Public service dynamics
Key points

• 49,611 PSA members
• Supported with a very effective marketing campaign
• 15,762 responses
• A response rate of 32 per cent
• 5 point Likert scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSA members … are committed and motivated

- Motivated (M = 4.04, SD = .54).
- Committed to their organisation (M = 3.59, SD = .88).
- But more to making a difference to society (87.9%) or their job (84.5%) than their org (67.9%)
Mediocre (and declining?) experience of HRM practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear(ish) organisational goals, weak systems and processes

- Org goals – $M = 3.56$, $SD = .81$
  - 58.1% can “clearly explain the direction (mission, values, mission) of this org…”
- Communication and co-operation $M = 2.73$, $SD = .92$
- Innovation – $M= 2.81$, $SD = .86$
- Processes $M = 3.27$, $SD = .87$
  - Clear policies procedures – 55.3%
  - Efficient and well designed – 37.1%
Weak managers - risk averse, overly political and not strong on development

Per cent

... set realistic goals.

... are willing and able to take prudent risks.

... treat failure as a learning opportunity, not something to be ashamed of.

... base decisions on facts and analysis, not politics.

... work hard to develop the capabilities needed to execute our overall organisational strategy.

... give ready access to information that others need.

... devote considerable effort to developing their subordinates.

[Bar chart showing the percentage distribution of responses for each statement]
Organisational performance

• Organisational performance rated poorly (M = 2.79, SD = .81). An example item is “This organisation is achieving its full potential.”

• Adaptability – also poor (M = 2.90, SD = .88). E.g. “The management systems in this organisations are flexible enough to respond quickly to changes”

• Alignment – slightly better (M = 3.04, SD = .79). E.g. “My organisation wastes resources on unproductive activities”
Organisational level analysis

In an analysis across 56 public sector orgs .................

- Performance comes from ambidexterity AND high involvement work systems
- But high involvement work systems is very associated with organisational systems – efficient processes, assigned responsibilities, managerial trust and support
- HIWS systems supports ambidexterity but (oddly) does not seem related to ambidexterity
Conclusion

Focus on:

• Org goals
• Consideration, stand taking and “walking the talk”, upward feedback
• Organisation processes that are efficient, allocate responsibilities and help rather than hinder
• Management support and trust
• Wider competencies, such as top team integration
• High involvement work practices
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