins et al. (2007) found that emotional intelligence (EI) is a critical factor for effective leadership among school boards. Fernandez (2005) found that time spent on managing internal matters appears to contribute less to performance as compared to managing the external environment in Texas Education Agency. Pitts (2005) stressed the importance of empowerment in managing followers. Bronfenbrenner (2005) found that the campaign to promote gender equality in public sectors' proportion of leaders was not successful while Isaac (2011) and Bligh and Kohles (2008) stressed that women in public sectors continue to feel the effects of gender stereotypes and expectations in higher levels of public sector because of the masculine environment. Schraeder, Tears and Jordan (2005), and Pettibone (2007) found that public sector in USA should reinforce the importance of training and leading by example to ensure leadership effectiveness. These findings have shown that there are also multifaceted theories of leadership practices used in countries in the North American continent, in which, The Traits theory and the challenges of gender inequality were the dominant issues.

Nonetheless, in South America continent, only Chile had a moderate effective GES; however, most of countries, such as Argentina had ineffective GES. Consistently, Hyden et al. (2003) did a study to compare bureaucracy practices in 16 developing countries; findings indicated that the bureaucracy performance in Chile and Argentina's public sector was rated moderate by their officials, hence there is a need to better NPM and the use of ideal leadership theory.

Further, Europe was one of the continents that had inconsistent leadership effectiveness as demonstrated by GES 2008, in which UK had very effective GES, Portugal had moderate effective GES, and Italy had low effective GES. In UK, to practice better leadership practices, Collinson and Collinson (2009) suggested blended leadership practices. Currie et al. (2008) found that entrepreneur leadership was important in British NHS Trust Hospitals, secondary schools, and further education (FE) colleges. Hamlina et al. (2010) suggested the 23 most effective leadership practices was observed in British NHS Trust Hospitals. On the other hand, Pedersen and Hartley (2008) suggested some leaders' dynamic behaviours, Worrall and Ruskin (2008) suggested leadership participation, Kakabadse, Kakabadse and Myers (1996) suggested some situational characteristics since the concept of leadership effectiveness in National Health Service (NHS) Trust in UK was low as compared to private sector. Peters and Kabacoff (2010) stressed the importance of cultural effect on leadership practices in public sector in UK while Charlesworth et al. (2003) stressed that the NPM in UK had positive effect on leadership effectiveness and should be continuous. In addition, some of researchers such as Ford (2006) and McTavish and Miller (2009) found that the main reason for the small number of women leaders in UK's public sector was caused by the masculine environment in public sector.

Nonetheless, in Italy Lippi's et al. (2008) found that leadership practices in Water Sanitation Agency in Italy were highly influenced by the government's politician. Hence, it was suggested that there is a need to reduce politician domination in the public sector. It can be seen that Contingency theory was the dominant theory of leadership practices in Italy. In addition, Murgia and Poggio (2011) found that the gender inequality in Italian public sector leadership was caused by cultural effects, such as the work/life

balance measures and opportunities. Nevertheless, GES demonstrated moderate effective leadership practices in Portugal. This showed that the NPM in Portugal can be improved. Consistently, based on survey among 60 public sectors in Portugal, Yasin et al. (2009) demonstrated that the Traits theory is useful to improve NPM by emphasizing the leaders' competencies, such as technical and nontechnical competencies. These demonstrated that the multi-faceted theory of leadership was practiced in Europe.

