

Impact of Leadership Styles on the Effectiveness of Higher Educational Institutions in Himachal Pradesh

–Prajna Paromita Dey*, Ina Sood**

ABSTRACT

The present study has been conducted with the purpose of examining the impact of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutions. It also examines whether perception of leadership and organizational effectiveness differ according to the demographic variables. Data were gathered from 215 teachers of different positions from both private and public higher educational institutions of Himachal Pradesh (India). The findings of the study reveal that perceptions of leadership and organizational effectiveness partially differ according to the various demographic variables. The result further shows that only transactional style of leadership has a significant impact on organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutions.

Keywords: *Higher Education, Transactional Style, Transformational Style, Leadership, Organizational Effectiveness*

INTRODUCTION

India's higher education system is the third largest education system in the world, next to China and the United States (Shaguri, 2013). As per the reports of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (2016), there has been a tremendous increase in the number of Universities and Colleges since independence. According to the reports of MHRD, the number of Universities in the country grew from 20 in 1950 to 677 in 2014. In India, the main categories of University and University led institutions are Central Universities, State Universities, Private Universities, Deemed-to-be-Universities, and University-level-institutions. The recent reports reveal that as on 31st March, 2017, the sector has 47 Central Universities,

* Assistant Professor, PSIT College of Higher Education, Uttar Pradesh, India.
Email: prajna_dey07@yahoo.co.in

** Research Scholar, H.P.U.B.S, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India.
Email: ina.sood9@gmail.com

367 State Universities, 23 IITs, 31 NIITs, 23 IIITs, 7 IISERSs, 7 AIIMSs, 7 NIPERSs, 3 SPAs, and 25 other Institutes of National Importance. In 1950 this sector had only 500 colleges which increased to grow upto 37,204 as on 31st March, 2013 (MHRD, 2017). The University Grants Commission has published a list of 246 Private Universities as on 11.03.2016 that have been established by the Acts of the Legislatures of different states. Of late, this number has increased to 249 as per latest updates given by the official website of UGC (University Grants Commission, 2016). Despite the impressive growth story that India has witnessed in this sector in terms of quantity, the quality of delivery of higher education has been subjected to much criticism which has emerged as the greatest challenge of the sector. Other challenges that plague the sector are indiscipline, corruption, violence, chaos and lack of proper governance. Some of the reasons for the failure of universities as service organizations, as highlighted by Tripathi (1991), are – (i.) objectives and results are intangible, (ii.) lack of effectiveness and efficiency, and (iii.) lack of proper management and strong leadership. Verma (1990) has attributed the crisis in university system to poor management, vision, and leadership qualities of the Vice-Chancellors. Like every organization, institutions of higher learning too are deemed to be effective as long as they are able to satisfy and deliver to their stakeholders while achieving various goals and objectives. Effective leadership helps them to attain effectiveness by creating the right vision, culture, and motivation which drive the organizations to success. The higher educational sector of the country assumes great social importance because they are responsible for shaping the workforce of the country. Therefore, overall effectiveness of higher educational institutes is extremely essential in order to disseminate quality education to the country's massive young population so that they procure enough skills and knowledge to be employable. Hence, the need of the hour is to study the importance leadership holds for higher educational institutions by determining the styles of leadership that can influence their overall effectiveness significantly.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership is one of the most important as well as widely debated concepts in organizational behaviour which has generated abundant research in relation to factors, principles, attributes, traits, behaviours, competencies, and qualities that might bring about effective leadership.

Most organizational theorists agree to the fact that the success of organizations is greatly dependent on effective leadership (Parker 1994; Finigan 1999; Garcia & Stewart 2000; Goleman 2000; Cohen 2002; Nahavandi et al. 2015). Much debate over the construct of leadership has led to many theories and schools of thought of leadership. Both traditional as well as contemporary theories of leadership have strong influence on the current practice, and also offer a useful framework for the selection and development of leaders (Bolden, 2004). Several patterns of leadership have been identified on the basis of the behaviour of leaders which are categorised as 'Leadership Styles'.

Leadership style is a leader's manner and approach of providing direction, motivating people, and implementing plans. They include the total pattern of both explicit as well as implicit actions performed by the leaders (Newstrom, Davis, 1993). Among the numerous styles of leadership that have emerged in the course of time, two styles which are very relevant in the contemporary world are transactional and transformational styles of leadership. The 1978 work of Burns on political leadership is often credited to the development of the theory of transactional leadership, in which he illustrated that leaders achieved compliance from their followers through transactional exchanges, wherein the leaders offered tangible rewards to their followers in exchange of the achievement of the performance criteria. Bass (1985) applied Burn's ideas of transactional leadership in the field of management and explained transactional leadership can be reflected in organizations as the study of leadership as an exchange process in which the needs of the followers are met when their performance measures up to the expectations of their leaders. Yukl (1989) noted that leaders influence the behaviour of their followers in transactional leadership, wherein leaders give something to followers they want in exchange of their compliance. Transformational leadership was popularised by Burns (1978) through his classic study of political leadership in the book 'Leadership', in which he distinguished between transactional and transformational leadership followed by political leaders. Later, Bass (1985) developed a model called the Full Range Leadership model which contained several factors of leadership that clearly distinguished between transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership factors. As per this model, transformational leaders are role models for their followers. Such leaders motivate and inspire their followers by providing them with a clear vision for their future as well as arousing team spirit in them in order to reach that vision

(Bass, 1985). According to Robbins and Coulter (2007), transformational leaders stimulate and inspire followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes. Warrilow (2012) found transformational leaders to be able to create positive changes in their followers so that they are capable of taking care of each other's interests as well as act in the interests of the group as a whole. Although Burns (1978) found transactional and transformational leadership completely opposite to each other, yet Hater and Bass (1988) found them to be relatable despite their apparent differences.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

It is mandatory for every organization to fulfil their goals and objectives effectively in order to sustain themselves for a long time in this fast, ever-changing market characterised by constant competition and challenges. Although it is a known fact that every business organization's main objective is to remain profitable for the longest of times possible, yet there are other numerous and often contradictory goals that organizations have which directly or indirectly have an impact on their profitability and sustainability. Therefore, the extent to which an organization fulfils all such various goals at the organizational level determines its level of organizational effectiveness (Cameron & Whetton, 1983; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Thibodeaux & Favilla, 1995). Conceptualizing organizational effectiveness is however, not an easy task (Cunningham, 1977). The construct of organizational effectiveness has been one of the most controversial and there has been a lot of confusion as well as disagreements regarding what organizational effectiveness actually is (Cameron, 1978). It is still unclear what researchers mean when they refer to the term 'effectiveness' which has resulted in ambiguities while interpreting results of their work (Cameron, 1984: 236). Therefore, organizational effectiveness conceptually is an enigma for researchers although its importance as the ultimate dependent variable cannot be overlooked. Since there is no one standard criterion of effectiveness because of multiple and contradictory goals (Warner, 1967; Perrow, 1970; Hall, 1972, 1978; Dubin, 1976), different approaches to organizational effectiveness have emerged such as the goal approach, the systems resource approach, the strategic constituencies approach, and the competing values approach. Campbell (1977) enlisted thirty criteria of organizational effectiveness on the basis of a thorough review of literature on the subject

