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Abstract:
The purpose of this research is to analyze to what extent the perceptions about leadership change during a studio and content renewing project in Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE’s News and Current Affairs in 2018-2019. The theoretical part is based on existing research and different theories on leadership and leadership styles. Leadership is a process where an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Alonderine & Majauskaite 2016 p. 141; Nazarian et al 2017, p.1079; Salehzadeh 2017 p. 865). Leadership style is playing a central role when predicting organization performance or outcomes (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015 p.190; Vignoli et al 2018 p.275) and can be divided into three main categories: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.191). Data has been collected from 30 participants with a questionnaire, semi-structured discussions and the notes from the discussions. The questionnaire and discussions were done twice: at the start and the end of the year 2019 to compare the result. The method to measure and analyze the result is BoMentis Coaching Houses’ Coaching Leadership Pulse© (CLP), which is measuring different interaction competences. According to previous research (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2014; Rollinson 1998) leaders and supervisors can change or mix their leadership styles during big projects. The best of leaders typically display both transformational and transactional leadership (Avolio & Bass 1999 p.457) and they can stress different factors of the leadership styles during for example longer projects (Salehzadeh 2017 p. 866). According to the survey and interviews, management is at a high level in YLE News and Current Affairs. Although, during the year 2019 supervisors’ perceptions, reflections and priorities in the different areas of coaching leadership style changed. From the results it can be interpreted that the renewing project of the studios and content has demanded a change in the leadership concepts in YLE News and Current Affairs in 2019. In the light of the results, one can see more transition to the selling and telling style leadership. These approaches are less collaborative and more directive, as the leader simply provides instructions for the team members.
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Especially I would like to thank editor-in-chief Jouko Jokinen for his support. I would also like to thank Valentas Strolys for his kind advices during the writing process, my supervisor PhD Nathalie Hyde-Clark for her patience and guidance and Matti Tiensuu for his support. Without you this would have been impossible task to do.

Helsinki, December 2019

Janne Mällinen
1 INTRODUCTION

Leadership style is playing a central role when predicting organization performance or outcomes (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015 p.190). Leadership style of supervisors play an important role not only in productivity, but also in enhancing employees’ well-being (Vignolli & Depolo & Cifuentes & Punnett 2018 pp. 275-276). According to previous research (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2014; Rollinson 1998) leaders and supervisors can change or mix their leadership styles during big projects. The best of leaders typically display both transformational and transactional leadership (Avolio & Bass 1999 p.457) and they can stress different factors of the leadership styles during for example longer projects or when getting more experience; appropriate leadership style is based on the followers and the task (Salehzadeh 2017 p. 866).

The purpose of this research is to analyze to what extent the perceptions about leadership change during a studio and content renewing projects in YLE, Finnish Broadcasting Company News and Current Affairs in 2018-2019. This research is as well answering the questions, what are the leadership styles at YLE News and Current Affairs, and can the supervisors change or mix their leadership styles during big projects?

The research is based on theoretical background about leadership and different leadership styles and data is gathered from surveys and interviews during the process. The aim of this research is to define what is leadership in YLE News and Current Affair, what leadership styles supervisors are using and how ideas about leadership styles change during the project of renewing YLEs studios and journalistic content.

Data for this study will be gathered with a questionnaire from 30 supervisors who are taking part on the renewing process. Survey will be done twice – at the beginning of the process in January 2019 and second time in November 2019. The survey method is based on BoMentis Coaching Houses’ Coaching Leadership Pulse© (CLP) which is measuring 35 different interaction competence that are divided to seven different main roles of coaching leadership. The survey was reshaped to web-based questionnaire with 21 questions about the coaching leadership style. The reshaped survey gives, in addition to the traditional analytical evaluation (scale 1-5), the number of such behavior that is estimated to be realized.

The use of the CLP as a basis for the research is justified because YLE has focused on coaching leadership in its various managerial training. The results of this research will be utilized in the company’s supervisor training (Jokinen 2018).

The results of the study are not generalizable, they only reflect the possible change in activities and thinking of YLE News and Current Affairs’ supervisors. However, the research is important for the community and the organization. The results of this research can be used in the future for the supervisor coaching.

This study will first contextualize technical and content project in Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE. It will give the framework for the whole research and tell the background for the renewing process. After that I will briefly describe the scientific background of the leadership and leadership style concept and go through the previous
research and the studies. At the end I will describe how this theoretical background will be used in this research.
2 CONTEXT

Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE is parliamentary owned and funded by tax allocated funds to the public service company in Finland. Yle’s operations are governed by the Act on Yleisradio Oy (Finlex 2002). The company has 2786 permanent employees, four television channels, three channel slots, six nationwide radio channels, three radio services, and multiple online services. An example; on-demand media service Areena. YLE has as well 23 regional radio stations and regional tv-news in ten districts. The company reaches weekly 93 per cent and daily 76 per cent of the population (Yleisradio 2018a).

YLE News and Current affairs produce all the Finnish and Swedish news and current affairs programs for YLE’s channels in television and radio. At the same time, the organization is responsible for YLE's morning television show Ylen Aamu, all the productions of current affairs programs A-studio, A-talk, Perjantai, Sannikka/Ukkola, Swedish news TV-Nytt, Swedish current affairs program OBS and OBS Debatt, special news as YLE News in English, News in sign language, News in Russia, Sport news, entertainment program Puoli Seitsemän, local news from twenty districts from all over Finland, news in Same language and crisis situation information (Yleisradio 2018b). At the same time, the production runs the online services yle.fi and yle.fi/uutiset and mobile services Uutisvahti and Yle.fi.

These services reach practically every Finn on weekly level. The most popular television production is TV-News 20.30, which reaches every weekday approximately 800,000 viewers (Finnpanel 2018). There are about thousand people working in the organization.

Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE’s News and Current Affairs decided to make a major technical and content renewal in 2018. YLE News is going to renew all their studios and visual outcomes in the following two years. The development process started in autumn 2018 with renewing the studio of TV-News and continued with renewing the Ylen Aamu studio during the summer 2019. In the autumn 2019 YLE News and Current Affairs have updated the web services’ visual outcomes.

In December 2018 YLE’s competitor commercial and private television channel MTV3 was renewing their studios (MTV 12.9.2018). MTV3 also started a 24/7 online stream service, which was a functional reform for the channel.

YLE News and Current affairs has renewed their studios previously in 2013 (Rajaniemi 2013; Kaunisto 2013) and this process cost over five million euros (Hagert 2013). During the renewal the entire studio technology was replaced which caused the costs to rise high. The new studio made the broadcast more modern, and at the same time, the automation of the studio technology was significantly increased by robotic cameras and various control systems.

On spring 2018 News and Current Affairs decided to renew all the studios to support especially digital broadcasting. The kickoff meeting for this renewal was held 24.9.2018 (Valaskivi, 2018a). The purpose of the renewal was to make the entire television and web delivery process more flexible and the transfer production more networked.
(Valaskivi, 2018b). The new studio space is suitable for both television and digital productions.

The renewal of the studios and content have had a strong impact on YLE news activities throughout year 2019. In addition, the renewal project has also reflected in the organization by re-organizing its structures. Over the year, the tasks of the teams have been refined and, among other things, the entire graphic has been redesigned (Mällinen, 2019).

The renewal process emphasized the role of superiors and led their teams to the new technological solutions; it also developed the ways to work on the content. The research of the role of the superiors is usually based on the employees’ perceptions of good and bad leadership, but this study examines superiors’ own perceptions and reflections of the good leadership.

This research explores how the superiors’ self-assessments of their own leadership skills changed during this major development project. People’s beliefs, motives, motivation and feelings can change during long lasting projects and this research is trying to reflect that change.

First, we need to look to the theoretical background of leadership and leadership styles.
3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Management and leadership

Leadership is a topic that has been researched exponentially during the last 50 years. Different leadership styles have become an important topic of study in the management field (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015 p.190). Leadership is a complex and at the same time popular topic for research.

In this literature review we will first define leadership and discuss about different leadership styles. These definitions form a base and theoretical background for the empirical part of this research.

Leadership and management are easily mixed as concepts. However, there are significant differences between them, which must be kept in mind when talking about leadership. Kottler (1990) presents relationships and differences between these concepts as shown in Table 1.