The Asian continent also had inconsistent GES scores. The GES 2008 demonstrated that leadership effectiveness as very effective in Singapore, moderately effective in Malaysia, lowly effective in China, and ineffective in Indonesia. In Malaysia, Zamhury, Hashim and Ahmad (2009) found that leadership effectiveness did not affect citizen's satisfaction in five selected public sectors; Samaratunge et al. (2008) and Ahmad (1997) stressed that bureaucracy structure with NPM in Malaysia was proven effective; Abu Daud Silong et al. (2008) found that the leadership in Public Service Department in Malaysia has undergone a changing roles and competencies of leadership, in which three major roles and 15 major competencies were identified. Zaharah Hassan and Abu Daud Silong (2008) stressed that barriers for women advancement in Malaysia include the traditional believes, stereotype of women's weaknesses, masculine model of leadership, women's attitudes, organizational structure, and cultural effects; hence, some improvement programs were suggested to improve women leadership. In Singapore, Samaratunge et al. (2008) and Haque (2004) stressed that the leadership practices and NPM was proven successful but can still be improved. In Indonesia, Hyden et al. (2003) found that officials in Indonesia rated the bureaucracy performance as moderate. In China, Han, Kakabadse and Kakabadse (2010) found similar leadership practices between western's leadership theory and application in 22 public sectors in China. Meanwhile, Hyden et al. (2003) found that officials in China rated the bureaucracy performance as moderate. These have shown the multifaceted of leadership practices, gender inequality for the number of leaders in public sector, and particular NPM carried out by various countries in the Asian continent.

In the African continent, almost all sub-continents, such as North Africa had consistent and negative GES scores, such as Egypt. However, South Africa had low effective leadership practices, but the most effective as compared to other countries in Africa continent. In Egypt, Hamlina et al. (2010) suggested the 23 most effective leadership practices in a public sector in the country; while, Burke and El-Kot (2011) found that less women was pointed as leaders in public sectors. Women were treated unfairly and hence, they were less satisfied with their careers, less work engaged, and reported higher levels of both exhaustion and psychosomatic symptoms. In South Africa, Pillay (2010) found that leaders' characteristic was the most influential factor for leadership effectiveness in the Health Services Management while, Meyer (2007) found that South Africa's public sector needs to shift to better NPM. These have shown that the Traits theory was suggested to be the most ideal leadership practices in Egypt and South Africa as compared to other theories, although there are multifaceted theories of leadership practiced by the public sector. In addition, gender inequalities for the number of leaders in public sectors continue to become a challenging issue.

Taken together, GES 2008 was very useful to demonstrate the leadership effectiveness in public sector across 15 countries. Using GES 2008, the integrative literature review revealed the similarities, dissimilarities, and implications of leadership practices across countries.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research is suggested to study further the situational and leader's characteristics used by the countries with effective leadership so that it can be use as a model. To improve situational characteristic, public sector's management is suggested to analyse and adapt the NPM characteristics that is proven successful especially in the countries that had most effective leadership, such as Singapore, New Zealand, UK, and USA. As a guideline, Kaufman (2001) has suggested some NPM characteristics as an ideal leadership practices, this includes:

(1) Diminishing the influence of politicians and political parties over appointments to public positions, over promotions, and other rewards within the public sector, and over the decision of public officers and employees.

(2) Strengthening executive leadership through leadership characteristics.

(3) Decentralizing administration by giving field officers greater authority to take action on their own, free of the need for prior approval by higher echelons, reduce delays and promote sounder administrative actions.

(4) Reorganizing constituent structure by eliminating overlapping and duplication among organizations, such as facilities coordination and the formation of comprehensive programs by putting similar and related functions under one administrative roof, and improves supervision by narrowing executives' span of control.

(5) Changing the internal bureaucratic environment by stimulating market (focus on customer satisfaction), reducing paperwork, reducing secrecy, raising managerial consciousness, democratizing administration, and training ethics.

Further, although situational characteristic is very important in determining leadership practices in various countries (Schraeder et al., 2005; Peters & Kabacoff, 2010), however, leaders' characteristic is more important (Hope, 2003; Wright & Pandey, 2009; Pillay, 2010). This is consistent with the findings in this study, in which Contingency theory of leadership was dominant in countries with low to ineffective GES, such as Italy, Indonesia, and Egypt. However, Traits theory was dominant in most of countries with very effective GES, such as New Zealand, Australia, US, and UK. In fact, Traits theory or ideal leaders' characteristic is also suggested to be the ultimate leadership practices in various countries. As a guideline, Abu Daud Silong, Madinah Mohamad, Zaharah Hassan, and Ismi Ariff (2008, p.42-44) have suggested the three major roles and 15 suggested competencies for leaders in public sector. The major roles are engaging others in the work process, to focus on performance and excellence, and to focus on ethics and values. The suggested competencies are the abilities related to communication, teamwork, problem-solving, relational skills, conflict resolutions, project management, public relation, interpersonal skills, professionalism, visioning process and strategic thinking, technical specialized skills, change management, research skills, and leadership training, coaching, and developing subordinates. While, Hamlina et al. (2010, p.53-56) have suggested the 23 most effective leadership practices as follows:

(1) Encourage training and development for staffs.

