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Summary

This article presents the problem of defining the concept of “competence”, due to it being an integral and complex term that has been applied in many domains as well as in a more general sense for everyday life. However, no doubt, a competence can only be tested and valuated in the practice, and it is a person who becomes competent in a context for a certain function. This is why there are many different conceptions in the literature regarding this issue; it’s a consequence of its imprecise, variable character. However, the position profiles (mainly in educational entities) and the acceptation/graduation profiles are being more and more frequently established in terms of competences. This paper intends to check what has been valuated and written about the managerial competences training and development regarding the educational field, in order to obtain conclusions regarding its dimension in the school level.

Keywords: Competences, directive competences, professional competences, education.

Resumen

En el artículo se expresa la problemática acerca de la definición del concepto de competencia debido, en parte, a que es un término integral y complejo, y a que se ha aplicado en diversos ámbitos, así como en sentido general, para la vida. Pero, sin lugar a dudas, ella solo puede comprobarse en la acción, y es la persona quien se vuelve competente en contexto para una determinada función. De ahí que en la literatura se observen concepciones diferentes en torno a esta problemática, lo cual se deriva de su carácter impreciso y variable. Sin embargo, cada vez con mayor asiduidad, los perfiles de puesto (sobre todo en entidades educativas) y los de ingreso/egreso son establecidos en términos de competencias. El presente artículo pretende llevar a cabo una revisión acerca de lo que se ha valorado y escrito sobre el proceso de formación y desarrollo de competencias directivas en lo específico del ámbito educacional, para arribar a conclusiones sobre su dimensión en el plano escolar.
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Introduction

Even today, there is not a general consensus regarding the definition of the term “competence”, partly due to it being a complex, inclusive concept which has been applied in many different domains, such as the work field and the academic field (including the teaching-educational process, special teaching methods, and teachers and learners functions in the classroom), as well as, in a more general sense, in everyday life. However, there is no doubt that this can be proved only in the practice, and it is the person who becomes competent in a certain context, for a specific function.

Different conceptions regarding this issue are frequently found; for example, in the human resources field, the concept is understood in a different way than it is in the educational field. It is even possible to find different definitions in one field. This is the result of the term’s imprecise, variable character. However, the position profiles (mainly in educational entities) and the acceptation/graduation profiles are being more and more frequently established in terms of competences.

This article intends to check what has been valued and written about the managerial competences training and development specifically in the educational field, in order to obtain conclusion regarding its dimension in the school level.

Argumentation.

In the academic field, competence-oriented pedagogy defines the actions a student will need to be able to take after the learning has taken place (Corominas et al., 2006). This means that, first, the learning process takes place and it is then applied; and it is during its application where the competence development level is verified in a certain context and with the possibility to be transferred to other areas, since this competence manifests in habitual, observable behaviors that allow to succeed in the task (Arbós, 2006).

Competences refer to what a person is able to do, more than to the person’s knowledge. This has several implications:
• If the competence refers to the “doing”, it must have a specific context.
• The competence is a result which describes what a person can do, and not a learning process built by oneself.
• In order to measure the competence, performance levels, evidences or standards are to be set, for it is through these elements that the competence will be evaluated; therefore, it is the measurement or degree of what a person can do in a certain moment and context.

There are multiple definitions to the term “competence” and they can arise from different perspectives; for example, they can emerge from a set of observable behaviors that lead to perform, effective and efficiently, a certain job in a certain organization (Arbós, 2006, p. 46). Therefore, this concept is associated to several elements: (1) it’s about observable behaviors, (2) which contribute to succeeding in a task or work position, and (3) it is developed in a certain organization; that is to say, in the framework of a program, an organizational structure, a culture and a concrete task. Therefore, a competence is not something isolated, like a skill or an attitude, but it is the harmonic integration of all these aspects in the performance of a concrete work activity.

According to several authors, “competence” is the capability of using several cognitive resources in order to face a certain type of situations, and it implies aptitudes and personality traits, as well as knowledge acquired in a professional activity which is, at the same time, a direct source of personal development that demands a constant learning capability.