and concluded that since the effectiveness of an organization depends on many facets that might be relatively dependent or independent of each other, it is therefore not possible to give any operational definition to the construct.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Previous studies have shown demographics to be having a significant impact on leadership styles and organizational effectiveness. Eagley and Johnson (1990) found that women had a more participative style of leadership whereas men used a more order and controlling style. Women have been found to use transformational style of leadership more often than men (Druskat, 1994; Rosener, 1990). Many studies have shown that gender has a significant role to play in the determination of leadership style of the manager (Loden, 1985; Grant, 1988; Rosener, 1990; Rosener et al., 1990, Alimo-Metcalf, 1995; Bass et al., 1996; Lipman-Blumen, 1996; Lipman-Blumen et al., 1996). However, there are also studies that have proven that differences in leadership styles are not determined by differences in gender (Powel, 1990; 1993; Bass, 1981; Maupin, 1990; Eagley and Karau, 1991). Studies have shown age to be influencing the style of leadership adopted by leaders (Kazan, 2000; Payden, 1997, Taylor, 1998, and Thomas, 1996). Oshagbemi (2003) found significant difference in the style of leadership between younger and older employees. The study of Kakabadse et al. (1998) showed that age has a powerful effect on the leadership style of senior managers. Lojpur et al., (2015) did not find gender, age, and education to have any significant effect on leadership styles. Previous research studies have found significant positive relationships between level of educational qualification and leadership style (Barbuto et al. 2007; Ali and Ali, 2011, Kao, 2006 and Nayak, 2011). According to Bass (1985) transformational leadership is more likely to emerge in private organizations than their counterparts. Several studies have found hierarchical differences to be influencing leadership style (Kabacoff, 1999; Stordeur et al., 2000; Tichy, 1997). The study of Avolio and Bass (1988) found transformational leadership to be practised at all levels of an organization but it is adopted to a greater extent at higher levels. Tichy and Ulrich (1984) agreed that transformational leadership is more likely to be prevalent at higher organizational levels. However, the meta-analytic review of leadership research conducted by Lowe et al. (1996) revealed that transformational leadership is more prevalent among

lower-level leaders. The same study also found public-sector leaders to be demonstrating more frequent transformational behaviours than leaders in private organizations.

Very few studies have been conducted on the effect of demographic variables on perception of organizational effectiveness. The study of Shakir, Mohd (2013) found age to be significantly affecting organizational effectiveness. The research conducted by Kunze et al., (2013) concluded that age diversity does not relate to the company's performance directly. Studies have found perception of organizational effectiveness to be differing significantly according to gender (Moehlman 1988; Murray, 1988). Parhizgari and Gilbert (2004) compared the measures of internal structures and processes associated with organizational effectiveness in the private and public sectors. The results of the study revealed that the effectiveness measures applied in both private and public sectors were significantly different. Perception of some of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness has been found to differ according to the designation of the respondents (Cameron, 1978; Murray, 1988).

Several studies have found effective leadership to be one of the most important contributors to the overall effectiveness of organizations in educational institutions. Joyce (2009) investigated how critical is leadership in driving organizational effectiveness in educational institutions and found that leadership and the values and ethos of the leaders had a significant impact on organizational effectiveness of the institution. Research studies suggest that leaders and their leadership styles play a critical role in the success of institutes of higher learning (Scott et al. 2008; Bryman and Lilley, 2009). Bryman (2007) found leadership to be responsible for achieving effectiveness in higher educational institutes. Plowman's (1991) study indicated that significant relationship existed between leadership practices and organizational environment as a measure of effectiveness in institutes of higher learning. A study conducted by Martin et al. (2003) revealed that transformational leadership in institutes of higher learning was associated with high quality student learning processes and outcomes. Research studies have revealed that transformational leadership provided by leaders in higher educational institutions, such as principles, and departmental heads has a positive impact on staff and departmental functioning which indirectly influences students (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Leitwood & Jantzi, 1999). The study of Scott et al. (2008) found that effective leadership in educational institutions led to the achievement of personal development goals, creation

of a collegial work environment, higher student satisfaction, retention, and achievement, better learning and teaching quality, building a better reputation of the institution, achievement of financial targets, obtaining of adequate funds, and successful accomplishment of innovative initiatives as well as achievement of goals within the timeframe. According to Ramsden (1998), strong leadership in higher education is very essential as it leads to innovation in teaching methodology, high levels of motivation, strong emphasis on research, strategic vision and effective networking, as well as creation of a healthy, open, and learning environment. Marzano et al. (2005) did an extensive research encompassing 69 leadership studies so as to develop a set of principles and practices that have been proven to impact educational effectiveness. Williams (2006), after an extensive research, found that an educational institution cannot function effectively without a leader to direct its goals and drive the vision. According to him, the effectiveness of leadership depends upon the style of leadership employed by the leader, which could be transactional or transformational in nature. The results showed that majority of principals studied followed a transformational leadership style. The study further revealed that more females than males favoured transformational leadership however no difference was found between males and females regarding the preference for styles based on cognitive complexity. Chaffey and Tierney (1988) contended that the successful matching of leadership strategy of the president of a higher educational institute with appropriate dimensions of organizational culture affect the organizational effectiveness of the institution. Harrison (2000) surveyed 46 community colleges to measure leadership styles and community college performance. The findings indicated that transactional leaders were more focussed on the efficiency of the system whereas transformational leaders had inclination towards managing the needs of the stakeholders, encouraging open communication, building trust and empowering subordinates without being autocratic. The study concluded transformational style of leadership to be a better predictor of organizational effectiveness than transactional style. Murray (1988) in his study conducted on 11 small colleges in the United States found that a significant relationship existed between both transactional and transformational leadership styles and only one dimension of organizational effectiveness that measured student achievement. However, the study did not find significant relationships between transformational leadership style and organizational effectiveness.

NEED FOR STUDY

Organizational effectiveness for higher education is very essential as it leads to delivery of quality education and skill development. Previous studies have revealed several variables responsible for overall effectiveness of a higher educational institution, of which the construct of leadership often emerged out to be one of the most significant (Plowman, 1991; Ramsden, 1998; Williams, 2006; Marzano et al, 2005). ; The study of Mahajan, Vikram (2004) has found organizational effectiveness to be having significant relationship with the demographic variables of colleges of Himachal Pradesh. The study further found a significant relationship between various decision-making styles of leaders and organizational effectiveness and showed that decision-making styles of leaders predict organizational effectiveness in colleges of Himachal Pradesh. Rana, Surekha (1995) found significant relationship between leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in institutes of higher education of Himachal Pradesh. Since very few studies are available which measure the association and impact that leadership practices have on organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutes in the state of Himachal Pradesh in India therefore, there is a need to understand whether proper leadership can help the higher educational institutes of the state become more effective.