(2) Actively helps staff acquire new knowledge, develop new skills and grow within their career.

(3) Gives staff and teams the flexibility to distribute and perform work in the way they consider is best'

(4) Values and respects staff who work hard.

(5) Listens to staff, is open to and respectful of their views, and is willing to accept the opinions of others.

(6) Quickly helps and supports every member of staff, particularly in highly loaded working periods or when there is a problem or emergency.

(7) Provides trusted and dependable help and support (including psychological support) to staff who are under stress, whether caused by work related difficulties and problems, or by a personal situation.

(8) Is approachable, and takes time to know staff at a personal and social level, though retaining some distance.

(9) Sets SMART goals, plans and metrics (measurement) for staff.

(10) Develops a sense of trust with staff (e.g. keeps promises; shares information; is honest in his dealings with people).

(11) Is good at controlling, resolving problems, and achieving results with minimum loss of time.

(12) Prepares for meetings effectively.

(13) Takes care of all his staff and treats them as a 'family'.

(14) Gives staff the opportunity to express themselves, including voicing their ideas, suggestions or complaints.

(15) Is good at planning, organizing and decision making.

(16) Creates a good, friendly, happy and familiar working environment.

(17) Announces (and praises) the good work of their staff in meetings and actively promotes good news stories emanating from his department.

(18) Divides and distributes work and responsibilities according to staff abilities, and in a fair, equitable and unbiased way.

(19) Remains calm and in control of his emotions when faced with hard situations, and does not lose his temper.

(20) Manages his staff in a considerate, courtly and sympathetic manner.

(21) Co-operates with employees by organizing work in a way to make things easier for them.

(22) Actively seeks and takes action to obtain high standards of performance and productivity from his staff and department

(23) Treats staff fairly, applies rules equally to everyone without exceptions, and is fair and strict in applying rewarding systems

Further, balancing gender inequality for public sectors' leaders across various countries has become a challenging issue in leadership practices. Zaharah Hassan and Abu Daud Silong (2008) suggested that some program can be carried out by public sector to overcome the barrier of career advancement for women leaders. This includes awareness campaign for political understanding and women leadership, drafts strategy to help women's problem in career advancement, training and development for women leaders, changing the masculine culture in organization, and matching the women's needs and leadership.

CONCLUSION

Effective leadership practices are very important in public sector. However, the comparison of leadership practices across countries has received little attention. Therefore, the purpose of this paper was to explain about leadership practices in public sector across countries. Secondary data on GES 2008 has demonstrated that leadership practices were more effective in most of developed countries as compared to developing and undeveloped countries. The integrative literature review revealed that there are similarities and dissimilarities of leadership practices in public sector across countries. The similarities include the uses of bureaucracy as organizational structure, the effect of culture, the utilization of multifaceted leadership practices, and the shift to new public management (NPM). Most countries are facing the same challenges to provide better leadership, such as providing better roles and competencies of leaders, balancing the gender inequality among leaders, and providing better NPM. The dissimilarities include the different and unique leaders' characteristics, specific NPM, and the uses of different leadership practices. Most of the countries in the Australian and North American continents had very effective leadership practices, while countries in other continents had inconsistent levels of leadership effectiveness. As an implication of the study, Traits theory is suggested to be the ultimate leadership practices since countries with effective leadership demonstrated the dominant use of the Traits theory. Most of the countries with lower level of leadership effectiveness demonstrated the dominant use of Contingency theory and were suggested to use Traits theory. Future research is suggested to further study

the NPM, and situational and leader's characteristics used by the countries with effective leadership model.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES ACROSS VARIOUS COUNTRIES