From a closer perspective, Tobón (2014, p. 24) points out that, in a social-instructive level, competences are not a response to the requirements of the context, but the behavior that a person has in an ecological framework concordant with personal needs and interests, activities required by the context, the capability to cope with problem and the creative, enterprising assumption of new challenges. This is how he defines them as “inclusive behaviors to identify, interpret, argue and solve context-related problems, developing and applying different types of knowledge in an articulate way (...), with suitability, continuous improvement and ethic” (p.89).
Today, when the complexity of responsibilities and duties increases for a manager, the aptitudes and personality traits references are no longer enough, so the job positions’ exigencies are described by the experts directly in terms of competences. These competences are, then, characterized in connection with the same concrete duties that resort to several aptitudes and personality traits, all together; and the success of said missions also depends on theoretical and practical knowledge (Lévy-Leboyer, 2009).

In addition to this, the competence has many mastery levels and evaluates the results, not the processes, for it focuses on the action itself; that is to say, on the real possibility of a person for a certain function.

One of the many existing classifications, according to the competence mastery level, is the following: novice, beginner-advanced, competent, professional and expert (Thight, 1996, p. 123), and it is sustained on the relation between the competence and the person’s experience. In other words, those who reach the expert level can make sense of the behavior models based on the mastery of their own dexterity, because they have deeper degrees of understanding.

On the other hand, Bogoya (2000) proposed three levels: recognition and distinction, interpretation and understanding, and production. Gómez (2001) refers to four levels: the first one is called “routine performance”, second, “autonomous performance”, the third, “transference performance”, and the fourth, “intuitive performance”, which is when the competence is put into action, in a personalized way, in diverse related problems and in many contexts.

Finally, Tobón (2014, p. 332) mentions five mastery levels: performance, receptive, decisive (or basic), autonomous and, on the higher level, the strategic one, which is when reality change strategies are used, there is creativity and innovation, there are high levels of impact on reality, evolutionary and prospective analysis are made in order to better approach different problems that may come up, and the consequences of certain decisions are considered.

According to other authors, there are many levels regarding process management, as he has called them (direction levels); but, there is a list
if performances in terms of qualities and processes, such as interpersonal qualities, communication, because in every sphere of human activity, including the managerial one, there are communicative exchanges. These exchanges are related to the use of the language and take forms, characteristics and singularities in the field where they originate, according to Botta (1994); also, leadership, knowledge, organization, planning, etc.; the disposition to create teams, to face stress and ambiguity, to select and develop a personnel team, among others.

In this field, the competency allows to effective and efficiently face a troublesome situation defined through the harmonic integration, that is to say, certain knowledge, to generate (positive, favorable) attitudes and to develop skills; all this in a certain context and in continuous learning situation. This allows them to generate innovative ideas, to face new situations, to make continuous evaluations, to make analogies and similarities between contexts and situations in order to learn. This way, the professional competence has different categories according to different authors.

The concept of “competences” started to be used in the entrepreneurial context in the 70’s of the last century in order to reveal that the professional and personal success cannot be predicted only basing on a series of fixed traits. They certainly define a potential behavior, but the precise behavior of the subject is the result of a complex process interaction, in such a way that the traits identification and measurement does not allow to predict the behavioral result.

In order for a person to manifest a certain behavior, it is necessary to have a series of conditions (Tobón 2014) which include “knowing”, which means having the necessary technical knowledge for the task; the “know-how”, which is to apply and use said knowledge through the exercise of appropriate skills and dexterities; the “know hot to be”, which means to adopt certain attitudes and to develop the appropriate ethical behavior for the norms and culture of the organization; the “want to do”, showing the precise interest and motivation; the “can do”, which is to have the necessary means and resources to carry out the activity.
The first researches on managerial competences happened thanks to Boyatzis (1982), who proposed a group starting from a study with managers, which was focused on goals direction and action, leadership, and human resources, subordinate and relations management, among others. From this moment, other proposals arose, such as those of Levy-Leboyer (2009); Mitrani, Dalziel and Suárez (1992), who identified the differential competences which distinguish an excellent execution from a non-excellent execution, such as strategic reasoning, change leadership, relations management, flexibility, introduction to change, interpersonal sensitivity, delegation, team work and transferability.

