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Abstract. The article discusses the issue of managing people in organisations, with particular reference to the Polish Police. As the authors note, since the political changes in 1989 and the enactment of the Police Act, there has been an increased interest in improving leadership effectiveness in all types of organisations responsible for security. Areas of particular interest have become leadership, flexibility of behaviour related to the dynamically changing environment and leadership styles. In doing so, there has been a growing interest in leadership theories that could be applied to managerial practice. The theoretical models offered to managers, while not being ready-made models of behaviour, should be a helpful tool when assessing situations and making appropriate decisions. The article describes the models and determinants of managerial decision-making. The results of studies conducted in 1994–1996, 2013 and 2021–2022, based on the conditional model of managerial effectiveness developed in 1964 by F.E. Fiedler, are presented and compared.
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Introduction

Since the political changes in 1989 and the enactment of the Police Act, there has been an increased interest in improving leadership effectiveness in all types of security-related organisations. Areas that have attracted particular attention include leadership, flexibility in dealing with a dynamically changing environment, and leadership styles. There has also been an increased interest in leadership theories that could be applied in managerial practice. The theoretical models offered to the managerial staff, although they have never been and should not be seen as ready-made patterns of behaviour, should nevertheless assist in proper situational assessment and making appropriate decisions.

Main part

The police operate in an environment characterised by specific regional, economic, political, cultural, and technological features. These factors create particular operating conditions, present various threats to be eliminated by the police, and
opportunities that they should seize to improve their situation. This environment is referred to as the surroundings and is considered as a set of conditions and factors that determine the success or failure in achieving the organisation’s goals. Like any organisation, in order to function efficiently, the police institution must constantly adapt its organisational structure and internal management system to the changing conditions shaping the surrounding reality. The society that the police serve requires continuous improvement from this organisation so that it can effectively fulfil its assigned tasks and duties.\(^1\)

The environment always imposes greater or lesser limitations on the police, exerting specific pressures, creating threats or opportunities that force or encourage them to take certain actions and implement changes. And every organisation, in order to survive and thrive, must accept and serve its environment. It can be said that the environment constantly disrupts the police organisation, creating simultaneous uncertainty and complexity. Therefore, if the police want to function effectively within their environment, they must adapt to the changes occurring within it. They must direct their actions towards adaptation and shaping their performance in connection with imagination and flexibility.

Within the organisational environment (including the police), the following elements are usually distinguished:\(^2\)

1. **Economic environment** — which consists of: economic model, national wealth, economic conditions, rate of economic growth, exchange rates, inflation rate, consumption rate, interest rate, unemployment rate, level of national debt, savings rate, and level of privatisation. Each of these indicators (the list of which is non-exhaustive) has a decisive impact on the functioning of the organisation and the construction of its strategy.

2. **Technological environment** — which includes both physical technological products and the resources of technical and technological knowledge that an organisation can take advantage of. The technological environment is changing at an increasingly rapid pace, as evidenced by the continuous reduction in the time between invention and market introduction. Technological changes can result in the downfall of certain organisations and the emergence of new ones overnight; this creates both opportunities and threats from the environment.

3. **Educational environment** — which includes factors such as the overall level of education in a society or region, the degree of specialisation development, the system of education and professional development, the proportion of individuals with higher and secondary education in the population, accessibility to various forms of knowledge acquisition, etc. Changes in this environment, especially in the population, bring about specific consequences not only for the construction of the overall economic strategy but also for the formulation of organisational strategies.

4. **Social (sociological) environment** — encompassing the class and layered structure of society, social mobility, entrepreneurship, perception of social


roles (e.g., the position of women in society), level of social security, professional and consumer organisations, and social activities of the state (e.g., in the field of unemployment prevention).

5. **Cultural environment** — which is made up of the cultural and historical traditions of a society, the dominant system of values, ethical and moral norms, behavioural patterns, and changes in the value system. The cultural environment exerts a fundamental influence on the philosophy and practice of management, the relationship between individuals and their work, customers, society, and natural resources. It also influences methods of motivation, patterns of communication among people, and leadership styles.