![Table 1: Comparing Management and Leadership (Kotter 1990 p. 6).](image)

Despite similarities the management and the leadership are different concepts. Timeframe in both concepts is different and when leadership creates change, the management keeps something working efficiently (Kotter 1990 p.7). In management organizing and control are highlighted, when in leadership aligning people and motivational aspects and visionary are emphasized (Table 1).

There are different definitions of the leadership in the literature. Leadership has been defined as a set of behaviors used by leaders (Vignoli et al 2018), some define leadership as a process to influence people to achieve results (Alonderine & Majauskaite 2016).
Mitonga-Monga et al (2012), as cited in Nazarian et al (2017 p. 1079), stated that leadership is a procedure for influencing others commitment by identifying their full potential for reaching objectives. This definition combines task-orientation and results with influencing the employees’ behavior. Kottler (1990) also defines leadership through these two attributes. According to him leadership is establishing direction, it is developing a vision of the future, it is aligning people and it is motivating and inspires the employees’ (Kottler 1990 p. 5). Kottler emphasizes especially direction-setting aspect of the leadership in his article.

Day-to-day leadership comprises task-orientated behaviors, for example scheduling and providing instructions (Li et al 2016 p. 109) and it is a process where intentional influence is exerted by one person over the other people (Salehzadeh 2017 p. 865). Individuals have a role in shaping the society and the organizations, and for Salehzadeh it is critical to understand this role of the individuals.

As said before, leadership is a complex phenomenon and consists of various sub-assemblies. Here we talk about leadership styles, which are reflected in behaviors and attitudes of the leader.

Leadership style is playing a central role when predicting organization performance or outcomes (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015 p.190; Vignoli et al 2018 p.275). Effective and strategic leadership is important for members of organizations to sustain profitability and productivity – and empirical evidence provides that leadership style is an antecedent of organizational commitment (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015).

Leadership style of supervisors play important role not only in a productivity, but also in enhancing employees’ well-being (Vignolli et al 2018 pp. 275-276). For instance, Alonderiene and Majauskaite (2016) found in their research that there was a significant positive impact of leadership style on job satisfaction in Lithuanian public and private universities.

### 3.2 Full range leadership

One of the most cited theory of leadership styles is Bass’s (1985) Full Range Leadership Model, where three preferred leadership styles are identified: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. Bass’s original theory included three types of transformational behavior (idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and two types of transactional behavior (contingent reward and passive management by exception) (Avolio & Bass 1999 pp.441-443).

Later, in year 2004, Bass made a revision of the theory with Avolio, and they added inspirational motivation to transformational behavior and active management by exception to transactional behavior. Idealized influence and inspirational motivation are elements of charismatic leadership and it is split into two components: idealized influence behavior and idealized influence attribution (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.191).
Transformational leadership | Transactional leadership | Laissez-faire leadership
---|---|---
Charisma (Idealized influence behavior) | Contingent reward | No guidance
Charisma (Idealized influence attribution) |  |  
Inspirational motivation | Management by exception - Active | Avoids decision making
Intellectual stimulation | Management by exception - Passive | Indecisive management
Individual consideration |  |  

Table 2: New elements (underlined) in Bass/Avolio leadership theory.

Yahaya & Fawzy (2016) are presenting these components widely in their literary review about leadership styles and organizational commitment.

Laissez-faire leadership is many times described as leadership that avoids decision making. Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by very little guidance from leaders and it gives complete freedom for followers to make decisions. Leaders who demonstrate laissez-faire leadership are indecisive and avoid taking leadership responsibility (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.191). Research has found that laissez-faire leadership has an adverse effect on work-related outcomes of employees (Saeed et al 2014 p. 218).

Bass (1990), as cited in Saeed et al (2014) states that transactional leadership has been linked to high levels of effort, performance and satisfaction. Transactional leaders determine and define goals and communicate how successful execution of tasks will lead to desirable rewards (Saeed et al 2014 p. 2018). Transactional leaders are concerned with the accomplishment of the goals and therefore focus in clarifying tasks and offer rewards for positive performance (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p. 192).

Transactional leadership consists of three components (Table 2): contingent reward, active management by exception and passive management by exception. The contingent reward is the exchange process between leaders and subordinates. The reward is based on agreement between leaders and followers (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.193). The active management by exception means that the leader sets objectives and performance standards and monitors employees’ job procedures – and corrects the errors (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p. 193). The boss operates as the monitor of the process (Avolio & Bass 1999 p. 446). In passive management by exception leaders do not react to problems systematically (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.194). Transactional leadership is therefore highly goal targeted, reward based and even behavior-monitoring leadership style.
Transformational leaders focus on future needs (Saeed et al 2014 p.218). The innovator of the concept of transformational leadership, Burns (1978), as cited in Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.194), stressed that transforming leadership occurs when leaders and followers raise each other to higher level of motivation and morality. Transformational leaders, unlike transactional leaders, focus on individual’s needs and personal development of followers (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p. 196). Leadership consists of four different parts: charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Table 2).

Leaders charismatic influence improve pride, faith and respect among followers and transmits a sense of mission (Cheung & Wong 2011 p. 659). Idealized influence is related to charisma and the leader considers followers’ needs over the leader’s own needs, through this, the followers want to identify with the leaders and their mission (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p.197). Inspirational leadership motivates subordinates to work hard and to be committed and to achieve more (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016; Cheung & Wong 2011). Intellectual stimulation is a form of leadership, which challenge the employees’ own thinking and beliefs and to be creative in problem solving (Yahaya & Fawzy 2016 p. 197). Individual consideration is an important aspect of the leader-employee relationship. It allows leaders to build a strong relationship with each follower and followers are stimulated to achieve high levels of creativity (Cheung & Wong 2011 p. 659).

Literature supports, as shown here, that transactional leadership and transformational leadership approach the organization from different directions: both are goal-oriented, but the approach is different. Where transformational leadership approaches the task through individual view, transactional leadership is processing leadership from the task. Laissez-faire leadership gives minimal guidance from the leaders and gives complete freedom for employees to make decisions.

Perceptions to leadership are numerous and leadership has been theorized in several slightly different theories. In addition to the above-mentioned Full Range Leadership model, Robert House has presented a path-goal theory of leadership and a Situational Leadership model has been studied as well. As such, these models contain much similarities to the Full Range Leadership concept (Glegg et al 2008).

### 3.3 Situational leadership model

Earlier studies about leadership are based on a belief, that it is difficult for leaders to adjust to situations. Hersey-Blanchard’s situational leadership theory indicates that leaders should vary their approach based on the people they are leading, and the circumstances that surround the task at hand. When a leader is able to adapt to the situation as quickly as possible, everyone will benefit in the end. A key belief is that the individuals can improve their ability to understand situations, to adapt and to communicate through experience. Situational theory raises the importance of a leader’s understanding of the details of each situation they are faced with (Izsatt-White & Saunders p. 69).

There is no best way of leading that is appropriate for all situations – leader must learn to understand situations and then adapt their leadership style to match that situation (Izsatt-White & Saunders p. 68-69).
Hersey-Blanchard’s situational leadership theory is based on the belief that leadership requires three different competencies (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>The cognitive ability to understand complex and dynamic situations, seeing them as they are now and as they reasonably could be in the near future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting</td>
<td>The behavioral ability to change the way you behave as a leader to match the situation as you have understood it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Defined as a process skill, knowing how to get your message across to individual employees in any given situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Main competencies in leadership (Izzatt-White & Saunders, p. 67)

The situational leadership theory offers four potential leadership styles and four maturity levels that define the members of a team. The leadership styles are in this theory telling, selling, participating and delegating (Izzatt-White & Saunders, p. 69; Rollinson, p. 371). Model suggest that the leaders style needs to change in relation to the readiness of the employee for any given task (Izzatt-White & Saunders, p. 69; Rollinson, pp. 370-373). Different styles and levels of readiness are presented below in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task behavior</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participating style</strong></td>
<td>Shares ideas</td>
<td>Selling style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness: followers able, unwilling, not confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness: followers unable, willing, confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegating style</strong></td>
<td>Turn over decisions</td>
<td>Telling style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness: followers able, willing, confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness: followers unable, unwilling, not confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Hersey-Blanchard’s leadership styles (Izzatt-White & Saunders, pp. 68-70; Rollinson, pp. 370-373)

In telling style, both task and relationship behaviors are high. This is told to be the most direct form of leadership (Izzatt-White & Saunders, p. 68). The leader of the group tells each team member what to do (Free management books, 2018). This approach is less collaborative and more directive, the leader simply provides instructions for the team members. Readiness of subordinates is low, people are unable and unwilling because they have low task-related readiness and low psychological readiness (Rollinson, p. 371)

In selling style, relationship behaviors are low, but task behavior is high. While the team members are still directed by the leader, he or she is more likely to engage with the team members along the way. The leader still provides information and direction in this style, but there’s also more two-way communication with subordinates (Luizzi, 2017). The
leader may need to convince some of the team members to follow lead and do things in a specific way (Free management books, 2018). Readiness of people is low/moderate, people are willing but unable, and employees’ have low task-related readiness but some psychological readiness (Rollinson, p.371).