For Kanungo and Misra (1992), competences in this area represent the “skills” that were learned to use self-regulating and self-controlling procedures at work, and they are classified into affective, intellectual, and action-oriented competences. Other authors categorize them emphasizing on the individual (sistematicity, proactivity, learning disposition, decision-making and control capability, flexibility and adaptability, creativity and critical conscience) or on the social aspect (capability to cooperate and communicate, solidarity attitude, respect and responsibility). However, one of the more divulged proposals was the one from IESE Business School (2008), a pioneer in the concept of managerial training in an alliance with other leader institutions, where the following competences emerged:

- Strategic ones, which refer to the strategic capability a manager has, as well as their relationship with the external environment of the company, which are necessary for achieving economic results. Among them we can find a business vision, problem solving, resource management, client orientation, effective relationship network and negociation.

- Intrategic ones, which refer to the executive and leadership capacity regarding the inner environment of the company, and are oriented to develop the employees and to increase their commitment and trust in the organization. Here, communication, organization, empathy, delegation, coaching and teamwork competences are found.

- Personal efficacy, relative to the habits which allow an effective relationship between the person and their environment, and
which refer to personal balance and development as well as to the maintenance of an active, realistic, stimulating relationship with the environment, strengthening the efficacy of the previous managerial competences groups. They measure the self-direction capability, which is essential for managing, and they involve four basic competences, each of one is, at the same time, divided in three sub-competences: proactivity (initiative, creativity and personal autonomy), self-government (discipline, concentration and self-control), personal management (time, stress and risk management) and personal development (self-criticism, self-knowledge and personal change).

In the main, we can observe that the managerial process reflects a way of integrating human behaviors, making decisions and solving problems in an organization, which allows to reach goals that would be impossible to reach individually. This facilitates a certain transformation of the environment in which the organization is immersed. Therefore, this requires to unite two essential aspects: the person’s intervention and the organization’s mission. This is when we can say that there are two types of goals: the organization’s goal (objective goal) and the members’ personal goals (subjective goals), which is what makes necessary the existence of a linking mechanism, which is called a control system control (Bastons, 2004, p. 64).

In this sense, it is important to use the learning environment contributed by the organizations to identify the relevant knowledge and practices in people and groups which constitute learning communities; and to make the implicit knowledge explicit, supported by the organizations, and the focus of the next development zone conceptualized by Vigotsky (1989) and his followers, from where it is unavoidable to consider that organizations are the ideal scenario for productive tasks and, therefore, of learning in work situations, which is why they have a relevant educational role. In this environment, the desire to improve is what motivates the organizations’ interest in preserving their intellectual capital, in looking after people’s knowledge and in improving and increasing their competences. The self-improvement areas must then be built in a permanent facilitation for these processes in organizational management spaces.
Managing and ruling are synonyms, and to rule an organization means to “design and apply professional collaboration criteria for every work in which this would be good” (Valero & Taracena, 2000, p. 52). Seen this way, the managerial action is a specific human activity, and there are three principles that define it: creativity (logical principle of action), community (ethical principle of action) and growth (aesthetical principle of action).

Human action is reasoned; this means that it is founded on a deliberate, controlled process, which is why it supposes an intentional character of the action, which is ruled by goals. But these goals are, at the same time, the consequence of a deliberate, rational choice, which requires a reference to achieve said goal. This translates into the managerial action needing to accomplish three substantial functions: a logical, an ethical and an aesthetical one, which coincides with what was previously pointed out, so it is possible to decide that an education manager behaves in a consistent way regarding their professional profile and the expectations the organization in which they perform and perfect has of them.

Educational managers are people who manage, who are responsible of every aspect forming their organization; an example for university studies. They are in charge of guiding, showing the way to a signaled goal. A manager, in essence, plans, organizes, executes (leads) and controls the training process.

The managerial duty, assumed as a competence, is then a way of working which can be defined through three goals, coinciding with what has been pointed out by many authors:

- To obtain that which covers human needs, not only biological, but also cultural, family, social, educational.
- To organize and to transform the natural environment in which the human being lives, which implies and improvement when this is reasoned and this helps them to ethically reach their goals.
- To perfect themselves by acquiring new habits, forging new discoveries, strengthening their competences, their preparation, their experience, their knowledge, so they will be fit to accomplish tasks through, for instance, a profession.
Sometimes, directing and managing are confused. This is why it is important to note that the latter focuses on the administration of the resources in order to achieve a concrete goal; it is a part of directing, but it is not directing. The director, besides administrating resources, cares about the projection of the organization. “To direct is more than to solve cases; it demands, fundamentally, to discover and to deal with people” (Fernández, 2000, p. 38). It can be said that direction includes some managerial tasks, but not the other way around.