6. **Legal environment** — encompassing the legal system in force, the level of detail in legal norms, especially those relating to the establishment and functioning of organisations, the system of dispute resolution through legal means, etc. Legal factors have a significant impact on the level of opportunities and threats for an organisation because changes in the legal system must be immediately taken into account in the strategic planning process in the form of reliable information.

7. **Political environment** — which consists of the existing political system, the manner in which power is exercised, the extent of interference of political factors in economic affairs, personnel policies, etc. Political changes at the top levels of power that result in shifting the pace of systemic transformations, or changes in the focus as regards economic and social policies are crucial for formulating organisations’ strategies and must be considered in determining their future.

8. **Demographic environment** — which consists of the structure of a society by gender and age, labour resources and mobility, population distribution in urban and rural areas, retirement age limits, etc. Demographic factors are of great importance to all organisations, as they need to align their personnel strategies with the overall strategy. Changes in the labour force and its structure resulting from factors such as a lower retirement age, education reform, or demographic decline can bring about significant changes in areas such as employee selection, training and development, staff interrelationships, and compensation. They can even significantly hinder the achievement of full employee engagement in the accomplishment of tasks set by the organisation.

9. **Infrastructural environment** — which includes infrastructure facilities and service institutions in the fields of transportation, communication, energetics, healthcare, and other necessary elements for the proper functioning of society (local communities) and productive economic activities. Infrastructure fundamentally determines the efficiency of resource utilisation within an organisation.

10. **Ecological environment** — which encompasses the natural resources and their availability, soil quality, hydrological system, climate, as well as the degree of pollution and environmental degradation. In the modern economy, environmental protection has become a subject of state policy. This requires organisations to comply with existing rules and norms, introduce innovative measures aimed at reducing the amount of pollution affecting the environment, and implement environmentally friendly solutions.
11. **International environment** — which mainly refers to norms, rules of the game, and institutional solutions adopted in other countries that remove barriers such as prohibitions, restrictions, legal barriers, customs, and others. The influence of the international environment is significant, and it should be remembered that all its elements can present opportunities or threats to an organisation, the awareness of which should accompany the formulation of its strategy, for example.

Research on managerial behaviours and their relationship to effectiveness, based on multivariate analysis, has resulted in the development of many useful behavioural theories of management. To give an example, a research project conducted at Michigan State University aimed at identifying characteristics correlated with managerial effectiveness led to the identification of two main dimensions of management:

- **employee-oriented (people-oriented) approach,**
- **results-oriented approach.**

It was also possible to identify differences in the nature of conduct exhibited by more and less effective managers. As a result, it became possible for R. Blake and J. Mouton to expand the two-dimensional behavioural concept (known as the managerial grid), which they had created. For the dimensions defining managerial behaviour, they adopted the ‘people-oriented’ (concern for individuals) and ‘task-oriented’ (concern for results) approaches. However, leadership style is not simply a sum of managers’ orientations towards people or tasks, but rather their resultant. These orientations cannot be interpreted in isolation. The concept of ‘orientation towards…’ refers to the manager’s mode of action, not a measurable outcome of their activities. A task-oriented (results-oriented) approach can manifest itself not only in the quality of decision-making but also in the form of creative ideas concerning highly useful processes and methods of production or service provision, increasing the quality, conscientiousness, and efficiency of work. While at the lowest level of the organisation, task orientation can manifest itself in quantifiable elements of activity, at higher levels of the organisation, it is manifested through the consolidation of a specific course of action, or in the directions set by the organisation’s main development programmes. On the other hand, a people-oriented approach is manifested through improving working conditions, creating a fair system and structure of remuneration. Such an orientation increases employees’ sense of security, self-confidence, and the ability to establish positive social relationships. As a result, there will always be an increase in employees’ level of engagement in accomplishing the tasks for which they are responsible.

The graphical interpretation of management styles according to this concept is a managerial grid, on which the authors defined the intensity of each of the two variables on a scale from 1 to 9. The management style employed by each manager can be determined by indicating the coordinates of both variables. In theory, there are 81 possible variations of the management style. However, in practice, only five styles are considered as the most distinctive ones.