In participating style, both relationship and task behaviors are low. This means that participating is a process where the leader tries to build relationship with those on the team – and in this way the leader is really becoming part of the team (Free management books, 2018). The leader might not even make all decisions in this style. The situational leadership manager works closely with the team or a specific person and shares decision-making responsibilities (Luizzi, 2017). Readiness is moderate or high; people are able but unwilling and have high task-related readiness but low psychological readiness (Rollinson, p. 371).

Finally, in delegating style, relationship behaviors are high but task behavior low. In this style the leader passes on most of the responsibilities for a given project to various members of the team. Readiness is high: employees have will and ability, they are high in both task-related and psychological readiness (Rollinson, p. 371).

3.4 Coaching leadership model

The Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE has focused on coaching leadership in its managerial training. Marjo-Riitta and Vesa Ristikangas are presenting coaching leadership model in their book Valmentava johtajuus. Coaching Leadership Pulse® leadership assessment tool is based on to their theory about coaching leadership and it measures 35 different interaction competence which are divided to seven different main roles of coaching leadership.

Coaching is described in different theories as a confidential relationship based on co-operation in which the coaches help their clients to become aware of their strengths and to realize their goals (Business coaching institute 2018). It is a solution oriented, result-oriented and systematic approach, where the coach relies on established and recognized interdisciplinary theories and techniques to support the achievement of the goals of individuals, groups or organizations, performance improvement, well-being and self-directed learning (Grant 2013). Core competencies in coaching leadership are capability to create a basis, influential interaction skills and facilitating development (Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018, p. 26).
Ristikangas & Ristikangas describe leadership and coaching leadership with an example of hourglass (Table 5).

**Table 5: Hourglass of leadership and coaching leadership** (Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018)

At the top of the hourglass are managing, leadership and coaching. The leader can choose what kind of leadership he or she needs and wants to promote. All management and leadership styles have different manifestations and lead to different management (Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018, p.38). Tasks of the coach, manager and leader mix in
everyday work – tasks are not strict and are mixed (Radomska 2014, pp. 77-80; Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018, p. 40) and leader-member exchange depicts the quality of the relationship between supervisors and subordinates (Peng et al 2019, p. 2).

Ristikangas & Ristikangas (2018, p. 39) describe the managers role as caretaker of processes, quality control and taking care of responsibilities. He or she is implementing the company’s strategy and action plan and is working as a decision maker interacting and connecting with his or her subordinates (Peng et al, 2019, 3). Planning, delegating and reporting are also emphasized in the managing operations.

Leaders role is different from the managers (Kottler 1990; Martin 1999, p. 94). In the role of the leader, the supervisor shows the direction of his or her organization and ensures that people go in the same direction. In this leadership style, the importance of communication is highlighted, and the management task is also to maintain the relationships between the employees (Ho 2014; Wolper 2016). The superior motivates a subordinate through the appropriate coaching techniques and provides sufficient resources and support to promote the subordinate’s ability to study and work (Wang & Zhu 2017, p. 1657).

The coaching approach emphasizes the common ideas in the workplace. Coaching is about to give employees the opportunity to create new ways of doing things or set goals for the organization (Wolper 2016). The role is more supporting than dominant, the coach leader focuses on the strengths of the individuals and the leadership is constantly evolving through learning from the mistakes (Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018, 39). In coaching style, the leader is focusing on the team and using its potential. The group’s functionality is built together, and even development is done in co-operation (Ho 2014; Ristikangas & Ristikangas 2018, p. 44).
4 METHOD

The research method used in this study is based on Avolio and Bass’s (2004) thoughts on transformational leadership. The theory has been developed further by BoMentis Coaching House (2018) and has led to the creation of a coaching leadership assessment tool Coaching Leadership Pulse®. The instrument measures seven different leadership roles and each one of them is divided into different sub-roles (Table 4). The Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE has focused on coaching leadership in its managerial training and has used this instrument during the last years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trendsetter</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Group developer</th>
<th>Boundary setter</th>
<th>Relationship builder</th>
<th>Developer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Announcer</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Limiter</td>
<td>Listener</td>
<td>Recipient of the feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outliner</td>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>Supporter</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Challenger</td>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>Idealist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option seeker</td>
<td>Goal setter</td>
<td>Opportunist</td>
<td>Bridge builder</td>
<td>Intervener</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>Value giver</td>
<td>Feedback giver</td>
<td>Utilizer</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy holder</td>
<td>Data splitter</td>
<td>Guiding questions</td>
<td>Success maker</td>
<td>Boundary owner</td>
<td>Trust builder</td>
<td>Knowledge divider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Main roles of the coaching leadership (BoMentis 2018, p.4). Translated from Finnish.

BoMentis Coaching Houses’ Coaching Leadership Pulse® (CLP) measures 35 different interaction competences which are divided to seven different main roles of coaching leadership (Table 6). CLP gives the traditional analytical evaluation (scale 1-5), and it tells how much such behavior is realized (scale 1-5).

For this study 35 original Coaching Leadership Pulse -claims were limited to a total of 23 claims about coaching leadership style. The overlapping and simultaneous statements in original claims were eliminated in the new ones. In addition, the appreciation meter was also added to this study; the respondents were able to assess the importance of each claim to themselves. The survey was tested in Yle’s HR department as well as in UAS Arcada before sending it to the sample group.

For this study the research claims were rearranged in 7 different groups of main roles (Table 7). All these claims and statements were evaluated in the survey using a scale of 1-5 (disagree-agree) and as well in importance scale 1-5 (claim is not important for me – claim is important for me).
Table 7: Main roles and the claims (English translation marked in italics)

**Valmentaja – Coach**

1. Yritän saada myös muos innostumaan – *I try to get others excited*
2. Kannustan jokaista henkilökohtaisesti – *I encourage everyone personally*
3. Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta – *I give constructive and guiding feedback*

**Ryhmäyttäjä – Group developer**

4. Seuraan aktiivisesti tiimini toimintaa – *I actively follow my team’s activities*
5. Huomioin ryhmäni jäsenet – *I pay attention to the members of my group*
6. Korostan tiimiläisen yhteistyötä – *I emphasize the co-operation of my team members*

**Rajojen asettaja – Boundary setter**

7. Olen tarvittaessa jämäkkä ja kykenen sanomaan myös ei – *I'm strong if needed and I am also able to say no*
8. Piidan yllä yhteisesti sovittuja pelisääntöjä ja puutun tarvittaessa epäkohtien – *I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary*
9. Toimin johdonmukaisesti enkä ole manipuloitavissa – *I act consistently and cannot be manipulated*

**Suhteen rakentaja – Relationship builder**

10. Kuuntelen tiimini jäseniä – *I listen to my team members*
11. Kohtelen kaikkia oikeudenmukaisesti – *I treat everyone fairly*
12. Teen sen, minkä lupaan – *I’ll do what I promise*

**Suunnannäyttäjä – Trendsetter**

13. Minulle on tärkeää näyttää suuntaa ja viestää ajatuksiani tiimilleni – *It is important for me to show direction and communicate my thoughts to my team*
14. Tarkastelen päätöksentekosuhteissa erilaisia vaihtoehtoja – *In the decision-making situation, I look at different options*
15. Kannan vastuun päätöksistä – *I take responsibility for decisions*

**Tuloksen mahdollistaja – Facilitator**

16. Olen työtekiöjöiden puolella – *I am on the side of the employees’*
17. Annan tiimini jäsenille vastuuta ja valtaa – *I give responsibility and power to my team members*
18. Asetan tavoitteet yhteistyössä tiimiläisten kanssa – *I set goals together with my teammates*
19. Seuraan ja arvioin asetettujen tavoitteiden toteutumista yhdessä tiimiläisten kanssa - *I follow and evaluate the achievement of given goals with my teammates*

**Kehittyjä – Developer**

20. Pyydän palautetta omasta toiminnastani – *I ask for feedback on my activities*
21. Luon kehittämiselle edellytykset – *I am creating conditions for the development*
22. Huolehdin oman esimiestöni kehittämisestä – *I work to develop my own supervisor skills*
23. Sallin myös virheitä – *I allow errors*
The survey was conducted in Finnish, because all the members of sample group are native Finnish speakers. The claims were translated to English for this study. Every effort has been made to ensure that the translations are as accurate as possible, while being aware that the focus is often on meaning, as some words do not translate directly.

