

Exploring Experience and Gender Based Instructional Leadership Styles at University Level in Pakistan

Irfan Bashir¹
Usman Khalil²

The paper titled “A Study of Instructional Leadership Styles of Head of the Departments (HoDs) at University Level in Pakistan” aims to explore instructional leadership styles in universities of Pakistan. The objectives focused on finding out teaching experience, leadership experience and gender based differences between leadership styles of the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan. These objectives were broken into research questions and null hypotheses. The study is limited to the province of Punjab with 24 public and private comprehensive universities in sampling frame. Using random sampling technique, 120 Heads of the Departments; and 240 faculty members were selected from various faculties and departments of 5 public and 5 private Sector universities. The questionnaires based on Goleman’s Leadership styles, have content validity & reliability (0.86), both for faculty and Heads of the Departments are used. Results of the study showed that: certain differences do exist between leadership styles of Heads of the Departments on the basis of gender and experience. The study mainly suggested leadership courses and training for HoDs; using gender and experience very carefully as the sole criteria for appointment of HoDS.

Key words: *Instructional Leadership, Gender, Experience, Higher Education, University, Pakistan*

¹ Director Admin. Lahore Institute of Future Education, Lahore
Email: iergraduate@gmail.com

² Associate Professor, Dept. of Education, University of Management and Technology Lahore

Introduction

Leadership is the backbone of any organization. Its importance increases manifold in educational setups where future of the nations is weaved; especially the Universities which are considered the highest interest bodies of knowledge production. Pakistan as a developing country has almost 177 universities and degree awarding institutes (HEC 2017) which seem to be insufficient. Knowledge production, teaching-learning and research culture in the universities mainly depend on the university academic leadership, especially the head of the departments (Heads of the Departments) who are the real instructional leaders.

Initial works on leadership were based on data from corporate and business domains. Later these concepts were borrowed by the researches in educational leadership. Various leadership styles and theories have emerged during last 6 decades (Northouse, 2014). In educational settings, the concept of Instructional Leadership (IL) leadership is the most recent one. Researchers (Flath 2010, Fullan, 2011) said that less importance is given to instructional leadership because of the absence of training, job description, inadequacy of time to practice the instructional activities and load of paper. In the early years of the 90s, instructional leadership saw a phase of replacement by institute-based instructional management (Lashway, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

One of the major roles played by the Heads of the Departments of the universities is of an instructional leader's. Being instructional leaders, the Heads of the Departments use various leadership styles to run the departments. Gender and experience may have impact on leadership styles of the HoDs, so the study focuses on leadership styles of HoDs based on teaching and leadership experience and gender.

Objectives of the Study

Objectives of the study are to:

1. Find out the teaching experience based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan.
2. Find out leadership experience based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of t universities of Pakistan.
3. Find out gender based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan.
4. Make recommendations in the light of the findings of the study.

Research Questions

1. What is teaching experience based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan?
2. What is leadership experience based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan.
3. What gender based differences of instructional leadership styles between the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan?

Hypotheses

H0₁: There is no significant difference among mean scores of leadership styles of the Heads of the Departments with more teaching experience and less teaching experience at universities of Pakistan.

H0₂: There is no significant difference among mean scores of leadership styles of the Heads of the Departments with more leadership experience and less leaders experience at universities of Pakistan.

H0₃: There is no significant difference between leadership styles of male and female heads of the departments of universities of Pakistan.

Significance, Rationale and Justification of the Study

Numerous leadership theories, styles and models have been discussed in the literature; and the latest emergence is of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and leadership styles by Goleman (1998). In the survey of literature traces of work on educational leadership in Pakistan are found but no significant work has been carried out in the area of emotional intelligence (EI) based instructional leadership at the university level in Pakistan. There is a gap and space for research based on Goleman's leadership styles at university instructional leadership level. So, the results of the study will be useful for Leadership Curriculum, Leadership Trainers, University Heads of the Departments, Policy Makers/Board of Governors of Universities/Board of advanced Studies & Curriculum, Higher Education Commission (HEC), University Leadership (Vice Chancellors & Deans) and Further Researches. The study will also establish the cross cultural basis of Goleman's leadership style.

Literature Review

Various definitions of leadership are available in the literature. The most common among them are the concepts with reference to the characteristics, traits, responsibilities, styles and roles of a leader.

The early formation of the charismatic leadership theory is traced from the work of Max Weber (1947). Great Man Theory believes that the ability for leadership is an inherent,

gifted and in-built quality of a leader (Dennison, 2003).” Trait Theory, emerged during 1930s, (Northouse, 2013) and is based on the idea that there are inborn attributes in the leaders that make them unchallenging suitable to leadership. Leadership Behaviors Theories stem from two streams: interpersonal relationships and task-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 2012). Dierendonck (2011) is of the view that most of the researches have focused on the theoretical perspectives of servant leadership rather than what it is and how does it exist. Team leadership or participative leadership focuses on studying the roles and processes involved in team building, empowerment and distribution roles (Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson, & Jundt, 2005; Stagl, Salas & Burke, 2007 & Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2009).