---

Fig. 1. Management grid
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Concern for results

STYLE 9.1 (autocratic style) shows a high concern for results and a low concern for people. A manager with these characteristics could be referred to as an ‘extreme autocrat’. Such a manager is solely focused on work results and tasks, showing no interest in their performers. His/her main concern is to issue orders to subordinates early enough, specifying how, when, and what they need to do in order to achieve the goals. This type of manager disregards interpersonal relationships within their subordinate team. They typically do not have the habit of informing subordinates about the reasons behind organisational changes. They also do nothing to help their subordinates acquire knowledge or improve themselves. Individuals who employ this leadership style place great importance on making decisions that they can implement. They strive to push their views, beliefs, and ideas, regardless of what others think or how popular these opinions are among their colleagues. In cases of conflicts, autocratic managers try to ignore them or resolve them in a top-down, autocratic manner. If they encounter resistance, they become defensive and present counterarguments to defend their position. They can also be hostile and ‘rush’ themselves and others to work. This type of manager can be called a ‘task-oriented manager’.

STYLE 1.9 (liberal style) entails a high emphasis on people and a low emphasis on work. Managers with this leadership style are primarily interested in creating ‘happy and harmonious work teams’, even at the expense of their institution. This attitude can stem from two basic assumptions. The first is when performance requirements contradict people’s needs, and the second is when we assume that only a satisfied employee is productive. Managers with this approach prefer to accept the opinions and ideas of their colleagues instead of imposing their own views and beliefs, and they devote most of their energy to preventing any conflicts. If conflicts arise despite their efforts, they take actions to mitigate them and encourage agreement and further collaboration. Such managers believe that any tensions...
lead to conflicts and ‘friction’; therefore, they typically display a warm and friendly attitude towards their employees during work. They rarely demand anything from their employees, but they frequently provide assistance wherever and whenever it is needed. An organisation dominated by this leadership style wants to create the impression that every employee is a member of a large, happy family, and every manager is a ‘good father’. They excessively emphasise the importance of a friendly atmosphere, a pleasant environment, and unusually widespread cooperation. Managers of this type are inclined to take an interest in tasks only when people do not feel oppressed because of them.

STYLE 1.1 (passive style) involves a low focus on people and a low focus on production. Passive managers belong to the category of weak managers. They are often disregarded by subordinates rather than considered their leader. Since they care neither about results nor people, they simply do not manage anything. Followers of this style accept decisions made by others, and align with their opinions, proposals, and behaviours, avoiding taking sides. In the case of conflicts, they try to remain neutral. They do not overstrain themselves when doing their work and maintain their managerial position solely because they never expose themselves to their superiors. Although they are present in the institution, they prefer not to draw attention to themselves. They fill their time waiting for retirement and delude themselves into thinking that nobody notices. Their main motive is to survive in the organisation at any cost. The driving mechanism behind such a manager’s behaviour is the fear of failure. The consequence of this leadership style is general dissatisfaction among both subordinates and superiors. This type of leader is well described by the term ‘phantom manager’.

STYLE 5.5 (compromising style) is characterised by a moderate emphasis on people and a moderate emphasis on tasks. Managers of this type are referred to as ‘managers at the crossroads’ or ‘balancing bureaucrats’. Their main responsibility is to achieve the institution’s goals through the proper management of people, and their personal goal is to attain high status and prestige. Such managers function well in bureaucratic organisations where traditions, regulations, and rules are goals in themselves. They believe that these traditions, regulations, and rules are sufficient to direct the life of the organisation. They make efforts to make decisions that are achievable, even if they are not always the best possible ones. When confronted with opinions and proposals that differ from their own, they usually take an intermediate, compromising position. When resolving conflicts, they strive to be fair and seek a solution that would be satisfactory for both parties. Tensions within the team undermine such managers’ confidence, as they cause them uncertainty as to how to make a decision that would reduce the existing conflicts. Managers who use this leadership style impose a consistent, reasonable pace of work. Their efforts to maintain a balance between people’s needs and organisational requirements often convince them that they are ‘firm managers’ but also ‘honest ones’.