30 people were selected for the sample group, all of them were performing different managerial tasks in Yle News and Current Affairs at that time. This sample group is representative, because there are total of about 40 managers in YLE News and Current Affairs. In the sample group were 14 women and 16 men and all had experience of management from 1 year to 20 years.

The study was carried out in four phases. In the first phase, a questionnaire was sent to the sample group in January 2019. After analyzing the answers, the responses were discussed in the group meetings in phase 2 in February 2019. These discussions allowed for more detailed and empirical information to be drawn.

In the third phase of the research, the survey was repeated in November 2019. The results were then reviewed in the phase 4, in the group meeting, again with the subjects in December 2019.

The results of phase 1 and 2 were compared with those of phases 3 and 4. This comparison allowed the researcher to see, how the superiors’ self-assessments of their own leadership skills changed during the major development project in Yle News and Current Affairs in 2019.

The survey was conducted as an online survey with the ZEF tool. When using this tool, each responder receives a reply link to his or her private email and the questionnaire is answered in the online environment. In this questionnaire, the answer to each question was given in a four-field, where on the horizontal level the respondent assessed the accuracy of the claim and at the vertical scale the personal importance of each claim. In the final report, all responses were grouped into major roles (Table 8) and all the answers were grouped in the four-field.

![Four-field as seen in ZEF tool in final report.](image)

**Table 8:** Four-field as seen in ZEF tool in final report.

In the analysis, results were standardized with the ZEF tool. In the standardization process the distances from the center point of four-field are averaged. The ZEF Intelligent Zoom tool moves the center of the answers for each group of claims to the center of the four-field and standardizes attitudes. Standardization increases the dispersion of
responses and highlights the differences in responses in each question group as shown in table 9.

Table 9: Standardized answers in ZEF

Since the survey questions are used to measure behavioral change, repeating the survey questions are a critical part of the reinforcement process. Repeating survey questions provide insight into behavioral change over time. Fowler (1993, cited in Briggs et al. 2015, p. 78) emphasizes the need to ensure that all the interviewees are asked the same questions in the same way if the procedure is to be reliable.

Repeating the same survey with the same research sample group provides a comparable result that can be used to determine whether a change in leadership style has occurred between surveys. Longitudinal data enables analysis of individual or microlevel change (Rafferty et al. 2015, p. 16.) There are a number of devices for checking reliability in scales and tests: test–retest is administering the same test sometime after the first; in the alternate forms method, equivalent versions of the same items are given and results correlated; and in the split-half method, the items in the test are split into two matched halves and scores then correlated (Bell 1999, p. 117)

Reliability requires a standardized approach’ and this may limit a study’s validity. Validity tells us whether an item measures or describes what it is supposed to measure or describe (Bell, 1999, p. 104). The research method in this paper is triangulation, which is often used to describe a research where two or more methods are used, known as mixed methods (Tashakkori et al. 2003, p. 8). This means, that a research is comparing many sources of evidence in order to determine the accuracy of information or phenomena and the method is cross-checking data to establish its validity (Briggs et al. 2012, p. 84). Triangulation is fundamentally a device for improving validity of a research (Briggs et al. 2012, p. 86).

According to Heale and Forbes (2013) combining both quantitative and qualitative methods to answer a specific research question may result one of the following outcomes:

1. The results may converge and lead to the same conclusions
2. The results may relate to different objects or phenomena, but may be complementary to each other and used to supplement the individual results
3. The results may be divergent or contradictory
Converging results aim to increase the validity through verification; complementary results highlight different aspects of the phenomenon or illustrate different phenomenon, and divergent findings can lead to new and better explanations for the phenomenon under investigation (Heale & Forbes, 2013).

The results of the study are not generalizable, they only reflect the possible change in activities and thinking of YLE News and Current Affairs’ supervisors in 2019. However, the research is important for the work community and the organization where results can be used in the future, for example in training for supervisors and managers.

In order for research to be ethically acceptable and reliable and for its results to be credible, the research must be conducted according to the responsible conduct of research. This research process follows the guidelines of responsible conduct of research (TENK, 2019).

Editor-in-chief Jouko Jokinen has given permission for this research and permission was obtained from each interviewee. All the respondents were informed how the collected data will be used and the results will be presented publicly in YLE News and Current Affairs and used for developing the leadership support of Finnish Broadcasting Company. YLE’s Human Resources have been informed about the topic, used method and ways to report the results.

Because the researcher himself works as a manager in the same organization, the anonymity of the answers has been ensured in this study. All the responses for the study were anonymous and interview recordings are securely stored. Interviewees have been anonymized for this report.

The survey is based on self-assessments. In the survey the supervisors evaluate their own performance, action and attitudes as a supervisor. These assessments provide the supervisors invaluable feedback about themselves and assists them in their professional development as a group. Individuals can make both global assessments of themselves and differentiated assessments about their skills and abilities (Erford et al, 2017).

On the other hand, self-assessment is beset with several limitations. Self-assessments can present a narrow conceptualization of the self, ignoring the multiple facets on the self. Self-assessment and self-evaluation have been repeatedly shown to be unreliable (Taylor, 2014). One problem in using self-reflection for development is that although leaders regularly engage in self-reflection in conducting their work, they rarely examine the quality of their reflections. Self-reflection requires more than just casual
5 RESULTS

As told in this paper before, the study was carried out in four phases. In the first phase, a questionnaire, was sent to the sample group in the early spring 2019.

5.1 Results from the first survey

The research project was presented for the sample group in an open briefing on 23.1.2019. Information about the research was distributed in advance also via email for the whole group. The response link was sent to everyone by email on 24th of January 2019 and the response time was until 3.2.2019. At the end of the period 20 respondents had responded to the questionnaire.

After the survey, the results were analyzed and reported to the chief editor and editor-in-chief in Yle News and Current Affairs. The purpose of this report was to give them the results of the research, so that they could develop a management culture based on it.

The answers were also analyzed and summarized for this study, and a report and a discussion on the study was held in April 2019 for all the participants divided into three groups. The views, which were expressed in the discussion, complemented the numerical results of the report. All the participants in the discussions gave written answers during the discussion panels. These written answers were translated to English and summarized to the results section of this paper.

In the first round of the survey the respondents answered similarly. The unanimity figure announced by the ZEF program was 84%. Unanimity is a number that tells how much the respondents agree as a group about the questions asked. 100% unanimity means that all respondents are fully in agreement with each other, and 0% unanimity means that the respondents are completely in disagreement with each other.

The answers were given in a four-field, where the value x = 0 and y = 0 meant that the respondent disagreed with the statement and he/she did not consider it important to him or herself. The value x = 100 and y = 100 meant in a four-field that the defendant agrees with the statement and considers it important to him or herself.

In the results all the answers placed to the highest quarter of the four-field (Table 10). This means that the respondents have evaluated the claims true and considered them at the same time to be important for themselves.
The worst self-ratings were given in the following statements:

- Olen työntekijöiden puolella – I am on the side of the employees’ (y58.8-x68.9)
- Pyydän palautetta toiminnastani – I request feedback on my activities (x59.1-y71.5)
- Huolehdin oman esimiestyöni kehittämisestä - I work on to develop my own supervisor skills (x65.9-y83.3)

As can be seen from all these answers, even they are at a very high level.

That is why all the responses were normalized with ZEF tool. In the normalization of responses, ZEF takes into account each respondent's response style and highlights the mutual appreciation of the answers as told in the method chapter of this study.

First questions in the survey measured supervisor’s thoughts about coaching leadership style.

In statements about coaching style (table 11), the supervisors seemed to value the most the claim “Yritän saada myös muut innostumaan - I try to get others excited”. Encouraging (Kannustan jokaista henkilökohtaisesti) and feedback (Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta) ranked much lower in this normalized four-field.
In normalized answers about group developer skills, the supervisors valued the most the claim about active following of his or her’s team activities (Seuraan aktiivisesti tiimini toimintaa – I actively follow my team’s activities). The second best was the claim about attention given for the group (Huomioin ryhmäni jäsenet – I pay attention to the members of my group), as shown in table 12.