On the basis of literature reviewed, the paper proposes that leadership styles have a significant influence on organizational effectiveness.

Hypothesis

H₁: Leadership styles differ significantly among different demographic groups of the respondents.

H_{1a}: Leadership styles differ significantly according to gender of the respondents.

H_{1b}: Leadership styles differ significantly according to type of organization of the respondents.

H_{1c}: Leadership styles differ significantly according to age of the respondents.

H_{1d}: Leadership styles differ significantly according to designation of the respondents.

H_{1e}: Leadership styles differ significantly according to educational qualification of the respondents.

H₂: Perception of organizational effectiveness differs significantly among different demographic groups of the respondents.

H_{2a}: Perception of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differs significantly according to gender of the respondents.

H_{2b}: Perception of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differs significantly according to type of organization of the respondents.

H_{2c}: Perception of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differs significantly according to age of the respondents.

H_{2d}: Perception of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differs significantly according to designation of the respondents.

H_{2e}: Perception of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differs significantly according to educational qualification of the respondents.

H₃: Leadership styles have significant influence on organizational effectiveness.

H_{3a}: Transactional leadership style has a significant influence on organizational effectiveness.

H_{3b}: Transformational leadership style has a significant influence on organizational effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

Scope of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutes in districts Shimla, Kangra, and Solan of Himachal Pradesh. Both public and private colleges and universities were considered for the study.

Data Collection

Multistage sampling was used in which initially the districts were identified, followed by the higher educational institutes from which respondents were sampled. Out of the 12 districts of Himachal Pradesh, the districts of Solan, Shimla, and Kangra were selected for the study since they had an adequate number of higher educational institutions, both private and public. Simple random sampling was employed to select colleges and universities from the chosen districts, and therefore every college and university, both private and public, had an equal chance of being selected and as a result accepted as being representative of the population. Table 1 shows the total number of colleges and universities as well as the sampled

colleges and universities from districts selected for the study. Data were collected from 215 employees belonging to 38 private and public colleges and universities from districts Solan, Shimla and Kangra. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors were considered as respondents of the study. The respondents were selected by using convenience and judgement sampling techniques. Table 2 shows the sampled respondents.

Table 1: Sample Profile of Private and Public Colleges and Universities

Dis- trict	Total Private Col- leges	Sam- pled Private Colleges	Total Public Col- leges	Sam- pled Public Col- leges	Total Private Universi- ties	Sampled Private Universi- ties	Total Public Universi- ties	Sampled Public Universi- ties
Solan	20	5	10	3	10	3	1	1
Shimla	19	4	25	5	1	1	1	1
Kangra	33	6	31	5	2	2	2	2
Total	72	15	66	13	13	6	4	4

Source: Department of Higher Education, Himachal Pradesh (2016), <http://educationhp.org/>; University Grants Commission, www.ugc.ac.in.

Table 2: Number of Respondents Sampled from Private and Public Colleges and Universities

District	Respondents from Private Colleges	Respondents from Public Colleges	Respondents from Private Universities	Respondents from Public Universities	Total
Solan	17	13	25	14	69
Shimla	14	18	13	16	61
Kangra	23	21	21	20	85
Total	54	52	59	50	215

Source: Self Survey

Sources of Data

The study being empirical in nature considered both secondary as well as primary sources of data. Primary data were collected with the help of questionnaires and discussions with teaching staff of public and private higher educational institutes. Secondary data were collected through research journals, reports, magazines, books, and websites related to higher education.

INSTRUMENTS USED

Two instruments have been taken to measure leadership styles and organizational effectiveness respectively. The questionnaire started with a set of demographic questions relating to the respondent's age, gender, designation, educational qualification, and the type of organization (viz., private or public) in which the respondent was currently employed. This was followed by two sections which measured leadership and organizational effectiveness respectively. Leadership styles were measured by a scale developed by Peter G. Northhouse (2007). It consisted of 20 items which measured two styles of leadership, viz., transactional and transformational. The construct of organizational effectiveness was measured by a scale developed by Kim Cameron (1986) which comprised of 8 dimensions of organizational effectiveness with 42 items. The items of both the scales were scored on a five-point Likert Scale. Reliability coefficient, i.e., Cronbach Alpha for the two scales was calculated for a sample of 215 employees. The Cronbach Alpha for Leadership Style was found to be 0.788 (20 items; $\alpha = 0.788$) whereas for Organizational Effectiveness the value was 0.925 (42 items; $\alpha = 0.925$).

ANALYSIS

The result of the study was arrived at by statistically analysing the collected data with the help of SPSS (20) package. The tools which were employed for testing the hypothesis included: t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Pearson's Correlation, and Multiple Regression Analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The demographic variables chosen for the study were gender, age group, designation, educational qualification, and type of organization. Following are the hypotheses that were developed with the aim of testing whether leadership styles and organizational effectiveness differed significantly among different demographic groups.

H₁: Leadership styles differ significantly among various demographic variables of the respondents.

H₂: Perception of organizational effectiveness differs significantly among different demographic groups of the respondents.

Independent sample t test was run to analyse whether leadership styles and organizational effectiveness differed significantly among males and females and according to the type of organization.

It is evident from Table 3 that the difference in the perception of transactional, transformational as well as overall leadership styles between the gender of male and female is not statistically significant (H_{1a} is rejected). The table further shows that perceptions of the different dimensions of organizational effectiveness as well as overall organizational effectiveness also do not differ significantly among males and females (H_{2a} is rejected).

Table 3: Independent Samples T Test of Type of Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness– Gender ($n= 215$)

Variable	Male		Female		t	df	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Transactional	38.91	4.52	38.71	4.75	0.314	213	0.754
Transformational	37.00	4.34	36.66	4.83	0.544	213	0.587
Overall Leadership	75.91	7.55	75.36	8.37	0.496	213	0.621
Student Educational Satisfaction	16.94	3.90	16.84	4.04	0.178	213	0.859
Student Academic Development	17.06	2.29	17.41	2.33	-1.102	213	0.272
Student Career Development	19.98	3.50	19.13	3.68	1.725	213	0.086
Student Personal Development	14.24	2.00	14.38	2.02	-0.502	213	0.616
Faculty&Administrator Employment Satisfaction	20.66	3.55	20.59	3.63	0.138	213	0.891
Professional&Faculty Development and Quality of Faculty	19.65	4.45	20.09	4.73	-0.707	213	0.481
System Openness & Community Interaction	16.23	3.83	15.83	3.67	0.774	213	0.440
Ability to Acquire Resources	18.39	3.67	18.63	3.86	-0.472	213	0.637
Overall Organizational Effectiveness	143.14	21.26	142.90	22.15	0.079	213	0.937

Table 4 shows that respondents of private and public institutes of higher learning differ significantly in their perception of overall leadership ($p = 0.001$) and transactional leadership style ($p < 0.001$), whereas they do not have any significant difference in their perception of transformational leadership style ($p = 0.179$). The table also shows that transactional style

of leadership ($M = 40.30$, $SD = 3.36$) and overall leadership ($M = 77.56$, $SD = 6.88$) are more prevalent in public higher educational institutions (H_{1b} is partially accepted).