If the direction function is analyzed, it is possible to observe that directors carry out four systematic procedures, regardless of the context in which they are (Kepner & Tregoe, 2002, p. 12-14):

- **Problem analysis**, sustained on a cause-effect pattern, which allows to identify, describe, examine and precisely solve a situation where something has gone wrong and the cause of it is unknown. It offers a systematic resource to extract what’s essential in a problematic situation and to cast aside non relevant information.
- **Decision analysis**, through observing the reasons why a decision has been made, and, consequently, to examine its purpose.
- **Potential problems-opportunities analysis**. They focus on future events. A latent problem exists when possible disorders are anticipated in a certain situation. This analysis allows the organizations to take an active role in shaping their future.
- **Situation assessment**, which is the action of clarifying, classifying and disaggregating complex matters into more manageable components, as well as the maintenance of control over events.

Formal authority confers, for example, to school directors a special status within the educational institution’s structure. Directive functions come from this authority and status, which are divided in three groups (Mendoza, 2006):

- **Interpersonal**, which are all activities directly linked to dealing and relating to people; this means, as the visible head, as the leader and as the link.
• Informative, which are headed towards recovering and transmitting information; the leader is seen in these as a situation detector, an information diffuser and a spokesperson.

• Decision making, as the main factor, because it implies their participation in the strategy determination process, through which significant decisions are taken and related to each other. Therefore, this is a promoter of actions, a manager of abnormalities and an administrator of resources.

When directors set the course of the process, they must be aware of the fact that “directing is nothing but a decision problems structuration process. To direct does not mean to choose for someone else. It means to structure someone else’s decisions: to operationalize, to instrumentalize and to formulate someone else’s decisions” (Bastons, 2004, p. 74), about what needs to be done, why and what for. This means, they organize their behavior.

The exercise of each one of these functions is joint to a certain direction capability. The capability joint to that of formulating problems can be called a leadership capability. Strategic direction capability is joint to problem instrumentalization. Executive capacity is joined to operalisation. According to Bastons, the proportion in which each one of these appears configures a director’s profile and determines their quality (p. 75).

On the other hand, the act of organizing implies the delimitation of tasks: “...those who have goals are people from the organization, not an organization. Therefore, to talk about such thing as the organization’s goal would simply be and anthropomorphism and it would be problematic” (idem), and he goes on: “an organization doesn’t decide. People are who decide, although the organization defines the structure of their decisions. The organization has defined the problems...”, trying to make the solution given to these problems cooperate with common good of its environment.

It is known that direction activities are, then, all which are necessary to operationally define a purpose and to make this definition come true, that is to say, to effectively apply it. Therefore, a director will be the person who participates in the definition of the organization’s purpose.
When a director, who is enterprising, has operationally defined a purpose, which is connected to the choice of a formal system with all the elements it identifies, when treating the design of its task, every activity that is still necessary to identify the action plan to take (among all the plans realized by the operational definition) and to obtain the cooperation of the other participants with no directing functions will also be directional activities.

A good educational director requires several –intellectual, technical and methodological- qualities, all of them which are closely related to ethics as the main item, for theoretical or technical intelligence will not be suitable if they are not ethically correct.

In this regard, humanistic directions emerges from a clear principle, which is that its center of activity is in people, is exerted by people and is addressed to people; this substantiates this type of activity. Several years ago, Spaemann gave a clear expression of a very significant definition of “person”, because the common ground of all of them is highlighted at the same time as their particular characteristics. He states: “to be a person is to realize human essence with complete novelty” (2000, p. 18).

The educational institution is also a human reality, created by people for their own development, whether it is a community, a society or a country. This is why, from this paper’s perspective and due to its importance, some of the qualities of humanistic directions are expressed and highlighted based on the bibliographic revision:

The first one is in the fact of taking into account that the action of directing is carried out by people, with no need of any special characteristics. In any case, these people do their work in a different way, which means they do tasks that no one else does. As stated by Kouzes & Posner (2001, p. 83), anyone can become a director, and they argue they position because they understands that this denotes a set of observable practices which can be learned.