In normalized answers about boundary setting skills (table 13), the supervisors valued the most the claim Pidän yllä yhteisesti sovittuja pelisääntöjä ja puutun tarvittaessa epäkohtiin – I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary. Other two claims ranked to levels of disagreement or the claim was not important for the respondents.
Table 14: Normalized four-field about relationship building

In claims about relationship building (table 14), the sample group of 30 people ranked the highest the claim about trustworthiness: Teen sen, minkä lupaan – I’ll do what I promise got the best rank in normalized results. Kohtelen kaikkia oikeudenmukaisesti - I treat everyone fairly was a bit more agreed claim, but the importance of it was lower in this survey.

Table 15: Normalized four-field about trendsetting

In claims about trendsetting skills (table 15) supervisors seemed to value the importance of responsibility. Kannan vastuun päätöksistä – I take responsibility for decisions was fully agreed and an important quality for supervisors.

Table 16: Normalized four-field about facilitating (due technical problems with ZEF this table is hand-written)

In the survey there was four claims measuring facilitator skills as shown in table 16. Annan tiimini jäsenille vastuuta ja valtaa – I give responsibility and power to my team members got the highest rank in normalized answers. It should be noted that in this and the following claim group (table 17) also the normalized responses reach a high level at the upper corner of the quadrilateral.
In the last table (table 17) and claim group, supervisors answered to claims about developer skills and attitudes. Luon kehittämiselle edellytykset – I am creating conditions for development got the highest rank. As told previously, responses also in this claim group remained on a very high level after normalization.

Through normalized responses, it can be seen that the supervisors of the sample group in YLE News and Current Affairs emphasize particularly the following elements of leadership:

- Yhteisistä sovituista pelisäännöistä kiinnipitäminen – I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary
- Omista lupauksista kiinnipitäminen – I’ll do what I promise
- Vastuunkanto omista päätöksistä – I take responsibility for decisions
- Vastuuttaminen ja vallan antaminen tiimin jäsenille – I give responsibility and power for my teammates
- Edellytysten luominen kehittämiselle – I am creating conditions for the development
- Yritän saada myös muut innostumaan – I try to get others exited
- Seuraan aktiivisesti tiimini toimintaa – I actively follow my team’s activities

“Weak points” of leadership can also be found through the normalized responses. In the survey, the superiors gave lowest evaluations in the following statements:

- Toimin johdollisesti enkä ole manipuloitavissa – I act consistently and cannot be manipulated
- Kuuntelen tiimini jäseniä – I listen to my team members
- Tarkastelen päätöksentekotilanteessa erilaisia vaihtoehtoja – In the decision-making situation, I look at different options
- Asetan tavoitteet yhteistyössä tiimiläisten kanssa – I set goals together with my teammates
- Pyydän palautetta omasta toiminnastani – I ask for the feedback on my activities
- Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta – I give constructive and guiding feedback
- Korostan tiimiläisten yhteistyötä – I emphasize the co-operation of my team members

From the high-ranked responses, it can be noted that supervisors in YLE News and Current Affairs emphasize the “stiffness” of leadership in this survey. They consider it particularly important to stick to the rules and keep their own promises. In their own opinion, they also give responsibility to their team and create the conditions for the development. On the other hand, feedback is not given, teamwork is not emphasized and team
members are not listened to. It is also interesting that one's own actions do not seem to be compelling.

Comparing the answers, a fairly accurate picture of the centralized management model and the management thinking is drawn. The leadership in YLE News and Current Affairs is, in the first survey, quite small-minded and focused on to everyday tasks. The actual leadership can be somewhere else – the researcher sensed that the managers don’t have a feeling that they can really lead freely with confidence. Managers are floating like logs in the river, just follow the orders and carry out the tasks of each team.

The supervisor leads his team from above and think that the team members do not listen. Attitude towards the feedback seem to be underappreciated: different staff surveys have already noted the lack of feedback and are always discussed in YLE News and Current Affairs. Despite this, managers do not seem to appreciate it.
5.2 Results from the first discussions

The results of the surveys first phase were presented to the sample group in three separate discussion sessions. The events were organized after the results were analyzed. The first event took place on April 11, 2019, the second on April 23, and the third on April 24, 2019. About an hour was reserved for each event and the events were held in Finnish.

The discussions were always organized in the same way. Initially, the results of the study were presented to the participants and they were entitled to comment on the results at this stage. In addition, the participants wrote notes, and wrote down their own observations. These anonymous papers were collected after the event.

All three conversations were recorded and transcribed afterwards using Limecraft Flow speech to text software. Limecraft Flow is a cloud service which automatically turns audio into timed text and can be used for subtitling. In Finnish, its performance is still weak, but it translates speech into text in a general level.

Attendance at the events was low, with only a small proportion of the sample group members attending. Nevertheless, the semi-structured discussion of the results provided further information on the subject for the researcher.

The purpose of the discussions was not only to inform supervisors of the results, but also to get more information on the subject being researched. At the same time, they were able to comment freely on the research method and the questions.

It became clear during the discussions that the research findings were generally considered to be accurate and they highlighted the true weak points of leadership in YLE News and Current Affairs. Feedback culture and the development of one's own work attracted the most discussion in all three groups.

In the discussions, supervisors told that giving feedback and receiving it, is considered important but at the same time difficult. Particularly supervisors discussed, when and where to give feedback, that it would be noted.

Interviewee 1: “It’s true that it [feedback culture] has always been bad in staff surveys. When I started to work here, I never got any feedback. Or once actually, I remember that one colleague told that he/she had heard, that in a one meeting it was said that one my article was good”

Interviewee 3: “We’ve probably just raised into a culture that we’re not supposed to ask questions. It is always somehow assumed, that feedback comes without asking, and it is not actively asked.”

Interviewee 1: “It is so funny [in managerial feedback] that once a year your hands are shaking when you check what they [employees] have said now. In the same way, feedback could be continuous, that kind of... “supervisor X – you got this kind of feedback from the past week”
Interviewee 2: “I don’t really know if anyone needs any massive feedback meetings, but if you give any feedback on the corridors at work, it probably won’t be seen as feedback.”

Interviewee 4: “In the development discussions quite a few people says he/she doesn’t need it”

Interviewee 3: “It may be easier [to give feedback] when you go through together yearly Tyke-discussions or you’re talking about strategy or some other structured discussion. But in everyday life, I find it a lot more challenging. Or if there is a project, it is easy to give instrumental feedback. Yes, it’s hard to expose yourself to criticism and it takes a lot of skill to handle that feedback – if you don’t just want everyone to say: ”Right, everything goes smoothly”.”

Interviewee 3: “Feedback can be natural, when you have some kind of project and you give feedback about it. But it is much harder to act in general. So how in general you meet people in this work community etc. That’s awkward!”

The supervisor coaching in YLE was widely appreciated. On the other hand, it was criticized for being superlative and sometimes for being solely journalistic. Most of the interviewees still find trainings and leadership coaching useful.

Interviewee 4: “Sometimes, if your trainings are in our organization, we might go too micro-level. When you are in training with people, with whom you are not so familiar with and whose work tasks are a bit unclear for yourself – then you can maybe take that helicopter perspective into yourself and see solutions.”

Interviewee 5: “All of our goals strive to be journalistic, so should there be other goals in the direction we are supposed to go? Like work culture related?”

Interviewee 3: “What would it be like to develop my own managerial work? Do we understand it as reading the professional literature and attending to leadership courses? Do we see it as a lesson of the superintendent at that time, or is it seen as a reflection of one’s own everyday activities – through self-leadership and continuous self-reflection of one’s leadership capabilities? If you see it as an educational task, where you just take a book to read and settle managerial issues, it will certainly do quite a bit. But if it is seen as that reflection, then I believe, happens quite a lot.”

Employees self-direction also emerged in discussions.

Interviewee 3: “It would be ideal, that people would not stick to the rules so literally, and it wouldn’t be manager’s job to remind them of possibilities. And then I think that when people also take responsibility for their choices, somebody else doesn’t need to say “Hey, let’s follow these rules here”.

During the discussions, participants also made written notes and answered for the questions. A total of eight of these anonymous papers were returned after the discussions.
In the notes, the respondents mostly considered the results of the study to be credible. One of the respondents even found it surprising that the supervisors' experiences were so consistent.