World Continent	No.	Countries	GES 2008	Studies/ Researches	Leadership practices
Australia	1	Australia	1.9 (very effective)	Perryer & Jordan (2005); Lindorff (2009); Wyse & Vilkinas (2004); Rindfleish (2002); North-Samardzic & Taksa (2011); Collard (2001)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Servant, Trait, and Contingency.
	2	New Zealand	1.76 (very effective)	Parry & Proctor-Thomson (2003); Boston & Eichbaum, (2005); Junor et al. (2009)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Trait and Contingency, but Trait is more dominant.
North America	3	Canada	1.93 (very effective)	Javidan & Dastmalchian (1992); Meinhard & Foster (2003)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Behavioural.
	4	United States of America	1.65 (very effective)	Wright & Pandey (2009); Pettibone (2007); Helton & Jackson (2007); Schraeder et al. (2005); Fernandez (2005); Hopkins et al. (2007); Pitts (2005); Bronfenbrenner (2005); Bligh & Kohles (2008); Isaac (2011)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Great Man, Transformational, Servant, Contingency, Trait, and Behavioural.
South America	5	Chile	1.24 (moderate effective)	Hyden et al. (2003)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics.
	6	Argentina	-0.18 (ineffective)	Hyden et al. (2003)	Use bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics.

(Source: Authors)

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

World Continent	No.	Countries	GES 2008	Studies/ Researches	Leadership practices
Europe	7	United Kingdom	1.74 (very effective)	Currie et al. (2008); Hamlina et al. (2010); Pedersen & Hartley (2008); Worrall & Ruskin (2008); Kakabadse et al. (1996); Peters & Kabacoff (2010); Charlesworth et al. (2003); Collinson & Collinson (2009); Ford (2006); McTavish & Miller (2009)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Transformational, Servant, Contingency, and Trait.
Europe	8	Italy	0.39 (low effective)	Lippi et al. (2008)	Use bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, in which Contingency is more dominant.
	9	Portugal	1.05 (moderate effective)	Yasin et al. (2009)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Contingency, and is suggested to use Trait as the ultimate leadership practices.
Asia	10	Singapore (South East Asia)	2.53 (very effective)	Samaratunge et al. (2008); Haque (2004)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics.
	11	Malaysia (South East Asia)	1.13 (moderate effective)	Zamhury et al. (2009); Samaratunge et al. (2008); Ahmad (1997); Zaharah Hassan & Abu Daud Silong (2008); Abu Daud Silong (2008)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Behavioural.

(Source: Authors)

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

World Continent	No.	Countries	GES 2008	Studies/ Researches	Leadership practices
Asia	12	China (East Asia)	0.24 (low effective)	Han et al. (2010); Hyden et al. (2003)	Use bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics.
	13	Indonesia (South East Asia)	-0.29 (ineffective)	Hyden et al. (2003)	Use bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics.
Africa	14	Egypt (Southwest Asia)	-0.37 (ineffective)	Hamlina et al. (2010); Burke & El-Kot, G. (2011)	Use bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Contingency, and is suggested to use Trait as the ultimate leadership practices.
	15	South Africa	0.75 (low effective)	Pillay (2010); Meyer (2007)	Use NPM with bureaucracy as situational characteristics, and multifaceted leaders' characteristics, such as Contingency, and is suggested to use Trait as the ultimate leadership practices.

(Source: Authors)

REFERENCES

Abu Daud Silong (2009). *Leadership theories, research, & practices: Framing future leadership thinking. Inaugural Lecture, 16 January 2009*. Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Abu Daud Silong, Madinah Mohamad, Zaharah Hassan, and Ismi Ariff (2008). Changing roles and competencies of effective public sector leadership. *Jurnal Pengurusan Awam,* 7(1), 27-46.

Ahmad, A. S. (1997). *Governance: Promoting sound development management.* Paper presented at The 30th Annual Meeting of the ADB Board of Governors, Fukuoka.

Antwi, K. B., Analoui, F., & Nana-Agyekum. (2008). Public sector reform in sub-Saharan Africa: What can be learnt from the civil service performance improvement programme in Ghana? *Public Administration and Development,* 28, 253-264.

Bligh, M. C., & Kohles, J. C. (2008). Negotiating gender role expectations: Rhetorical leadership and women in the US Senate. *Leadership,* 4(4), 381-402.