Good directors recognize their qualities as people; therefore, they have a high level of self-knowledge. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002, pp. 40-52), referring to the direction which generates a resonance within the
institution, from emotional intelligence, attribute four properties to self-knowledge: self-awareness, self-management or self-direction, empathy, and relational management-direction. In this regard, humility is an indispensable condition of the way in which they proceed. This way, in order for the direction to be considered humanistic, it is necessary for those who have a responsibility to know that they will need other people’s knowledge if they want to achieve their goal: that they are willing to “learn how to learn” (Bennis, 2002, p. 5) and surround themselves with people who know what they do not.

The second quality of humanistic direction is in the potential to teach others. The humanistic director is twice a pedagogue, because, in addition to directing the training teaching process, they educate everyone around them. On one hand, the example, the importance of the facts, of behavior over words, although still acknowledging words. An example, in the short and the long term, generates credibility and security, both which are fundamental aspects for others to appreciate the value of human creations. Will power and persistency are decisive for this. On the other hand, the humanistic director transfers security in what they do.

The third quality are their potentialities to motivate people. In a more specific way, we could talk about motivation linked to leadership as a quality and, in this regard, Cardona’s contribution (2001), which establishes a parallelism between the two concepts. This way, there is a bigger challenge for the humanistic direction: to give meaning to other people’s work.

About this, it is known that, when a director is not able to move their people in ways other than economic, they are bad professionals. However, when they move people through the jobs they offer, they are already on another professional level; they are no longer just a strategist, but an executive. And when they are able to get to the deeper motives of what people are doing, then, they are a leader.

In order to complement this vision, but with a similar conceptualization, it is necessary to keep in mind the personalized direction to approach, treat, evaluate, reward and motivate in different ways.
The fourth quality is the change potentiality, which is why humanistic direction and change are realities which are internally joint, since human being is dynamic, in constant movement, and in a defined direction.

The fifth quality is that the humanistic director knows they are substitutable. Given the moment, they work for their dispensability. They deeply prepare the person or people who may replace them, since their sense of responsibility makes them act this way.

Analyzed this way, directional competence is the synergy of knowledge, attitudes, values and skills synergy, all motivated in their execution, which allows educational directors to perform their role in the different situations they face in their context: the educational institution.

In addition, it’s necessary to specify that directional competencies must be harmonized according to each institution’s management model which must be, at the same time, related to the organizational philosophy. If there were no synthesis between these criteria, there would be, logically, an affectation of the entire functioning of the organization.

In order to fully understand the role of educational directors, it is convenient to briefly look over the different management models that have been developed in the management field, a subject in which many studies have been done.

For several years the existence of several competencies in the educational institution’s direction field has been mentioned Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Fowler, 2004), among them:

- Attention management, which is the possibility of centralizing other people’s visions, values, interests and goals towards the school goal.
- Understanding management, which implies the connection between the members of the educational community in such a way that they feel valued and useful for the organization.
- Truth management, which is the possibility of considering the educational directors as trustworthy, credible, honest, legitimate people.
• Self-management, which implies that the leader knows who they are, what they believe in and why they do what they do.
• Paradox management, which is the possibility of provoking synergies between ideas that seem to be contradictory, but that are, in reality, good for the institution.
• Efficiency management, which involves the director in focusing on the possibility of making the development of the school institution more efficient; this way, economic, social and human capitals are benefited.
• Commitment management, which is the environment in which all the other educational directors’ six competences are developed in this case, and which helps get other members of the educational community involved in the decision making.

For Llano (2001), the directional action is formed by three fundamental tasks: diagnosis, decision and leadership, skills which are oriented to three goals: situation, goal, and people who will reach it. The diagnosis must be made with objectivity and discipline. The decision is made with the corresponding desire to achieve a goal and with the correlative risk capability. Finally, leadership is potentiated by five qualities: self-control, constancy in effort, strength in the face of difficulties, trusting others, and loyalty.

Regarding direction habits, Yepes and Aranguren (1999) propose the following habits classification as the base of the habit analysis: technical habits, which refer to handling instruments; intellectual habits, which refer to usual, everyday thinking; and character habits, which describe behavior per se and imply the domination of feelings. It must be added that ethics discusses them and divides them into positive and negative habits, depending on the help they provide- or not- to this harmony. The first kind is qualities, and the second kind is called vices. Every time the person does something, this action has an effect on the person: either it is perfected or worsened. This way, habits are acquired through the repetition of actions, so human beings will get used to them and they will become easier to carry out.