In the question "Which of the claims was most important for you?" the answers fell apart and almost everyone raised a different theme. All supervisors have strengths and weaknesses in their leadership, so the diffusion of interest in results was not surprising for the researcher.

To the question "In what direction would you like to develop your own leadership?" most of the supervisors answered, that they wanted to develop their leadership into a coaching and self-directed direction. Also listening skills and will to develop one’s own self-reflection skill were mentioned in written answers.

To the last question about the study itself, most of the supervisors answered that they found the study very useful and interesting for themselves.
5.3 Results from the second survey

The survey was repeated in autumn 2019. The response link was sent to the same sample group on 4th of November 2019 and the response time was until 15th of November. At the end of the period 23 respondents had responded to the questionnaire.

The survey was conducted in the same way and with the same claims as the first survey in January. This makes the survey results reliable, comparable and provides insight into behavioral change over time. Repeating the same survey with the same research sample group provides a comparable result, that can be used to determine whether a change in leadership style has occurred between the surveys.

After the survey, the results were analyzed and reported to the chief editor and editor-in-chief. The purpose of this report was to give them the results of the research, so that they could develop a management culture based on it in YLE News and Current Affairs.

The answers were also analyzed and summarized for this study, and based on the responses, a report and a discussion on the study was held in December 2019 for all the participants. The views, which were expressed in the discussion, complemented the numerical result of the report. All the discussion participants gave also written answers during the discussion panels. These written answers were translated to English and are summarized to the results section of this paper.

In the second round of the survey the respondents answered similarly. The unanimity figure announced by the ZEF program was 83%. As told before, unanimity is a number that tells how much the respondents agree as a group about the questions asked. 100% unanimity means that all respondents are fully in agreement with each other, and 0% unanimity means that the respondents are completely in disagreement with each other.

In the results all the answers placed again to the highest quarter of the four-field. This means that the respondents have evaluated the claims true and considered them at the same time to be important for themselves.

The lowest self-ratings were given in November in the following statements:

- Pyydän palautetta toiminnastani – I request feedback on my activities (x61.4 - y74.8)
- Olen työntekijöiden puolella – I am on the side of the employees’ (y63.5 - x66.3)
- Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta – I give constructive and guiding feedback (x72.6 – y 76.2)
- Korostan tiimiläisten yhteistyötä – I emphasize the co-operation of my team members (x75.4-y74.4)

As can be seen from all the answers, even they are, in principle, at a very high level.

That is why all the responses were normalized again with the ZEF tool. As told before, in the normalization of responses, ZEF takes into account each respondent’s response style and highlights the mutual appreciation of the answers as told in method part of this paper.
The first claims in the surveys second round measured supervisor’s thoughts about the coaching leadership style.

**Table 18: Normalized four-field about coaching**

In the normalized claims of coaching (table 18) it can be seen, that the supervisors valued the highest the claim “yritän saada myös muut innostumaan – I try to get others excited”. The feedback claim (Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta) ranked much lower and the claim about personal encouraging (Kannustan jokaista henkilökohtaisesti) was ranked to the lowest level on this table.

**Table 19: Normalized four-field about group developer skills.**

Table 19 shows normalized four-field about the group developer skills. In this main role table, the supervisors valued highest the claim “seuraan aktiivisesti tiimini toimintaa”. The claim about the attention given for the team was basically on the same level, but it wasn’t so important for the supervisors than the claim about following the team activities. The claim about supporting the co-operation in the team was the most disagreed and not important for the supervisors in the normalized answers.
Table 20: Normalized four-field about boundary setting

In the normalized answers about the boundary setting skills (table 20), the supervisors valued highest the claim “Olen tarvitessa jämäkkää ja kykenen sanomaan myös ei – I’m strong if needed and I am also able to say no”. The sample group agreed even more on the claim about commonly agreed rules (Pidän yllä yhteisesti sovittuja pelisääntöjä), but they didn’t seem to value importance of it as much as the strength of the management. The third claim in this table was ranked the lowest in importance and disagreement.

Table 21: Normalized four-field about relationship building

Supervisors agreed in the four-field about relationship building (table 21) the most the claim about trustworthiness. Surprisingly it seems to be at the same time the most lowest ranked in importance in this claim group. The claims about fairness and listening of the team members, were important for the supervisors, but at the same time both claims were quite disagreed in the sample group. None of the normalized responses were in the top quarter of this four-field.
In the claims about trendsetting (table 22) supervisors seemed to press importance on responsibility (Kannan vastuun päätöksistä – I take responsibility for decisions). This claim was fully agreed and it seemed to be important for the supervisors. The most disagreed claim was “Minulle on tärkeää näyttää suuntaa ja viestiä ajatuksiani tiimilleni - It is important for me to show direction and communicate my thoughts to my team.”

Table 23: Normalized four-field about facilitating

In table 23 are the normalized results from answers about facilitator skills. “Annan tieniin jäsenille vastuuta ja valtaa – I give responsibility and power to my team members” got the highest rank in the normalized answers. The claim about goal setting with the group and claim “Olen työntekijöiden puolella – I am on the side of the employees” were disagreed and not important for the supervisors.

Table 24: Normalized four-field about developer attitude

The feedback culture became the topic of discussion in the spring survey. According to the survey conducted in the autumn, the feedback seemed to be still on the agenda - the
claim "Pyydän palautetta omasta toiminnastani - I ask for feedback on my own actions" was extremely down in the normalized responses (table 24). The other developmental claims also circulate the upper quarter in the normalized answers.

Through normalized responses, supervisors of the sample group in YLE News and Current Affairs emphasize particularly the following elements of leadership:

- Yritän saada myös muut innostumaan – I try to get others exited
- Seuraan aktiivisesti tiimini toimintaa – I actively follow my team’s activities
- Olen tarvittaessa jämäkkä ja kykenen myös sanomaan ei – I’m strong if needed and I am also able to say no
- Yhteisistä sovituista pelisäännöistä kiinnipitäminen – I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary
- Vastuunkanto omista päätöksistä – I take responsibility for decisions
- Vastuuttaminen ja vallan antaminen tiimin jäsenille – I give responsibility and power for my teammates
- Edellytysten luominen kehittämiselle – I am creating conditions for the development

The weak points of the leadership can also be found through the normalized responses. In the survey in November 2019, supervisors gave lowest self-evaluations in the following statements:

- Kannustan jokaista henkilökohtaisesti – I encourage everyone personally
- Korostan tiimiläisten yhteistyötä – I emphasize the co-operation of my team members
- Kuuntelen tiimini jäseniä – I listen to my team members
- Asetan tavoitteet yhteistyössä tiimiläisten kanssa – I set goals together with my teammates
- Minulle on tärkeää näyttää suuntaa ja viestiä ajatuksiani tiimilleni – It is important for me to show direction and communicate my thoughts to my team
- Olen työntekijöiden puolella - I am on the side of the employees’
- Toimin johdonmukaisesti enkä ole manipuloitavissa – I act consistently and cannot be manipulated
- Pyydän palautetta omasta toiminnastani – I ask for the feedback on my activities
- Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta – I give constructive and guiding feedback
- Tarkastelen päätöksentekotilanteessa erilaisia vaihtoehtoja – In the decision-making situation, I look at different options

From the high-ranked responses, it can be noted that the supervisors emphasize still the “stiffness” of the leadership. However, inspiring the team members is seen important, as is responsibility and the empowerment of the team members. Through the normalization, the values of the superiors become visible. The answers that ranked the highest were the same as in the survey made in January.

Poor leadership scores indicate the difficulty of leadership in YLE News and Current Affairs. Based on the normalized responses, working with teammates seems to be
difficult for the team leaders, teamwork is less emphasized, and the goals might come from outside of the team. The feedback culture is still emerging in a negative light. The responses also seem to be improving the coherence of one's own activities and decision-making situations.

The dispersion of the normalized responses is greater in the autumn questionnaire, than in the spring. This might be because the supervisors were already familiar with the survey and the claims. The group discussions held in the spring, may have been in the minds of the respondents and directed them to respond in this way.

It is noteworthy, that in the two claim sections the normalized answers do not rank in the top quarter of the four-field. The relationship builder (table 21) and the developer attitude (table 24) sections were both ranked the lowest in the value scale.
5.4 Results from the second discussion

The results of the surveys third phase were presented for the sample group in a one separate discussion session. The event was organized after the results of the survey were analyzed. The event took place on December 5th in 2019. About an hour was reserved for the discussion and it was held in Finnish.