It is found from the table that there is statistically significant difference in the perception of all the dimensions of organizational effectiveness as well as overall organizational effectiveness on the basis of the type of organization. All the dimensions of organizational effectiveness are higher in public institutes of higher learning. Therefore, the overall organizational effectiveness is also higher in public higher educational institutions ($M = 155.43$, $SD = 16.14$) (H_{2b} is accepted).

Table 4: Independent Samples T Test of Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness - Type of Organization (n = 215)

Variable	Private		Public		t	df	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD			
Transactional	37.43	5.20	40.30	3.36	4.853	193.616	0.000
Transformational	36.41	4.95	37.25	4.19	1.348	213	0.179
Overall Leadership	73.84	8.54	77.56	6.88	3.491	213	0.001
Student Educational Satisfaction	14.67	3.61	19.33	2.71	10.764	206.196	0.000
Student Academic Development	16.78	2.75	17.78	1.54	3.345	179.133	0.001
Student Career Development	18.20	4.17	20.95	2.12	6.176	169.993	0.000
Student Personal Development	13.57	2.22	15.15	1.33	6.411	186.383	0.000
Faculty&Administrator Employment Satisfaction	18.81	3.18	22.61	2.90	9.131	213	0.000
Professional&Faculty Development and Quality of Faculty	18.56	4.20	21.37	4.60	4.693	213	0.000
System Openness & Community Interaction	14.27	3.89	17.94	2.37	8.445	187.942	0.000
Ability to Acquire Resources	16.93	3.63	20.28	3.09	7.258	213	0.000
Overall Organizational Effectiveness	131.79	19.94	155.43	16.14	9.492	213	0.000

One way ANOVA was run to analyse whether age group, designation, and educational qualification of respondents led them to have perceptions about leadership styles and organizational effectiveness that differed statistically.

Table 5 shows that age group of the respondents is responsible for them having significantly different perception of transactional leadership style ($p < 0.001$), transformational leadership style ($p = 0.003$), and overall leadership ($p < 0.001$). Transactional style of leadership is highest among respondents who belong to the age group of 51-61 years ($M = 41.21$, $SD = 3.61$) whereas transformational leadership is highest among respondents belonging to age group 29-39 years ($M = 37.66$, $SD = 4.85$). Overall leadership style is also highest among respondents of 51-61 years ($M = 78.11$, $SD = 7.36$). (H_{1c} is accepted).

As per the table it is only the differences in the perception of the dimensions of student career development ($p = 0.009$), ability to acquire resources ($p = 0.034$) as well as overall organizational effectiveness ($p = 0.027$) which are statistically significant on the basis of age group of the respondents. Student career development is highest for age group 51-61 years ($M = 20.63$, $SD = 2.39$), ability to acquire resources is highest among the ages which are greater than 62 years ($M = 20.40$, $SD = 3.71$), whereas perception of overall organizational effectiveness is highest among respondents belonging to the age group of 51-61 years ($M = 152.26$, $SD = 22.93$). (H_{2c} is partially accepted).

It is evident from table 6 that perception of transactional style of leadership ($p = 0.001$) is significantly different as per the designation of the respondents. The table shows that transactional style of leadership is most followed by Associate Professors ($M = 40.53$, $SD = 3.43$). (H_{1d} is partially accepted).

The table depicts that perceptions of student educational satisfaction ($p = 0.043$), faculty & administrator employment satisfaction ($p = 0.003$), professional & faculty development and quality of faculty ($p < 0.001$), ability to acquire resources ($p < 0.001$), and overall organizational effectiveness ($p = 0.001$) differ significantly on the basis of designation of the respondents. It is clear from the table that respondents who are Professors have the highest student educational satisfaction ($M = 18.70$, $SD = 4.35$), faculty & administrator employment satisfaction ($M = 22.45$, $SD = 2.63$), professional & faculty development and quality of faculty ($M = 23.80$, $SD = 2.21$), ability to acquire resources ($M = 21.75$, $SD = 1.12$) and overall organizational effectiveness ($M = 157.60$, $SD = 14.72$). (H_{2d} is partially accepted).

Table 5: One Way ANOVA of Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness-- Age (n = 215)

Variables	18-28			29-39			40-50			51-61			>62	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	Sig		
Transactional	35.74	4.44	39.46	4.77	39.39	3.82	41.21	3.61	39.20	2.17	7.868	0.000		
Transformational	35.43	3.76	37.66	4.85	37.00	4.31	36.89	3.98	31.00	6.71	4.055	0.003		
Overall Leadership	71.17	5.85	77.11	8.49	76.39	7.52	78.11	7.36	70.20	6.98	6.059	0.000		
Student Educational Satisfaction	16.26	3.66	16.48	3.99	18.06	3.54	17.74	4.85	15.60	5.03	1.999	0.096		
Student Academic Development	16.93	2.35	17.35	2.52	17.08	2.09	18.00	1.86	17.20	0.84	0.826	0.510		
Student Career Development	17.96	3.37	19.64	4.07	20.35	3.05	20.63	2.39	18.80	0.84	3.455	0.009		
Student Personal Development	14.07	1.67	14.25	2.28	14.43	1.77	14.95	1.90	14.40	2.19	0.712	0.585		
Faculty&Administrator Employment Satisfaction	19.70	2.76	20.42	3.79	21.51	3.77	21.84	3.69	19.60	1.34	2.300	0.060		
Professional&Faculty Development and Quality of Faculty	18.76	4.41	19.66	4.43	20.41	4.47	22.32	5.61	20.60	4.28	2.314	0.059		
System Openness & Community Interaction	14.87	3.37	16.04	4.13	16.73	3.37	16.79	3.34	15.80	2.28	1.767	0.137		
Ability to Acquire Resources	17.22	3.64	18.53	3.86	18.96	3.61	20.00	3.40	20.40	3.71	2.661	0.034		
Overall Organizational Effectiveness	135.76	18.19	142.36	22.63	147.53	21.30	152.26	22.93	142.40	15.34	2.790	0.027		