STYLE 9.9. (pragmatic style) is typical of leaders most commonly referred to as ‘managers of the future’. They combine maximum care for people with maximum care for tasks. They do not avoid their leadership role, nor do they deny their higher status in the organisation. However, they see themselves more as a team leader or crew guide rather than an organisational manager. Performing this role, they make decisions and lead effectively, integrating tasks with people’s expectations,
although they are fully aware that they cannot replace the entire team. They willingly listen to opinions and views that differ from their own. They have their own consolidated beliefs, but they can positively respond to proposals made by others and change their own opinion. If conflicts arise, they try to identify the reasons for their occurrence and neutralise their consequences. In times of crisis, they can maintain composure, even though their impatience may be evident. Even in conflict situations, such managers can diffuse the tension by showing a good sense of humour or making jokes. They work a lot and willingly, and others follow them in this regard. Pragmatic managers can be referred to as ‘integrators’. The result of their work is both subordinates’ and superiors’ satisfaction, as well as very high productivity and quality thanks to the improvement of improving interpersonal relationships. They strive for their employees to fulfil the need for self-realisation as part of the institution through the understanding of tasks, goals, and a sense of co-creation.

Usually, the ideal leadership style is considered the one which combines a strong concern for employees with achieving high productivity. However, in real situations, many managers employ the compromising style (with an average orientation towards employees and results), which does not yield the desired effects in terms of both performance and the social climate of the team.

The evolution of views on leadership effectiveness has led to the conclusion that the outcomes of managers’ performance are not solely determined by their individual traits or combinations of these traits, or specific behaviours (both one-dimensional and multi-dimensional concepts), nor are they determined solely by the characteristics of the external situation. Instead, they are the result of the interaction of all these factors. However, contemporary thinking and research lean towards interactive views on leadership.

The interactive approach emphasises the importance of situational variables for leadership effectiveness. Within the framework of the interactive approach, it is believed that various aspects of a situation and many other situational variables determine which type of leaders’ traits, abilities, and behaviours are relevant to achieving success. Interactive theories are intended to assist in solving social and human problems that managers encounter in their daily practice. Unlike universal theories, they take into account factors such as age or employees’ motivations. Managers familiar with interactive theories must select the most relevant one that corresponds to the specific situation in their team or organisation. They need to analyse the situation according to that theory, develop their own approaches, and strive to choose the most appropriate one. Proponents of the interactive approach aim to create a ‘practical’ theory of the organisation that works well in real conditions. Practical recommendations derived from the interactive-school-based premises are not absolute instructions. Instead, they suggest effective, proven strategies for various situations. Based on these recommendations, creators of interactive management theories have attempted to train and develop managers.

---

in ‘manipulating’ situations in such a way as to maximise their effectiveness. Below are examples of theories that have found broad application in managerial training:

— The Hersey-Blanchard Leadership Model (1977);
— The ‘Path-Goal Theory’ by Martin G. Evans and Robert J. House (1985); and
— The Vroom-Yetton Decision Model of Participation (1973).

However, the first developed interactive concept was the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness created by F.E. Fiedler in 1964. Based on the model that he authored, in 1976 he developed a special training programme called LEADER MATCH, which teaches managers how to alter the favourability of a situation to match their own leadership style. The model combines elements of the situational approach with personality-related concepts of leadership.