Boston, J., & Eichbaum, C. (2005, 18-19 November). *State sector reform and renewal in New Zealand: Lessons for governance.* Paper presented at the Repositioning of Public Governance - Global Experiences and Challenges, Taipei.

Bronfenbrenner, K. (2005). Organizing women: The nature and process of union-organizing efforts among U.S. women workers since the mid-1990s. *Work and Occupations, 32*(4), 441-463.

Burke, R. J., & El-Kot, G. (2011). Gender similarities in work and well-being outcomes among managers and professionals in Egypt. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 3*(1), 56-74.

Charlesworth, K., Cook, P., & Crozier, G. (2003). Leading change in public sector: Making the difference *Management Services,* November, 12-15.

Collard, J. L. (2001). Leadership and gender: An Australian perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 29*(3), 343–355.

Collinson, D., & Collinson, M. (2009). 'Blended leadership': Employee perspectives on effective leadership in the UK further education sector. *Leadership, 5*(3), 365–380.

Currie, G., Humphreys, M., Ucbasaran, D., & Mcmanus, S. (2008). Entrepreneurial leadership in the English public sector: Paradox or possibility? *Public Administration, 86*(4), 987-1008.

Dawson, M., Garvin-Kester, B., Vollmuth, J., & Waglund, M. (2001). *Public sector leadership for the 21st century*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Fernandez, S. (2005). Developing and testing an integrative framework of public sector leadership: Evidence from the public education arena. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 15*(2), 197–217.

Ford, J. (2006). Discourses of leadership: Gender, identity and contradiction in a UK public sector organization. *Leadership, 2*(1), 77-99.

Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and practice of leadership*. City Road, London: SAGE Publications.

Hamlina, R. G., Nassarb, M., & Wahba, K. (2010). Behavioural criteria of managerial and leadership effectiveness within Egyptian and British public sector hospitals: An empirical case study and multi-case/cross-nation comparative analysis. *Human Resource Development International, 13*(1), 45-64.

Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant leadership in the people's Republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(3), 265-281.

Haque, M. S. (2004). Governance and bureaucracy in Singapore: Contemporary reforms and implications. *International Political Science Review, 25*(2), 227-240.

Helton, K. A., & Jackson, R. D. (2007). Navigating Pennsylvania's dynamic workforce: Succession planning in a complex environment. *Public Personnel Management, 36*(4), 335-347.

Hope, K. R. (2003). Employee perceptions of leadership and performance management in the Botswana public service. *Public Personnel Management, 32*(2), 301-311.

Hopkins, M. H., O'Neil, D. A., & Williams, H. W. (2007). Emotional intelligence and board governance: Leadership lessons from the public sector. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 22(7), 683-700.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Huang, Y., & Yang, D. L. (2002, July 15-16). *Bureaucratic capacity and state-society relations in China.* Paper presented at the International Conference of Political Science and China in Transition, Beijing, China.

Hyden, G., Court, J., Mease, K. (2003). The bureaucracy and governance in 16 developing countries. *World Governance Survey Discussion, Paper 7*(July), 1-27.

Isaac, C. A. (2011). Women leaders: The social world of health care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management Services,* 25(2), 159-175.

Javidan, M., & Dastmalchian, A. (1992). *The relationships of senior management attributes and performance in public sector.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
Junor, A., Hampson, I., & Smith, M. (2009). Valuing skills: Helping mainstream gender equity in the New Zealand State Sector. *Public Policy and Administration,* 24(2), 195–211.

Kakabadse, A. K., Kakabadse, N. K., & Myers, A. (1996). Leadership and the public sector: An internationally comparative benchmarking analysis. *Public Administration and Development,* 16, 377-396.

Kaufman, H. (2001). Major players: Bureaucracies in American Government. *Public Administration Review,* 21(1), 18-42.

Kaufmann, K., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2009). *Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators 1996–2008.* Washington DC: World Bank Development Research Group.

Kaufmann, K., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and analytical issues.* Washington DC: World Bank Development Research Group.

Lindorff, M. (2009). We're not all happy yet: Attitudes to work, leadership, and high performance work practices among managers in the public sector. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration,* 68(4), 429-445.