The discussion was organized in the same way as in spring. Initially, the results of the study were presented to the participants and they were entitled to comment on the results at this stage. In addition, they wrote notes and observations for the researcher. These anonymous papers were collected after the event. The conversation was recorded and transcribed afterwards using Limecraft Flow speech to text software.

Attendance to the event was again low, only 8 persons participated to the discussion. Nevertheless, the semi-structured discussion and the anonymous notes of the results provided further information on the subject for the researcher. The purpose of the discussion was not only to inform supervisors of the research results, but also to get more information on the subject being researched. At the same time the participants were able to comment freely about the research method and the questions. The study’s results were posted afterwards through email for the whole sample group.

In the spring, the discussions highlighted particularly the feedback culture, but in the autumn, the supervisors agonized more on the changes that had occurred in the survey. There was also discussion of the research method and the normalization of the results.

When discussing the result, some supervisors saw the timing of the surveys significant for the result.

**Interviewee 1:** “It seems like a year is a short time for changes in trends. Can the result be related to the fact that the season is different? I’m just wondering, how does February feel like and how does it feel like now, in December? There is a lot of work to do at the end of the year and people are maybe more critical of their own work.”

There was a lot of discussion about the stiffness in the leadership. In the autumn, the supervisors pointed out in the discussion, that the organizational change in 2019 in YLE News and Current Affairs have contributed to this.

**Interviewee 2:** “I can see something in the fact, that in the spring some of the teams were new and in the autumn supervisors and the organization maybe needed a little more assertive leadership. Later in the autumn, people have been able to operate a little more freely and, for example, the claim about listening to my team members has risen at the same time.”

**Interviewee 3:** “The organization has changed during the year. And for example, that claim ‘I treat everyone fairly’ is surely reflecting the pain, that one had to make sometimes unfortunate decisions during the organizational renewal.”
Interviewee 4: “I’m not sure if it goes like that. Even difficult decisions can be made fairly. After all, decisions are not made randomly here. That is the hardest part of this job: being on the company’s side and at the same time understand the situation of your subordinate - be very close to that human pain. And so, at the same time, work under the pressure of doing so.”

Interviewee 5: “When it comes to making decisions based on the company’s policy – all the decisions are not always the best decisions for all employees. This position as a supervisor is not always comfortable.”

Interviewee 3: The most difficult... if you have to be in a situation, where you find a reform difficult or even wrong. And you still have to defend a decision that you’re not really supporting.”

In the discussion, the supervisors found the concept of power as one of the main results of the study. There was much discussion about the role of supervisors and whether they can truly influence to the decisions in the organization. The discussion was led by the claim "Toimin johdonmukaisesti enkä ole manipuloitavissa – I act consistently and cannot be manipulated" dropping in importance, while the normalized result had remained at a low level during the year 2019.

The survey was answered by the team leaders and producers, who are practically in a managerial position in YLE News and Current Affairs. Some of the responses in the discussion raised the feeling that perhaps power had risen up during the year and the producers were left as operational leaders.

Interviewee 6: “After all, for example, our producers have the power to make decisions, and they certainly get their dose of the strategy. However, maybe they are more involved in operational activities than in human resource management.”

Interviewee 3: “I have a really new producer in my team, and I don’t give him/her to make strategical or personnel decisions, or anything else. Yet. The new person in this position does not know yet the substance.”

Interviewee 4: “I think we have had the same way to operate for a long time. And now when we’re changing the way we do things... I think volatility of these results and in leadership are reflecting these feelings.”

Interviewee 5: “Surely no supervisor can choose his or her team and the team’s tasks are ready given. A supervisor cannot influence the goal or productivity of a team. It is difficult to start building a big change.”
The discussion highlighted the wish of superiors to receive support for their managerial work. Many of them said they get support from their colleagues, but that may not be enough. Asking for help was considered to be difficult. Based on the discussion held in December, there is a need for supporting the supervisors more in YLE News and Current Affairs.

**Interviewee 4:** “I think it should be automatic and easily accessible. One can need support every now and then - sometimes for a longer period, sometimes for a shorter period.”

Six written responses were collected after the event. Many of the anonymous answers marveled at the major changes that emerged during the study. However, during the discussion, the method was clarified and explained for the sample group. The method seeks only the developmental points and priorities in managing, and the figures in the table cannot be read as absolute truth. The normalization of the results is just a tool to see the emphasis in supervisors thinking. It was also stressed on the absolute result of the study, that superiors’ self-assessments are at a very high level.

However, in the written answers, the result of the study was considered interesting. One respondent said that he or she did not benefit from the study, but other respondents found it useful and interesting to hear about YLE News and Current Affairs superiors’ management views. One of the respondents said: "The results of the research are certainly a part of reality. There has been an undeniable improvement in the work of our supervisors in recent years." Another respondent stated that: "I recognize a change in my own attitudes. But has it really changed so extensively and vigorously? So, am I part of something bigger!?"
6 ANALYSIS

The purpose of this research is to analyze to what extent the perceptions about leadership change during a studio and content renewing project in Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE’s News and Current Affairs in 2018-2019. When interpreting the results, it must be borne in mind that supervisors' assessments of their own performance are high in self-assessments made in spring and autumn. The answers for the all claim groups were in the top quarter, which can be considered as the expected result, as it is a self-assessment of one's own actions. An annual staff survey conducted in the autumn 2019 also supports this result. According to the personnel survey, the work of supervisors at YLE is of a high standard and highly valued (Yleisradio 2019).

Repeating survey questions provide still insight into behavioral change over time and gives comparable result that can be used to determine whether change in leadership styles have occurred between surveys. However, the normalization of responses indicates areas for improvement that the organization should focus on in the future. Normalized responses also show change trends in superiors’ thinking.

The table on the next page (table 25) shows normalized results of the self-assessments made in the spring and the autumn 2019. The normalized results of the spring research are marked with light gray and normalized results from the autumn with darker grey.

Agreement level reflects similarity with each claim. The higher the figure, the more consensual the group of respondents has been with the statement. The importance level, in turn, reflects the importance of each claim for the respondents. The higher this figure, the greater the importance the respondent group has seen in the claim for themselves as leaders.

Normalized responses indicate that supervisors' priorities in their management style have changed during the year 2019 in YLE News and Current Affairs. In general, there is a slight decrease in the results for all claims.

If all the claims are thought to measure the general level of the coaching leadership style, then the spring agreement level averaged in the normalized answers 56.30. In the autumn, the average of all responses was 49.91. The importance level of the claims averaged 58.75 in the spring and averaged 50.19 in the autumn.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yritän saada myös muut innostumaan – I try to get others excited</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannustan jokaista henkilökohtaisesti – I encourage everyone personally</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annan rakentavaa ja ohjaavaa palautetta – I give constructive and guiding feedback</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seuraan aktiivisesti tiimin toimintaa – I actively follow my team’s activities</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huomoin ryhmäni jäsenet – I pay attention to the members of my group</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korostan tiimiläiseni yhteistyötä – I emphasize the co-operation of my team members</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olen tarvittaessa jämäkkä ja kykenen sanomaan myös ei – I’m strong if needed and I can also say no</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidän yllä yhteisesti sovittuja pelissääntöjä ja puuttun tarvittaessa epäkohtia – I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiman johdonmukaisesti enkä ole manipulointi-vassa – I act consistently and cannot be manipulated</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuuntelen tiimin jäseniä – I listen to my team members</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohtelen kaikkia oikeudenmukaisesti – I treat everyone fairly</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen sen, minkä lupaan – I’ll do what I promise</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minulle on tärkeää näyttää suuntaa ja viestiä ajatuksiani tiimilleeni – It is important for me to show direction and communicate my thoughts to my team</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkastelen päätöksentekolointiessa erilaisia vaihtoehtoja – In the decision-making situation, I look at different options</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannan vastuu päätöksistä – I take responsibility for decisions</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olen työtekiyjien puolella – I am on the side of the employees</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annan tiimin jäsenille vastuuta ja valtaa – I give responsibility and power to my team members</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asetan tavoitteet yhteistyössä tiimiläisten kanssa – I set goals together with my teammates</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seuraan ja arvoin asetettujen tavoitteiden toteutumista yhdessä tiimiläisten kanssa – I follow and evaluate the achievement of given goals with my teammates</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyydän palautetta omasta toiminnastani – I ask for feedback on my activities</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luon kehittämiselle edellytykset – I am creating conditions for the development</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huolehdin oman esimiestäni kehittämisestä – I work to develop my own supervisor skills</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salin myös virheet – I allow errors</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Comparison of the surveys made in spring and autumn
Based on the responses given during the year, the supervisors place particular emphasis on trying to get others excited, they are maintaining commonly agreed rules and take responsibility for decisions. They also seem to find important to give responsibility to their team and allows errors.