This theory sparked significant interest among researchers, as evidenced by the multitude of publications on the contingency model. This may indicate a significant creative potential embedded in the model, as well as its practical usefulness. In numerous publications, authors discuss the scope and type of regularities, as well as the nature and extent of the findings obtained through this approach. Despite some controversies, the prognostic value of the model has been confirmed in numerous studies. However, what is being questioned is the simplified model of organisational variables conditioning leadership effectiveness. Nevertheless, the

6 Proposed by F. Fiedler, the contingency model of leadership effectiveness has been widely utilised in the research and development of managerial personnel in Western European countries, the United States, Canada, and Japan. For example, officers in the Canadian military, the commanding staff of the National Guard, top executives in higher education institutions, directors of public schools, managers of postal and treasury offices, supervisors of nursing staff, executives in the commercial sector, as well as the chemical, food, and hotel industries, and heavy machinery industries can serve as examples (F. Fiedler, J. Garcia, New approaches to effective leadership. Cognitive resources and organizational performance. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1987). Noteworthy are also extensive studies conducted on the leadership staff of the United States Army, particularly the utilisation of Fiedler’s contingency model of leadership effectiveness in the development of commanders as part of the ROTC (Reserve Officers’ Training Corps). In Poland, F. Fiedler’s model has also been practically employed in researching the effectiveness of managerial personnel (Cf.: T. Szankin, Przewidywanie i podnoszenie efektywności kierowania, [in:] ‘Przegląd Policyjny’, Szczytno, 1999, Vol. 3, Issue 55; T. Szankin, Możliwości wykorzystania modelu warunkowego Fiedlera w prognozowaniu i podnoszeniu efektywności kierowania, [in:] Sukses w Zarządzaniu — problemy kadrowo-zarządcze, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu, 1999).

assumption of prediction does not necessarily have to encompass all independent variables, and moreover, an expanded interpretation of the model logically comprises a system of criterion situations. In his concept, F.E. Fiedler distinguished between an internal factor identified as leadership style and external factors, i.e., situational ones. The internal factor of the model determines the level of ‘people-oriented’ or ‘task-oriented’ approach. The external factors that define the organisational situation have been aggregated by the model’s author in the form of ‘situational favourability’.

In his model, Fiedler assumed that task-oriented leaders are more effective in highly favourable and unfavourable situations, while people-oriented leaders excel in moderately favourable situations. This assumption implies that placing the leader in a situation that aligns with their personality can improve their effectiveness in an organisation.

The measure used by the model’s author to assess leadership style is the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale. To obtain an LPC score, the research participant is asked to recall all the co-workers they have ever had and then choose and describe the person they least preferred working with. The description of the least preferred co-worker is made using an eight-point bipolar adjective scale known as the LPC scale (semantic differential). The score is obtained by summing up the points obtained in each position, with the number 8 representing the positive pole of each scale. The method employed by Fiedler divides individuals into those who obtained high scores on the LPC scale (high LPC) and those who received low scores (low LPC).

The proposed LPC indicator can be interpreted as a measure of the leader’s motivational hierarchy. Leaders with low and high LPC scores have different hierarchies of values and goals which they set for themselves. Individuals with a high LPC score have a strong need for emotional relationships with others. Their primary goal, which is a source of satisfaction for them, is task accomplishment. Leaders with a low LPC score highly value success derived from successful task execution and exhibit a strong task-oriented focus. They demonstrate the leadership style characterised by continuous control, imposition of their own opinions, and frequent use of punishments and rewards. They maintain distance in relationships with subordinates, are no-nonsense/unsentimental people, and emphasise the necessity of task completion as an ultimate goal. Generally, they tend to lead in an autocratic manner. On the other hand, leaders with a high LPC score place great importance on success in interpersonal relationships and exhibit a rewarding, non-autocratic, low-control behaviour that pays attention to the needs and attitudes of team members. They are typically tolerant, people-oriented, considerate of others’ feelings, and value cooperation with subordinates, as well as fostering a positive team atmosphere.

The fundamental thesis of the contingency model is that the effectiveness of leaders with different LPC scores depends on the situation or conditions in which they operate. The leadership situation can be described using three primary dimensions: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power.

---

The leader-member relations have been recognised as the most crucial situational variable in the contingency model. These relations refer to the positive or negative emotional bond between team members and their leader. They indicate the extent to which subordinates like and respect their supervisor as a person, and whether they accept him/her. The emotional contacts between the leader and the team are considered good if subordinates like, accept, respect, and see the leader as having authority. On the other hand, the emotional bonds are considered poor when the team do not like, value, or accept their leader.