**Table 6: One Way ANOVA of Leadership Styles – Designation
(n = 215)**

Variables	Lecturer		Sr. Lecturer		Assistant Prof.		Associate Prof.		Professor			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	Sig		
Transactional	34.85	3.36	37.37	4.26	38.89	4.98	40.53	3.43	40.10	3.23	4.762	0.001
Transformational	35.69	3.54	37.52	2.83	37.08	4.89	37.13	4.42	34.40	5.17	1.890	0.113
Overall Leadership	70.54	6.02	74.89	5.87	75.97	8.61	77.67	7.28	74.50	7.63	2.056	0.088
Student Educational Satisfaction	16.15	2.88	16.44	3.39	16.45	3.96	18.20	4.19	18.70	4.35	2.512	0.043
Student Academic Development	16.31	2.36	17.04	2.67	17.18	2.41	17.60	1.90	18.15	1.27	1.577	0.182
Student Career Development	18.31	3.45	19.41	4.33	19.33	3.86	20.40	2.54	20.20	2.07	1.079	0.368
Student Personal Development	13.85	1.07	14.30	1.64	14.09	2.19	15.10	1.88	14.90	1.55	2.197	0.071
Faculty & Administrator Employment Satisfaction	19.54	2.54	19.04	3.14	20.46	3.76	21.93	3.41	22.45	2.63	4.209	0.003
Professional & Faculty Development and Quality of Faculty	18.38	2.93	19.22	4.04	19.19	4.70	21.47	4.87	23.80	2.21	6.258	0.000
System Openness & Community Interaction	15.54	3.43	15.59	3.60	15.66	3.93	16.93	3.46	17.65	2.76	1.852	0.120
Ability to Acquire Resources	16.08	2.25	17.30	3.64	18.09	3.80	20.33	3.62	21.75	1.12	9.077	0.000
Overall Organizational Effectiveness	134.15	15.00	138.33	19.24	140.45	22.32	151.97	21.58	157.60	14.72	5.206	0.001

Table 7: One Way ANOVA of Leadership Styles - Educational Qualification (n = 215)

Variables	Postgraduate		M.Phil.		Ph.D.		Others		F	Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Transactional	36.46	4.61	37.89	5.52	40.47	3.83	37.08	2.68	12.315	0.000
Transformational	36.72	4.23	36.63	5.33	36.87	4.71	37.17	3.61	0.056	0.983
Overall Leadership	73.18	7.34	74.51	9.34	77.34	7.74	74.25	5.88	3.990	0.009
Student Educational Satisfaction	15.86	3.09	16.11	4.15	17.59	4.34	17.42	1.88	3.050	0.030
Student Academic Development	16.65	2.77	17.14	2.68	17.71	1.89	16.25	1.29	3.667	0.013
Student Career Development	17.98	4.15	18.77	4.43	20.29	2.83	21.67	1.37	7.647	0.000
Student Personal Development	13.95	1.72	13.63	2.44	14.75	2.00	14.08	1.00	3.928	0.009
Faculty&Administrator Employment Satisfaction	18.75	2.92	19.77	3.66	21.69	3.57	22.00	2.13	11.054	0.000
Professional&Faculty Development and Quality of Faculty	17.61	3.90	19.09	4.20	21.41	4.75	19.00	1.13	10.430	0.000
System Openness & Community Interaction	14.67	3.75	15.34	4.00	16.74	3.63	17.58	0.67	5.230	0.002
Ability to Acquire Resources	16.44	3.38	17.69	4.08	19.96	3.44	17.50	1.51	14.332	0.000
Overall Organizational Effectiveness	131.91	18.37	137.54	23.06	150.15	21.28	145.50	4.58	11.158	0.000

Table 7 shows that there is significant difference in the perception of transactional leadership style ($p < 0.001$) and overall leadership ($p = 0.009$) based on educational qualifications of the respondents. Both transactional leadership style ($M = 40.47, SD = 3.83$) and overall leadership ($M = 77.34, SD = 7.74$) are highest among respondents who hold a Ph.D. degree. (H_{1e} is partially accepted).

As exhibited in the table, perception of all the dimensions of organizational effectiveness as well as overall organizational effectiveness differs significantly on the basis of educational qualification of respondents. The dimensions student career development ($M = 21.67, SD = 1.37$), faculty & administrator employment satisfaction ($M = 22.00, SD = 2.13$), and system openness & community interaction ($M = 17.58, SD = 0.67$) are highest among respondents whose educational qualifications have been categorised as 'Others'. Many public as well as private technical institutes of higher learning covered under the study employed graduate and diploma holders as teachers with technical skills. Such teachers' educational qualifications have been clubbed under the category 'Others'. All the other dimensions of organizational effectiveness are highest among respondents with a Ph.D. degree. The perception of overall organizational effectiveness is also highest among Ph.D. holders ($M = 150.15, SD = 21.28$). (H_{2c} is accepted).

IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

To analyse the impact of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness the following hypothesis was formed and tested:

H_3 : Leadership styles have significant influence on organizational effectiveness.

Correlation between Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness

Before using regression analysis, Pearson's correlation was run to see whether the two leadership styles as well as overall leadership were associated significantly with organizational effectiveness. As is evident from table 8, the study has found all associations to be significant at 95 per cent level with strongest association between organizational effectiveness and transactional leadership style ($r = 0.460; p = 0.000$) and weakest association between organizational effectiveness and transformational leadership style ($r = 0.145; p = 0.034$).

Table 8: Correlation – Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness ($n = 215$)

	Transactional Leadership	Transformational Leadership	Overall Leadership
Organizational Effectiveness	0.460**	0.145**	0.350**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.034	0.000

** Correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Multiple Regression Analysis of Styles of Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness

Multiple regression analysis was used to study if the two styles of leadership significantly predicted organizational effectiveness. In the model, transactional and transformational leadership styles served as independent variables and overall organizational effectiveness as the dependent variable. Table 9 depicts the regression model summary whereby it reports the strength of the relationship between the model and the dependent variable. The table also displays adjusted R^2 and the Durbin Watson test of independence of errors. It is therefore evident that the regression model has explained 21.3 per cent of variance in organizational effectiveness and the value of Durbin Watson Test is between 1-3 which fulfils the assumption of independence of errors. Results of analysis of variance have also been summarized by the table which shows that significance value of the F statistic is less than 0.05, which suggests that variation explained by the model is not due to chance. Transactional leadership style has been found to be a significant predictor of organizational effectiveness in institutes of higher learning whereas transformational leadership style has been found to be a non-significant predictor of organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutions.

Therefore, the findings reveal that Hypothesis H_{3a} has been supported by the study whereas Hypothesis H_{3b} has been rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that although transactional leadership significantly influences organizational effectiveness in institutes of higher learning, yet transformational leadership has no such significant influence.