Lippi, A., Giannelli, N., Profeti, S., & Citroni, G. (2008). Adapting public–private governance to the local context: The case of water and sanitation services in Italy. *Public Management Review,* 10(5), 619-640.

McTavish, D., & Miller, K. (2009). Gender balance in leadership? Reform and modernization in the UK Further Education Sector. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 37(3), 350–365.

Meinhard, A. G., & Foster, M. K. (2003). Differences in the response of women's voluntary organizations to shifts in Canadian public policy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 32(3), 366-396.

Meyer, M. (2007). Bureaucracy: How it kills your stakeholders and ultimately your organisation. *Management Today,* April 1-7.

Murgia, A., & Poggio, B. (2011). Stories of work/life transitions from the Italian public sector. *Equality Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal of Business & Management,* 30(1), 8-21.

Nahavandi, A. (2011). *The art and science of leadership.* Canada: Pearson Education.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

North-Samardzic, A., & Taksa, L. (2011). The impact of gender culture on women's career trajectories: An Australian case study. *Equality Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal of Business & Management,* 30(2), 196-216.

Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2003). Leadership, culture and performance: The case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management,* 3(4), 376-399.

Pedersen, D., & Hartley, J. (2008). The changing context of public leadership and management: Implications for roles and dynamics. *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* 21(4), 327-339.

Perryer, C., & Jordan, C. (2005). The influence of leader behaviors on organizational commitment: A study in the Australian public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration,* 28(379-396).

Peters, H., & Kabacoff, R. (2010). Global or local: The impact of country culture on leadership style in Europe [Electronic Version]. *Research report: Leadership & culture*, 1-8. Retrieved 1 June 2011, from http://www.mrg.com/

Pettibone, C. (2007). Public service leadership: Lessons from the front lines. *Public Manager,* 36(3).

Pillay, R. (2010). The skills gap in hospital management: A comparative analysis of hospital managers in the public and private sectors in South Africa. *Health Services Management Research,* 23, 30-36.

Pitts, D. W. (2005). Leadership, empowerment, and public organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 25(1), 5-28.

Rindfleish, J. (2002). Senior management women and gender equity: A comparison of public and private sector women in Australia. *Equal Opportunities International,* 21(7), 37-55.

Samaratunge, R., Alam, Q., & Teicher, J. (2008). Public sector reforms and accountability: The case of South and Southeast Asia. *Public Management Review,* 10(1), 101 - 126.

Schraeder, M., Tears, R. S., & Jordan, M. H. (2005). Organizational culture in public sector organizations: Promoting change through training and leading by example. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 26(6), 492-502.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review,* 4(3), 356-367.

Vigoda-Gadot, E., Shoham, A., Schwabsky, N., & Ruvio, A. (2008). Public sector innovation for Europe: A multinational eight-country exploration of citizens' perspectives. *Public Administration,* 86(2), 307-329.

Wallis, J. L., Dollery, B., & McLoughlin, L. (2007). *Reform and leadership in the public sector: A political economy approach*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Wart, M. V. (2003). Public-sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review, 63*(2), 214-228.

Wart, M. V. (2011). *Dynamics of Leadership in Public Service: Theory and Practice* (2 ed.). Armonk: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Worrall, R., & Ruskin, A. (2008). *Co-creating public service leadership development in a new era of collaboration.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the European Conference on Management.

Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 20*, 75-89.

Wyse, A., & Vilkinas, T. (2004). Executive leadership roles in the Australian Public Service. *Women in Management Review, 19*(4), 205-211.

Yasin, M. M., Gomes, C. F., & Miller, P. E. (2009). Characteristics of Portuguese public-sector project managers: Toward closing the effectiveness gap. *Project Management Journal, 40*(3), 47-55.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6 ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Zaharah Hassan and Abu Daud Silong (2008). Kepimpinan wanita: Halangan dan strategi pengupayaan. *INTAN Management Journal, 9*(2), 31-49.

Zamhury, N., Hashim, R., & Ahmad, J. (2009). Towards better public sector management: A case of Malaysia. *International Journal of Global Management Studies Quarterly, 1*(2), 64-74.