The task structure is the second most important variable in a work situation. It refers to the complexity level of the task performed by the team. A task can have a well-defined, clear, and precise structure or an undefined structure (poorly or vaguely defined). Highly structured tasks provide detailed instructions or descriptions of each step of the procedure. Team members know exactly what is expected of them. The higher the degree of task structuring, the easier it is to coordinate and control activities. Unstructured tasks lack clear guidelines on how to proceed. According to F.E. Fiedler,9 the task structure depends on:

- how many goals need to be achieved;
- the number of means available to achieve the goal;
- how many solutions there are;
- whether it is possible to check the correctness of the applied solution.

The term ‘position power’ refers to the degree to which occupying a position in the power structure of an institution allows a manager to influence the team in such a way that they carry out the decisions made by the manager. This variable carries the least weight. It expresses the competence and the ability to apply sanctions associated with a given position. The scope of authority of a manager corresponds to their position in the organisational structure of the institution. Having the highest position of power within the team does not necessarily mean that the manager holds a strong position in the overall hierarchy of the organisation, but rather refers to power that is independent of the manager’s personal relationships with the group. A manager who is disliked by the group and lacks personal authority can still have significant or limited power granted by the institution. The scope of authority (position) of a manager depends on:

- possibilities to influence the situation of subordinates;
- ability to administer punishments and rewards;
- making (or participating in making) decisions regarding hiring, firing, promoting, and demoting employees;
- support from superiors.

The combination of the three situational variables in the contingency model resulted in eight possible managerial situations — ‘octants’. A very favourable situation occurs when a manager is liked and accepted by team members, receives clear and structured tasks, and possesses significant authority granted by the organisation. On the other hand, a highly unfavourable situation arises when the leader of a voluntary group is not trusted or respected, and the task is an unclear and unstructured one.

9 See: F.E Fiedler, 1967.
The first and most significant conclusion formulated by the author of the model is that the leadership style and the leadership situation must be mutually matched in order to achieve high effectiveness. When creating an organisation, it is therefore important to remember that achieving even an approximate alignment of these elements can contribute to increased work efficiency. Guided by the assumption that the leadership style, determined by the LPC indicator, reflects a personality structure that changes very slowly and is difficult to modify, it was proposed to adapt the situation (i.e., working conditions) to the leader and the style represented by him/her.

The above conclusions indicate that the practical application of insights derived from the contingent model of leadership effectiveness can serve as the foundation for creating a development programme for managers aimed at acquiring skills in creating and implementing strategies that enhance team leadership effectiveness. This is particularly significant in the case of a hierarchical institution such as the Police, where there are 12,120 managerial positions.

**Tab. 1. Managerial positions in the Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management level</th>
<th>Number of positions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>Outside the Civil Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

To date, studies on leadership effectiveness in the Polish Police have been conducted three times. The first one took place from 1994 to 1996 and involved 277 respondents: 229 district police chiefs and 48 deputy provincial police chiefs.

**Tab. 2. Results of the 1994–1996 study (Study I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships between the leader and group members</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task structure</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority associated with the position of the leader</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LPC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low LPC</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective ones in total: 98
Ineffective ones in total: 152

‘Flexible ones’ – 57 < LPC > 64

Darker colour indicates the number of potentially effective managers.

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
The subsequent study took place in April and May 2013, when almost the entire population of contemporary county (municipal and district) police chiefs was surveyed (317 respondents).

**Tab. 3. Results of the 2013 study (Study II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships between the leader and group members</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority associated with the position of the leader</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LPC</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low LPC</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective ones in total:** 112

**Ineffective ones in total:** 157

‘Flexible ones’ – 57<LPC>64: 48

Darker colour indicates the number of potentially effective managers.

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

The third study was conducted in 2021–2022 in the Warmińsko-Mazurski Garrison and the Police Academy in Szczytno. Unfortunately, due to the requirement to gain permission to conduct the study and other administrative constraints, only 122 managers at various levels of leadership could be surveyed.