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis – Organizational Effectiveness (n = 215)

Dimensions	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	t	Sig.	Regression Model Summary
(Constant)		5.487	0.000	Adjusted R ² = 0.213
Transactional	0.514	7.370	0.000	Durbin Watson = 1.840
Transformational	-0.109	-1.569	0.118	ANOVA (F) = 30.013
				Sig. = 0.000

- Beta co-efficient is the standardized regression coefficient, which allows comparison of the relatives on the dependent variable of each independent variable.
- t-statistics help to determine the relative importance of each variable in the model

DISCUSSION

This study was carried out with the aim of measuring the impact of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutions of Himachal Pradesh. It also analysed the influence of demographic variables on perception of leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutions. Findings of the study reveal that perceptions of both leadership styles as well as organizational effectiveness do not vary because of gender. The finding is consistent with Manning (2002) who found no significant differences in the leadership style of male and female managers. However, Eagly and Johnson (1990) and Eagly et al. (2003) found gender to be the reason behind significant differences in the leadership styles of managers. Moehlman (1988) and Murray (1988) too found perception of organizational effectiveness to be significantly differing according to gender of the respondents in educational institutions. Public higher educational institutions have been found to be having a more transactional style of leadership. The overall leadership is also higher for public institutions. This result is similar to the findings of several studies which found significantly different styles of leadership in private and public organizations (Anderson, 2010; Hansen and Villadsen, 2010; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Gill, 2009). Organizational effectiveness has been found to be higher in public higher educational institutions. This finding supports the result of Makmee et al. (2010)

who found the perception of organizational effectiveness to be high in public universities. This result might be due to the fact that public higher educational institutions are duly recognized, follow all the norms, and receive higher grants from the State which could result in greater overall effectiveness of the organization compared to private universities. Both transactional and overall leadership styles have been found highest among more senior respondents belonging to the age group of 51-61 years whereas transformational leadership has been found to be more prevalent among respondents of 29-39 years suggesting that age could be an important determinant of the style of leadership followed in higher educational institutions. This could imply that younger teachers do not hesitate to follow innovative approaches and are able to associate themselves easily with the younger generation, be empathetic to their needs, and motivate them to outperform. Studies conducted by Kazan (2000); Payden (1997); and Thomas (1996) showed that perception of leadership styles is influenced by age. Contrary to the findings of the present study, Bala (1990) and Calabria (1991) did not find age to be having any influence on leadership styles. The findings of the study also reveal that higher age groups are accountable for differences in the perception of organizational effectiveness. This could be because with increasing age and experience, the organizational goals become clearer to the employees. It has been found that only the perception of transactional style of leadership differs in higher educational institutions on the basis of the current designation of respondents. The result shows that transactional style of leadership is mostly preferred by associate professors. Therefore according to the study, designation of the respondents is responsible for the variance in the perception of only transactional style of leadership in institutions of higher learning. Some dimensions of organizational effectiveness as well as the perception of overall effectiveness differed significantly according to designation and were highest for respondents who were professors. This finding is consistent with the findings of Cameron (1978) and Murray (1988) whose study revealed that perception of some of the dimensions of organizational effectiveness differ according to the designation of the respondents in institutes of higher learning. Respondents with a Ph.D. degree have been found to be having higher transactional and overall leadership. This result is in line with the findings of researches conducted by Ojode et al. (1999) and Taylor (1998) which showed that educational qualification has a significant influence on leadership styles. The result also shows that educational qualification is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutions since all

the dimensions as well as the overall organizational effectiveness differed significantly according to educational qualification of the respondents. Therefore, on the basis of the findings of the study, hypothesis H₁ and H₂ have been partially accepted.

Significant relationships were found between the styles of leadership and organizational effectiveness. However, only transactional style of leadership was found to be a significant predictor of organizational effectiveness. Transformational leadership did not have any significant impact on organizational effectiveness. Transformational leadership has often been associated with motivation, performance and overall effectiveness in many studies (Trottier et al., 2008; McColl-Kennedy and Anderson, 2005; Bass, 1985; Senge et al. 1994; Argyris and Schön, 1996; Glynn, 1996; Hurley and Hult, 1998). Nevertheless there were also studies with findings which showed no direct impact of transformational leadership on organizational effectiveness. Transformational style of leadership did not have any direct impact on the effectiveness of Non Profit Organizations in the study conducted by Shiva and Suar (2012). Weese (1996) and Lim and Cromartie (2001) did not find any significant association between transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATION

Like most research studies, this study too has its own set of limitations. Since the instruments measuring leadership and organizational effectiveness were perception based, it is possible that there has been some amount of bias or misinterpretation of questions while filling them up. The study included only teachers as its respondents but did not approach non-teaching employees in leadership positions. A sample with both teaching as well as non-teaching employees could be more representative. However this was not possible because of lack of time and resources.

Therefore, keeping in mind all the major limitations, the present study has much scope for future research. It is recommended that further studies in the field should be carried out on respondents who belong to both teaching as well as non-teaching categories. The present study has explored only transactional and transformational style of leadership. However, there are various other styles of leadership that can be studied in relation to organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutes. Findings of this study are based only on quantitative research. Future

studies can explore the construct of leadership through qualitative means such as in-depth interviews of respondents.

CONCLUSION

The study empirically investigated the influence of demographics on leadership styles and perception of organizational effectiveness as well as measured the impact that the two styles of leadership, viz., transactional and transformational, have on organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutions. The major findings of the study reveal that demographic variables partially influence leadership styles and organizational effectiveness; the results also show that although both transactional and transformational styles of leadership relate positively with organizational effectiveness, yet only transactional style of leadership has a significant impact on organizational effectiveness. This result is contrary to many previous studies that have often found transformational leadership to be positively impacting organizational effectiveness of institutions. The reason of such a unique result could be many. It could possibly be that the teachers of institutions of higher learning in Himachal Pradesh do prefer to practise transactional style of leadership over transformational leadership and hence the former style influences organizational effectiveness more than the latter.

Leadership is regarded as one of the most important factors of effectiveness in educational institutions since the teachers themselves practise different styles of leadership to produce more valuable results for their classes. They often act as role models for their students and help them to explore their potential not only academically but also assist them in attaining a more holistic development. Therefore effective leadership in academic institutions are responsible for the institution's long term growth, sustenance, and effectiveness. This study has produced some preliminary insights on the relationship leadership styles have with organizational effectiveness as well as how these constructs are influenced by demographic variable in higher educational institutions. Keeping in view the importance leadership holds for higher educational institutions, the present study has a lot of scope for future researchers to carry forward the work on leadership and organizational effectiveness in higher learning institutions.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Although the present study has been conducted on educational institutions with an aim to analyse the leadership styles prevalent there and their impact on organizational effectiveness, it is equally applicable for business corporations. Modern business organizations constantly face critical challenges from both internal as well as external environments. If not led effectively, organizations can fail to withstand such challenging circumstances thereby lowering their overall effectiveness. Demographic variables such as gender, educational qualification, and age are often instrumental in determining the style of leadership followed in the organization. A vast array of literature presented in the study has shown the importance of leadership styles for an organization. Managers can motivate employees, boost their morale and productivity, create favourable work climate and eventually help increase organizational effectiveness with the help of an appropriate leadership style. Therefore, the study provides valuable insight on the importance of leadership styles which can be followed by managers of modern day corporations.