In this regard, operative habits are the “...dispositions of what’s perfect (first nature) for the optimum (the refining the first nature receives from the second nature); understanding, logically, that the first one is willing to, according to its purpose” (Fernández, 2000, p. 42).
It is clear, then, that human nature perfects through habits, which make achieving goals easier; this is how a person’s improvement process throughout their life can be summed up. The person, regarding their directional function, require the development of dianoethical and ethical qualities which will allow them to reach the aim of their professional work.

To reach the common good, which is also a humanist principle, implies to look for each and every one of the members of the collectivity, and demands a great amount of qualities. Its recommendable for the educational directors’ activity to be linked or associated to that of other members of the organization; that is to say, that it aims to a collegiate government model which works in a cooperative way, as a team; in addition, this way they would complement each other in order to achieve a better management.

In order to carry out a collegiate government structure in an organization, it is necessary for the academic coordinator to have a participative profile, for which there are ten principles of participative leadership (Estruch, 2002, pp. 137-138):

- Orientation towards the permanent quality increase, understood as the improvement of the educational service in favor of the students and society.
- Planning with a vision of the future based on the educational renovation, and the adaptation to social and educational changes.
- Problem detection and analysis, which requires to gather information, to be receptive to opinions and proposals, to establish a priority order, to differentiate between accessory and fundamental.
- Decision making with clear, temporalized, evaluable goals.
- Agreement impulse about decisions: general and sectoralized information so everyone will know their responsibility, the search for a consensus, the reformulation of goals based on the incorporation of personal or group contributions.
- Shared decision execution: team work, coordination, responsibility distribution, task delegation.
- General supervision of the executive proves, which implies the control of execution times, the coordination of different
work paces, readjustments according to unforeseen events and novelties, stimulation of high implication groups, stimulation and control of low application groups.

- Evaluation of the process visualizing achieved and non-achieved goals: analysis of the factors which have contributed to the results and encouragement of collective and personal self-esteem, equitable distribution of moral and material incentives.
- Directors self-evaluation and assumption of one’s own responsibility as well as of shared responsibility.
- Evaluation and feedback to look for new improvement goals.

In addition to participative leadership among educational directors, there is another important link between making decisions and the collegiate government: this directors must also be aware of the fact that, in order to direct well, collegiately, it is necessary to look for a complementary tea, of specialists who have different qualities and complement each other, so they help improve the institution through the practice of their mission. As it is shown, the exercise to achieve the mission is complex; this is why it is important to ask oneself how is it possible to make these directors become the right people for the position.

All of this is explained because decision making is the main activity of the directional competence for the organization to take the proposed path. Motivation is very close to it because, in order to effectively govern over people, it is very important for every member to carry out their work committedly to the organization. Put in other words, if educational directors don’t make decisions and persuade their personnel to motivatedly reach for the proposed goals, they will hardly have a successful organization.

The big problem is not to correctly choose the solution, but to face the previous face, which implies to structure a decision that originates in the definition of the problem. Many times, the person who makes the decisions is looking for the particular good, aiming to maximize their own interests, and not, as they should, seeking for the greater good. In the case of educational directors, their ultimate goal is to achieve both common and particular maximum good, submitting the particular good to the success of all members of the educational community.
Decision making also requires to operate the solution alternatives, to predict changes and to value results. A good decision implies to act well, to know well and to want the good. For this, there is a tool known as a decision tree: “decision trees allow to represent action alternatives with different occurrences and, above all, they allow to capture the sequential trait of decision making” (Bastos, 2004, p. 17).

A decision problem is a situation formed by several alternatives, all of which are constituted by actions (happenings that depend on the person making the decision), occurrences or results (which depend on the environment) and consequences (the effect of the results on the agent) (idem).

A suitable action requires the strength and it means to be aware of the environment, to appreciate the members of the organization and to achieve self-knowledge. So, another quality is needed: the reflection to consider the past based on the experience, to have the wisdom to fully visualize the present and the intuition to see what the future will bring.