**Tab. 4. Results of the 2021–2022 study (Study III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships between the leader and group members</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority associated with the position of the leader</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LPC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low LPC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective ones in total:** 38

**Ineffective ones in total:** 68

‘Flexible ones’ – 57<LPC>64: 22

Darker colour indicates the number of potentially effective managers.

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

The distribution of the study population results, based on Fiedler’s LPC scale, is as follows:

1. Study I — 59% of the population had high LPC, 39% had low LPC, and 10% had medium LPC.
2. Study II — 50% of the population had high LPC, 35% had low LPC, and 15% had medium LPC.
3. Study III — 70% of the population had high LPC, 16% had low LPC, and 14% had medium LPC.

According to F.E. Fiedler, the level of LPC reflects the leader’s tendency to use a specific leadership style. Leaders with a low LPC indicate a strong task-oriented focus and place a high value on the success derived from task accomplishment. On the other hand, leaders with a high LPC attach great importance to success in interpersonal relationships.

The analysis of the organisational situational favourability related to the contingency model shows that:

1) In Study I, 35% of the population is considered effective, 55% of the population is deemed ineffective, and 10% of the population possesses orientations that enable effectiveness in various situational variants.

2) In Study II, 35% of the population is considered effective, 50% of the population is deemed ineffective, and 15% of the population possesses orientations that enable effectiveness in various situational variants.

3) In Study III, 31% of the population is considered effective, 56% of the population is deemed ineffective, and 13% of the population possesses orientations that enable effectiveness in various situational variants.

It should be noted that the above results of effectiveness assessments are an outcome of perceiving the level of favourableness of the organisational situation by the respondents themselves, i.e.:

1) in Study I — 90% rated their own organisational situation as highly favourable, 9% as moderately favourable, and 1% as unfavourable.

2) in Study II — 100% rated their own organisational situation as highly favourable.

3) in Study III — 74% rated their own organisational situation as highly favourable, 25% as moderately favourable, and 1% as unfavourable.

Such a perception of the situation relies heavily on a high rating of the relationship between the manager and the members of the managed team, which may be subject to a strong bias of subjective perception (a tendency to evaluate relationships with subordinates as positive). The credibility of assessments of this variable could be validated by surveying the respondents’ subordinates. The results might differ significantly from the evaluations made by the managers themselves.

Another variable that should be objectivised through in-depth surveys and ‘competent judges’ is the level of task complexity. It is symptomatic that in Study II, all surveyed individuals rated the tasks they performed as well-structured, simple, and not requiring much independent thinking. When analysing the work of the managerial staff responsible for managing organisational units at the county level, it should be noted that their basic tasks can be evaluated as having a weak structure, being non-standard, and difficult to precisely quantify and algorithmise.

The value of the research based on Fiedler’s model is not only about determining the qualities of managerial personnel but also about showing the variables in a given situation that can influence and enhance the effectiveness of leadership processes. In many cases, it is not the full utilisation of authoritative powers, but improvement of relationships with subordinates, or changing the way of delegating tasks that can significantly impact efficiency. The diagnosis and self-diagnosis performed with the aforementioned research tool provide opportunities for conscious and rational action in this area.
The above conclusions indicate that the practical application of insights derived from the contingency model of leadership effectiveness can serve as the basis for developing a programme to enhance managers’ skills, enabling them to create and implement strategies that improve team leadership effectiveness. Regarding the selection of individuals for managerial positions, Fiedler proposed one of two solutions: either matching the manager to the situation or adapting the situation to the manager. The latter solution aligns with a special educational programme developed by F.E. Fiedler and his colleagues,\(^{10}\) called ‘Leader Match’, as part of which managers acquire competencies that enable them to change the favourability of a situation in order to align it with their leadership orientations. The programme establishes principles for modifying situational factors to match the leadership style of a given manager, thereby enhancing leadership effectiveness.