Based on the results (table 25), for the YLE News and Current Affairs management it is not so important or agreed to emphasize collaboration, act consistently, show direction and communicate ideas to the team, ask feedback on their own actions - or be on the employee side.

The decline occurred in the statements:

- I encourage everyone personally
- I actively follow team’s activities
- I emphasize the co-operation of my team members
- I act consistently and cannot be manipulated
- I treat everyone fairly
- It is important for me to show direction and communicate my thoughts to my team
- I am on the side of the employees’
- I set goals together with my team
- I ask for feedback on my activities
- I am creating conditions for the development
- I work to develop my own supervisor skills.

The increase occurred in the following statements:

- I give constructive and guiding feedback
- I pay attention to the members of my group
- I’m strong if needed and I am also able to say no
- I maintain the commonly agreed rules and I intervene if necessary
- I listen to my team members
- In the decision-making situation, I look at different options
- I give responsibility and power to my team members
- I allow errors

Most of the declined grades were connected to working or co-operating with the own group or the employees. For example, the claim “I set goals together with my team-mates” was declining from 64.4 to 21.2. in agreement level. “I emphasize the co-operation of my team members” declined in agreement level from 17.5 to 6.1 and it wasn’t thought to be important at all when supervisors were reflecting their managerial skills in self-assessments.

Therefore, based on the normalized statements, it can be interpreted that there has been a decline in the supervisor-employee relationship during the year. At the same time, it seems that the development of managerial activities is no longer considered as important than in spring.
On the other hand, some increases were shown in the results as well. The importance of feedback seemed to grow during the year, though supervisors did not agree with this claim: agreement level grew only from 23.7 to 23.8. “I pay attention to the members of my group” grew from 36.7 to 86.7 in agreement level, but at the same time “I actively follow my team’s activities” decreased from 95.8 to 57.2 in agreement level.

The strength of the leadership was a highly respected feature in this survey. Importance of the claim “I’m strong if needed and I am also able to say no” grew from 3.4 to 83.7 during the year 2019. Agreement with the claim about commonly agreed rules grew at the same time from 61.7 to 84.7. The claim about consistency of own work dropped from 66.9 to 4.6. Based on these results, it can be concluded that so-called hard values are on a upward trend in YLE News and Current Affairs.

As told before, the normalization of responses indicates areas for improvement that the organization should focus on in the future. Normalized responses also show the change trends in superiors’ thinking.
7 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the leadership perceptions of YLE News and Current Affairs executives changed during the year 2019. Major technical and content changes were made in the organization during the year, and even the organizational structure was modified. The possible change in the leadership was followed up with repeated surveys and the results were validated with semi-structured discussions.

Leadership can be defined as a process to influence people to achieve results (Alonderine & Majauskaite 2016 p. 141; Nazarian et al 2017, p.1079; Salehzadeh 2017 p. 865). Mitonga-Monga et all (2012), as cited in Nazarian et all (2017 p. 1079), stated that leadership is a procedure for influencing others commitment by identifying their full potential for reaching objectives.

This study examines whether reforms have led to changes in superiors' own perceptions and reflections of the good leadership. The leadership style is playing a central role when predicting organization performance or outcomes (Yahaya & Fawzy 2015 p.190; Vignoli et al 2018 p.275) and leaders need to adapt their leadership style to match situations in organizations (Istoa-White & Saunders p. 68-69).

The Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE has focused on coaching leadership in its managerial training, so it was natural for this research, that the possible change in leadership was measured with a tool of coaching leadership. A group of 30 people were selected for the sample group from the YLE News and Current Affairs. This sample represents over 2/3 of the supervisors in News and Current Affairs, so the result of the study can be considered comprehensive. The research was combining both quantitative and qualitative methods and the results were converging and leading to the same conclusions (Heale & Forbes 2013).

Based on the research, managers value their leadership to a very high standard. An annual staff survey conducted in the autumn 2019 supports this finding. According to the personnel survey, the work of supervisors at YLE is of a high standard and highly valued (Yleisradio 2019).

However, weak signals of the problems in leadership at YLE News and Current Affairs can be found through the normalization of the survey results. As the reform project progressed in 2019, supervisors’ perceptions and priorities in different areas of coaching leadership changed.

From the results it can be interpreted that the project has demanded a change in the leadership concepts. It has been YLE's goal to increase participatory leadership, where the situational leadership manager works closely with the team or a specific person and shares decision-making responsibilities (Luizzi, 2017). The situational leadership theory offers four potential leadership styles and four maturity levels that define the members of a team. The leadership styles are in this theory telling, selling, participating and delegating (Istoa-White & Saunders, p. 69; Rollinson, p. 371). Model suggest that the leaders style needs to change in relation to the readiness of the employee for any given task (Istoa-White & Saunders, p. 69; Rollinson, pp. 370-373).
According to previous research (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2014; Rollinson 1998) leaders and supervisors can change or mix their leadership styles during big projects. The best of leaders typically display both transformational and transactional leadership (Avolio & Bass 1999 p.457) and they can stress different factors of the leadership styles during for example longer projects or when getting more experience; appropriate leadership style is based on the followers and the task (Salehzadeh 2017 p. 866).

In the light of the results, one can see transition from the participatory leadership to the selling style leadership. In the selling style leadership relationship behaviors are low, but task behavior is high and readiness of subordinates can be low (Rollinson 1998, p. 371). In some of the results it looks like also the so called telling style is getting stronger in supervisors’ self-evaluations 2019. In telling style the leader of the group tells each member what to do (Free management books, 2018). This approach is less collaborative and more directive, the leader simply provides instructions for the team members. (Rollinson 1998, p. 371). The discussion held after the survey supports this finding. In the debate, superiors said that more assertive leadership has been needed during the year as the organization was reformed and the structure of the teams in YLE News and Current Affairs changed.

On the other hand, during the autumn, co-operation with team members has increased, and responsibilities are shared, so one can think that the hardest times have been in the spring and now managerial work is shifting towards collaboration and participatory again.

During the year, self-assessments of the supervisors decreased especially on issues related to subordinate leadership, intimacy and goal setting. The value of own team cooperation was also decreasing. There is also diminishment in the feedback culture. On the other hand, supervisors place emphasis on trying to get others excited, they are maintaining commonly agreed rules and take responsibility for the decisions. They also seem to find important to give responsibility to their team and allows errors.

The discussion held in December highlighted the wish of superiors to receive support for their managerial work. Many of them said they get support from their colleagues, but that may not be enough. Based on the discussion, there is a need for more leadership support for the supervisors at YLE News and Current Affairs.

Although this research combines both qualitative and quantitative research, it has its limitations. The survey is based on self-assessments and this is setting several limitations on the interpretation of the results. Self-assessment and self-evaluation have been repeatedly shown to be unreliable (Taylor, 2014). Therefore, for the future research, it would be important to involve employees to bring their views to the discussion about leadership styles in YLE News and Current Affairs. On the other hand, the personnel survey conducted in the autumn supports the results of this survey and it can therefore be considered reliable.

As a method, the normalization of results succeeded in highlighting weak signals of changes in leadership. Qualitative discussions supported the findings of this study.
8 CONCLUSION

According to this study, management is at a high level in YLE News and Current Affairs. However, during the year 2019 the supervisors’ perceptions, reflections and priorities in the different areas of coaching leadership style changed. From the results it can be interpreted that the renewing project of the studios and content, has demanded a change in the leadership concepts. It has been YLE’s goal to increase participatory leadership, where the situational leadership manager works closely with the team or a specific person and shares decision-making responsibilities (Luizzi, 2017). In the light of the results, one can see more transition to the selling style leadership, where relationship behaviors are low, but task behavior is high and readiness of subordinates can be low (Rollinson 1998, p. 371). According to the surveys and discussions, YLE News and Current Affair’s supervisors would need more support for their leadership. The organization should also possibly develop and systematize the feedback system and the feedback culture and develop management training system.
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