REFERENCE

- Ali, H., & Ali, H. (2011). Demographics and spiritual leadership: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Business and Management Review*, 1(10), 36-42.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1993). Women in management: Organizational socialisation and assessment practices that prevent career advancement. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 2(3), 68-83.
- Andersen, J. A. (2010). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 70(1), 131-141.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baglia, H.P. Dachler, & C.A. Schriesheim (eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 29-50). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bala, M. (1990). *Leadership behaviour and educational administration*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.

- Barbuto Jr., J. E., Fritz, S. M., Matkin, G. S., & Marx, D. B. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. *Sex Roles, 56*(1/2), 71-83
- Barrow, J. (1977). The variables of leadership: A review and conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review, 2*, 231-251.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). Women and Leadership. In Ralph Stogdill's *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research* (2nd ed.). Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*(1), 5-34.
- Bolden, R. (2004). *What is Leadership?*, Leadership South West, Research Report 1, University of Exeter, Centre for Leadership Studies, pp. 9-30.
- Bryman, A. (2007). *Effective Leadership in Higher Education*, Research and Development Series, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, School of Management, University of Leicester, pp. 2-30.
- Bryman, A., & Lilley, S (2009). Leadership researchers on leadership in higher education. *Leadership, 5*(3), 331-346.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Calabria, F. A. (1991). *Personality and Leadership Behavior of New Jersey School Board Presidents*. (Doctoral dissertation. Fordham University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(2762 A).
- Cameron, K. S. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*, 604-632.
- Cameron, K. S. (1984). The effectiveness of ineffectiveness. In Staw B.M and Cummings, L.L. *Research in Organisational Behaviour, 6*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 235-85.
- Cameron, K., & Whetton, D. (1983). Organizational effectiveness: One model or several? In Cameron, K. and Whetton, D. (Eds.). *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models* (pp.1-24). New York: Academic Press.
- Campbell, J. P. (1977). On the Nature of Organizational Effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman and J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 13-55.

- Chaffey, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: American Council on Education and MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Cohen, W. A. (2002). The art of successful leader. *Financial Services Adviser*, 145(4), 12-13.
- Cunningham, B. J. (1977). Approaches to the evaluation of organizational effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(3), 463-474.
- Department of Higher Education, Himachal Pradesh (2016). Retrieved from <http://educationhp.org/> (2016) on 7 June 2016.
- Druskat, V. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 99-119.
- Dubin, Robert (1976). Organizational Effectiveness: Some dilemmas of perspective. *Organization and Administrative Sciences*, 7, 7-14.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 685-710.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569- 591.
- Erkutlu, H. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(7), 708-726.
- Finigan, K. (1999). Be an effective manager: Develop leadership qualities. *Capital District Business Review*, 26(13), 27.
- Garcia, L., & Stewart, J. (2000). Model behaviour for leaders. *PIMA's Papermaker*, 82(12), 31-34.
- Gill, R. (2009). *Leadership in the public sector – is it different?* Research Focus – Leadership in the Public Sector. The Leadership Trust. Retrieved from <http://www.leadership.org.uk/files/uploads/67.pdf> (2016) on 7 December 2016.
- Glynn, M. A. (1996). Innovative genius: A framework for relating individual and organizational intelligences to innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1081-1111.
- Goleman, D (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78-90.

- Grant, J. (1988). Women as managers: What they can offer to organizations. *Organizational Dynamics, Winter*, 56-63.
- Hall, R. P. (1972). *Organizations: Structures and Processes*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, R. P. (1978). *Conceptual, Methodological, and Moral Issues in the study of Organizational Effectiveness*. Working Paper, Department of Sociology, SUNY-Albany.
- Hansen, J. R., & Villadsen, A. R. (2010). Comparing public and private managers leadership styles: Understanding the role of job context. *International Public Management Journal, 13*(3), 247-274.
- Harrison, D. (2000). *Transformational leadership and community college effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 2000)*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 61(02A).
- Harrison, D., Price, K., Gavin, J., & Florey, A. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface, and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1029-1045.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 695-702.
- Howell, J. & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(6), 891-902.
- Hurley, R. F., & Huit, G. T. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing, 62*, 42-54.
- Joyce, P. (2009). Leadership and organizational effectiveness- lessons to be drawn, from education?, *Journal of Nursing Management, 17*, 494-502.
- Kabacoff, R. I. (1999), *Management level, job function and leadership style: a large sample study*, paper presented at the 107th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.).
- Kao, H. (2006). The relationship between leadership style & demographic characteristics of Taiwanese executives. *International Business & Economics Research Journal, 5*(2), 35-48.
- Kazan, A. L. (2000). *Exploring the concept of self-leadership: Factors impacting self-leadership of Ohio Americorps members*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences,

60(11-A), 3870.

- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333. Retrieved from 10.1002/job.4030160404 (2016) on 25 September 2016.
- Kunze, F., Boehm, S., & Bunch, H. (2013). Organizational performance consequences of age diversity: Inspecting the role of diversity-friendly hr policies and top managers' negative age stereotypes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(3), 413-442.
- Lieberson, S., & O'Connor, J. (1972). Leadership and organizational performance: A study of large corporations. *American Sociological Review*, 37(2), 117-130.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10, 451-479. Retrieved from 10.1076/sesi.10.4.451.3495 (2016) on 25 September 2016.
- Lim, J. Y., & Cromartie, F. (2001). Transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. *The Sport Journal*, 4(2), 111-169.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge: Leading in an interdependent world*, Jossey-Bass, Fransisco, C.A.
- Lipman-Blumen, J, Fryling, T., Henderson, M. C., Moore, C. W., & Vecchiotti, R. (1996). *Women in corporate leadership: Reviewing a decade's research*. The Claremont Graduate School, Institute for Advanced Studies in Leadership, Claremont, CA.
- Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine Leadership, or How to Succeed in Business without Being One of the Boys*. Times Books, New York, NY.
- Lojpur, A., Aleksic, A., Vlahovic, S., & Mijana, P. B. (2015). Examining determinants of leadership style among montenegrin managers. *Naše Gospodarstvo Our Economy*, 61(1), 13-24.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Mahajan, V. (2004). *Decision making styles and organisational effectiveness in institutions of higher learning*, Institute of Management Studies (Doctoral disseratation. Himachal Pradesh University).
- Makamee, P., Sujiva, S., & Kanjanawasee, S. (2010). Development of a