Measurement is, on the other hand, the quality which favors wanting the good, for it helps give the right value to every situation: no more, no less. Finally, there is justice, quality which gives unity and which allows the person to act according to the truth, to behave well, know well and want the good. This way, efficiency in decision making is determined by the relation between possible actions, reactions and satisfactions they generate, since the definition of a decision problem must contain all the actions and all the logically possible reactions (idem).

Teaching directives must have a wide repertoire comprising from those which are necessary for rational decision making to group decision making understanding. Likewise, they need to know how to define problems, how to choose both individually and in groups and, in general, how to solve problems (Immegart, Immegart & Pascual, 1995). This means that solving problems and making decisions are competences based on knowing how to define problems.

To sum up, Immegart, Immegart and Pascual (1995) propose a model in which the importance of establishing an authentic leadership which is
clearly defined within educational institutions, based on the leader’s effort to establish action goals or mission objectives, in order to organize and establish a set of activities aiming to realize or obtain wanted results is posed.

The structure of said theory, due to its importance for the thesis, is explained below:

- Leadership always starts with a notion, idea, state, goal or mission on the part of the leader, which is interpreted by them as something requiring attention and/or action.
- Direction, which must be followed by a leader in the shape of specific goals, objectives or missions, always with more or less concrete help.
- A leader’s direction is influenced by their values, situation approach, future configuration of the organization, values of the institution, resource availability, success expectancy, organization member’s perception, history and its context, environment and pressure in the leader and the organization, in addition to other general considerations of ethical and axiological nature.
- To lead in complex situations requires leaders, subordinates, intermediaries, followers, as well as group organizational resources, structures, procedures and operations.
- To lead requires the good use, development and organization of human, financial and material resources, structure, technology and mission, in order to get the results.
- Leadership processes include formal, informal, ad hoc activities and processes aiming to a concrete objective, mission or results.
- Leadership is a quality aware of directional competency.
- Members of the organization accept leadership as a result of the importance of the expectations, the perception they have of the leader and of success, the cost-benefit balance, previous experiences, social and work relationships, ideology, symbolism and necessity (lack of choice).
- The efficacy of leadership and the leader can be determined through analyzing how close the results are to the leader’s intentions or the intentions influenced by organizational
activity and work reality and activity towards concrete goals and missions.

- To lead is the sum of all efforts, and it has a way of reflecting on other people, both on the part of the leader and the organization, who lead the organization towards an established goal to activity and work.

- The results of leadership are multidimensional and include acceptation of the leader, determination of the viability of future leadership efforts, leader attributes and goals, individual and organizational expectations, trust in the leader and the organization and the clarification of what the organization is and its meaning.

This way, leadership is essential to a good educational directive, because, with its manifestations, it can manage to create authentic, deep values in others; it can achieve efficacy, atractivity and long term unity; it can convert organizations into real institutions at the service of the satisfaction of the internal or external environment, presented in each scenario. It can be optimum in the development of results and the development of organization cultures, managing to add to the others with the authority of their example, both personal and professional, and those who trust them completely will never be let down. With them, they can achieve unity and the identification with the organization, also caring for everyone to develop as persons. They are leader makers.

This is why this consideration is impossible to talk about in terms of a directional function if it is not in total synergy with the leadership as an essential quality of the director. In this paper’s authors’ opinion, the directional action with leadership originates the directive competencies of each organization which, in this case, is focused on an educational level.

The contribution made by the CIFE Corporation (Tobón 2014, p. 74-76) is significant regarding the adaptation of the so called EFQM model to education and educational excellency management, focused on organizational psychology, which transcends the subject addressed in this study. However, this model is interesting in regard of the inclusion of the valuation of new criteria: (1) leadership, (2) strategic planning, (3) human
talent management, (4) alliance and resources, (5) academic processes, (6) results in the students, (7), results in human talent, (8) results in society and (9) general performance, although all of it stays on a strictly theoretical and essentially empirical plane.

Conclusions

To sum up, based on what’s addressed on this synopsis, besides not having found any evidence, this paper will consider the professionals’ directional competence as the process which involves the execution of direction in a context and which implies to put into action, harmonically, socially motivated and with a humanist background, the knowledge, attitudes and values which lead the decision making process and the action in direction, the participation and vision, and the skills required for the direction of the training process. This means, it implies the synergy between knowing, knowing how to be, and knowing how to do.
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