The contingency model of leadership effectiveness can serve as a foundation for planning and programming the content of training programmes for managerial staff, leadership training, and similar initiatives.\(^{11}\) Getting to know and understanding oneself and one’s personal, preferred leadership style facilitates interactions with the environment and aids in the practical application of principles derived from the model. Training, on the other hand, should familiarise managers with methods of influencing situational elements towards shaping interpersonal relationships, task structuring, and changes in power structure, as well as teaching practical utilisation of these methods. The applicability of the model lies in the ability to operationalise individual components and translate them into specific content and technical implementation methods.

Improving managerial competencies makes it possible to counter unfavourable or even pathological phenomena within an organisation, such as the complex of threatened authority, learned incompetence, and regressive behaviour.\(^{12}\)

Rational performance of tasks entrusted to the police management must take into account the ability to shape situational variables. Developing skills to change the situation in a manner favourable to superiors involves acquiring a set of competencies during training and professional development. These competencies include specialised knowledge and general skills (conceptual, interpersonal, and managerial ones). They enable the determination and implementation of a leadership strategy that contributes to achieving high effectiveness.
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\(^{11}\) A partial pilot training was conducted as part of the managerial staff courses at the Police Academy in Szczytno.
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Resumen. El artículo aborda la cuestión de la gestión de personas en las organizaciones, con especial referencia a la policía polaca. Como apuntan los autores, desde las transformaciones políticas del año 1989 y la promulgación de la Ley de Policía, ha aumentado el interés por mejorar la eficacia del liderazgo en todo tipo de organizaciones encargadas de la seguridad. Los aspectos que han despertado especial interés han sido el liderazgo, la flexibilidad del comportamiento en relación con el entorno dinámicamente cambiante y los estilos de liderazgo. En este sentido, ha crecido el interés por las teorías del liderazgo que podrían aplicarse a la práctica directiva. Los modelos teóricos propuestos a los responsables de la gestión, si bien no son modelos prefabricados de comportamiento, deberían constituir una herramienta de gran ayuda a la hora de evaluar situaciones y tomar decisiones oportunas. El artículo describe los modelos y los factores determinantes de la toma de decisiones de los directivos. A este respecto, se presentan y comparan los resultados de estudios realizados en los años 1994–96, 2013 y 2021–2022, basados en el modelo condicional de eficacia directiva desarrollado en 1964 por F.E. Fiedler.

Zusammenfassung. Im Artikel wurde die Problematik der Mitarbeiterführung in Organisationen, insbesondere in der polnischen Polizei berührt. Die Autoren stellen fest, dass seit den politischen Veränderungen im Jahr 1989 und der Verabschiedung des Polizeigesetzes das Interesse an der Verbesserung der Führungseffektivität in allen Arten von Organisationen, die für die Sicherheit verantwortlich sind, gestiegen ist. Von besonderem Interesse sind dabei die Bereiche wie Führung und Flexibilität im Verhalten geworden; das letzte vorwiegend in Bezug auf das sich dynamisch verändernde Umfeld und Führungsstile. Dabei hat das Interesse an Führungstheorien zugenommen, die sich auf die Führungspraxis anwenden lassen. Die theoretischen Modelle, die den Managern angeboten werden, sind zwar keine vorgefertigten Verhaltensmodelle, sollten aber ein hilfreiches Instrument

Резюме. В статье рассматривается вопрос управления персоналом в организациях, с особым упором на польскую полицию. Как отмечают авторы, после политических изменений в 1989 году и принятия Закона о полиции повысился интерес к повышению эффективности процесса управления в организациях всех типов, отвечающих за безопасность. Особый интерес вызвали такие области, как лидерство, гибкость поведения в связи с быстро меняющейся обстановкой и стили руководства. При этом повысился интерес к теориям лидерства, которые можно было бы применить на практике. Предлагаемые менеджерам теоретические модели, хотя и не являются готовыми моделями поведения, должны стать полезным инструментом при оценке ситуации и принятии соответствующего решения. В статье описаны модели и детерминанты принятия управленческих решений. Представлены и сопоставлены результаты исследований, проведенных в 1994–1996, 2013 и 2021–2022 годах на основе разработанной в 1964 году Ф.Е. Фидлер Вероятностной модели управленческой эффективности.