- model of organizational effectiveness evaluation for faculties of education: An application of multilevel causal analysis. *Scholar*, 2(1), 1-6.
- Manning, T. T. (2002). Gender, managerial level, transformational leadership and work satisfaction. *Women in Management Review*, 17(5), 207-216.
- Martin, E., Trigwell, K., Prosser, M., & Ramsden, P. (2003). Variation in the experience of leadership of teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 247-259.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maupin, R. (1990). Sex role identity and career success of certified public accountants. *Advances in Public Interest Accounting*, 97-105.
- McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2005). Subordinate - Manager gender combination and perceived leadership-style influence on emotions, self-esteem and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(2), 115-125.
- MHRD (2017). *University and Higher Education*, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. Retrieved from <http://mhrd.gov.in/university-and-higher-education> on 16.03.2018.
- Middlehurst, R., Goreham, H., & Woodfield, S. (2009). Why research Leadership in Higher Education? Exploring Contributions from the UK's Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. *Leadership*, 5(3), 311-329.
- Moehlman, G. M. (1988). *The relationship between leadership styles and faculty perceived effectiveness of principals in secondary vocational technical schools in Michigan*. (Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49(11), 3344.
- Murray, M. F. (1988). *A study of transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness, and demographics in selected small college settings*. (Doctoral dissertation. Kent State University). Michigan: U.M.I.
- Nahavandi, A., Denhardt, R. B., Robert, D., Janet, V., and Aristigueta. M. P. (2015). *Organizational Behaviour*. Sage Publications India Pvt Ltd, pp.315 – 345.
- Nayak, B. (2011). Leadership style of managers and supervisors: A case study of Rourkela Steel Plant in India. *European Journal of*

Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 42, 29–41

- Newstrom, J. W., & Davis, K. (1993). *Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Northouse, G. P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA.
- Northouse, G. P. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (6th ed.). Sage Publications Los Angeles, CA.
- Ojode, L. A., Walumbwa, O., & Kuchinke P. (1999). *Developing human capital for the evolving work environment: Transactional and transformational leadership within an instructional setting*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwest Academy of Management, Lincoln, NE.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Age influences on the leadership styles and behaviour of managers, *Employee Relations*, 26(1), 14-29.
- Parker, W. N (1994). Better leadership. *Executive Excellence*, 11(3), 14.
- Parhizgari, A. M., & Gilbert, R. G. (2004). Measures of organizational effectiveness: Private and public sector performance. *Omega, The International Journal of Management Science*, 32, 221-229
- Parrish, D. R. (2011). *Leadership in Higher Education: The Interrelationships, Influence and Relevance of Emotional Intelligence*, Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Wollongong. Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong, pp. 41-46. Retrieved from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3263> on 16 September 2016.
- Parrish, D. R. (2011). *Leadership in Higher Education: The Interrelationships, Influence and Relevance of Emotional Intelligence*, Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Wollongong. Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong, pp. 181-183. Retrieved from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3263> on 16 September 2016.
- Payden, B. L. (1997). *The relationship between perceived leadership behaviors and job satisfaction based on age, gender, and education level variables*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 57(7-A), pp. 3127.
- Perrow, C. (1970). *Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Plowman, R. (1991). *Perceptions of presidential leadership behavior and institutional environment by presidents and vice presidents of selected four-year colleges and universities in Florida (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1991)*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(08A).

- Pounder, J. S. (2001). New leadership and university organizational effectiveness: Exploring the relationship. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 22(6), 281-290.
- Powell, G. N. (1990). One more time: Do female and male managers differ? *Academy of Management Executive*, 4(3), 68-75.
- Powell, G. N. (1993). *Women and men in management* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Newbury Park, C.A.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing value approach to organisational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3), 363-377.
- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to lead in higher education*. London, Routledge.
- Rana, S. (1995). *A study of the relationship between organisational effectiveness and leadership in the institutions of higher learning*, Institute of Management Studies (Doctoral dissertation. Himachal Pradesh University).
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2007). *Management* (9th ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosener, J. D. (1990). Ways women lead: The command-and-control leadership style association with men is not the only way to succeed. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 119-125.
- Rosener, J. D., McAllister, D., & Stephens, G. (1990). *Leadership study: International women's forum*. Graduate School of Management, Irvine, CA.
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). Learning Leaders in Times of Change: Academic Leadership Capabilities for Australian Higher Education, University of Western Sydney and Australian Council for Educational Research, pp.1-107. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=higher_education on 16 October 2016.
- Senge, P., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., Smith, B. J., & Kleiner, A. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday.
- Shaguri, O. R. (2013). Higher Education in India. Access, Equity, Quality. Access, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Education. European Access Network. GAPS, pp. 3-4. Retrieved from <http://www.ean-edu.org/assets/highereducationindiashaguri.pdf> on 12 October 2016.
- Shakir, M. (2013). Impact of age, gender, and length of experience on the effectiveness of secondary school principals. *Research Analysis and Evaluation*, 4(46), 40-44.

- Shiva, M. S. A. M., & Suar, D. (2012). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, organizational effectiveness, and programme outcomes in non-governmental organizations. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(3), 684-710.
- Stordeur, S., Vandenberghe, C., & D'hoore, W. (2000). Leadership styles across hierarchical levels in nursing departments. *Nursing Research*, 49(1), 37-43.
- Taylor, T. R. (1998). *Factors influencing the effectiveness of cross-functional work teams in a research and development organization*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering, 58(10- B), 5685.
- Thibodeaux, M. S., & Favilla, E. (1995). Strategic management and organizational effectiveness in colleges of business. *Education for Business*, 70(4), 189-196.
- Thomas, B. B. (1996). *The relationship of leadership style to teacher leadership preferences*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 57(1-A), 0064.
- Tichy, N. M. (1997), *The leadership engine: How winning companies build leaders at every level*. Harper Collins, New York, NY.
- Tichy, N. M., & Uhich, D. (1984). The leadership challenge: A call for the transformational leader. *Sloan Management Review*, 26, 59-68.
- Tripathi, S. D. (1991). Universities Management in Non-Profit Organizations. In M. Singh (Ed.). *Some papers on higher education in India*, pp. 83-87. New Delhi: Amar Prakashan.
- Trottier, T., Wart, M. V., & Wang, X. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 319-33.
- University Grants Commission (2016). Retrieved from www.ugc.ac.in on 7 June 2016.
- University Grants Commission (2016). *State-wise list of Private Universities*, UGC, New Delhi. Retrieved from <http://www.ugc.ac.in/privatuniversity.aspx> on 12 October 2016.
- Verma, Y. S. (1990). *University management and administration*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
- Warner, W. K. (1967). Problems in measuring the goal attainment of voluntary organizations. *Journal of Adult Education*, 19, 3-14.
- Warrilow, S. (2012) Transformational Leadership Theory - The 4 Key Components in Leading Change & Managing Change. Retrieved

from [http://EzineArticles.com/?expert = Stephen _ Warrilow](http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Stephen+Warrilow) on 12.10.2016.

- Weese, W. J. (1996). Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(2), 197-206.
- Williams, R. B. (2006). Leadership for school reform: Do principal decision-making styles reflect a collaborative approach?, *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, No. 53. Retrieved from [http:// www. Umanitoba . ca / publications / cjeap / articles / williams . html](http://www.Umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/williams.html) on 16 October 2016.
- World Bank (2007). *India. Country Summary of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1121703274255/1439264-1193249163062/India_CountrySummary.pdf on 12 October 2016.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.