Psychodynamic approach taking its theoretical grounds from Freud and Jung argues that the leader is aware of his/her own personality type as well as the personalities of the followers (Gabriel, 2011; Kets de Vries and Balazs, 2011). Leadership Styles approach may be traced in the ideas of Kurt Lewin (1939); McGregor’s (1960), Michigan State University Studies of Managerial Grid; and Ohio State University Studies, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), (Northouse, 2013; Maccoby, 2007).

Goleman (2013), sees Emotional Intelligence as the most important factor in discriminating between the good and not so good leaders. In a general sense, Goleman’s major work is based on the argumentation about the following six different leadership styles (Business Psychologist, 2012): 1) *The Visionary Leadership* 2) *The Coaching Leadership* creates 3) *The Affiliative Leadership* 4) *The Democratic Leadership* 5) *The Pace-setting Leadership* 6) *The Commanding/Coercive Leadership*

Instructional leadership theory emerged during 1990s taking its roots from teacher leadership (Hallinger, 2009). Instructional Leadership is an act of leading teachers (Loeb & Horing, 2010). They emphasize viewing the role of Heads of the Departments as vital to the improved instruction and smooth management. Hallinger & Murphy’s (1987) conceptualize Instructional Leadership includes defining mission, managing program, promoting academic climate.

Higher education contributes to the achievement of social tasks of increasing public responsibility, social harmony and a more compassionate society (National Education Policy, Pakistan (NEP, 2009). Rehman (2011) is of the view that higher education receives a cold shoulder and mismanagement in the name of leadership that has resulted in the falling standards of academic excellence. Iqbal and Iqbal (2011) argue that a strong relationship exists between the leadership role and the quality of higher education. Mahmood (2007)

using three dimensional models based on Blake and Mounon (1985) Managerial Grid identified 8 styles of the Heads.

Thrash (2009), found significant differences among the leadership styles and the independent variables (age, leadership experience) of deans of universities. Rebecka (2012) found that female leaders in higher education have predominantly transformational leadership styles. Hough (2011) also conducted a leadership style study (with age, teaching experience, leadership experience, academic and professional qualifications, and other demographical variables) on the leadership styles of female administrators in higher education. She used a self-reporting researcher made instrument for data collection and found that female leaders in the higher education mainly use transformational leadership style. Bambi (2011) found that heads of the departments have both instructional and managerial responsibilities so they need to balance both by creating collaborative workplace environment.

The literature discussed above clearly indicates the current situation of instructional leadership styles globally; and points out situation of educational leadership in Pakistan. The literature above also establishes the bases for the researcher's development of "self-report" and "self-other report instructional leadership style questionnaires.

Research Methodology

Population of the study included all universities and higher education institutes of Pakistan. The study was limited to the province of the Punjab with a sampling frame of 24 universities. A sample of 10 universities, 5 each from public and private sector universities were selected randomly; thus almost 42% of the universities of sampling frame were selected as the sample. A total of 120 (20%) heads of the departments were selected as sample of the study. Moreover two faculty members working under each sample head of the department were also randomly selected (n=240), to triangulate the self reported data of the heads of the departments from various faculties.

Research Tools

The tool for Heads of the Departments was based on Daniel Goleman's Emotional Intelligence based leadership styles the tool comprised of 54, Five point Likert Scale items. The scale ranges from "Always" to "Never". Each leadership style contains 9 items reflecting different indicators of that style. To triangulate the data, the same tool with necessary changes was used for data collection from the faculty members. Reliability of the tools was determined using Cronbach Alpha. The reliability values of both the tools were .80 for the Heads of the Departments and faculty members.

Data Analysis

Both descriptive (Mean, SD) and inferential statistics (t & ANOVA tests) were used.

Data Analysis and Discussion

Table 1

Faculties and Departments in Sample

| Variable | Heads of the Departments | f(%) | Faculty f(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Departments | | | |
| Social Sciences | 17 | (14.2) | 34(14.2) |
| Humanities | 11 | (9.2) | 22(9.2) |
| Languages | 13 | (10.8) | 26(10.8) |
| Management Sciences | 13 | (10.8) | 26(10.8) |
| Commerce & Finance | 13 | (10.8) | 26(10.8) |
| Basic Sciences | 25 | (20.8) | 50(20.8) |
| Health Sciences | 14 | (11.7) | 28(11.7) |
| Engineering & Technology | 14 | (11.7) | 28(11.7) |
| Faculties | | | |
| Social Science, Humanities and Languages | 41 | (34.2) | 82(34.2) |
| Management & Administrative Science and Commerce | 27 | (22.5) | 54(22.5) |
| Sciences and Technology | 52 | (43.3) | 104(43.3) |

Table 1 presents frequencies and percentages of the Heads of the Departments and the faculty members in the study. Basic sciences and social sciences have comparatively higher representation of the Heads of the Departments and the faculty; while all other departments have almost equal representations (11-14). At faculty level again, social sciences, humanities

and languages (n=41) along with science and technology (n=52) have higher representation of the Heads of the Departments and the faculty.

Table 2

Instructional Leadership Styles of the Male and Female HoDs

| Leadership Style | Male | Female | T | p |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|------|
| | (n=100) | (n=20) | | |
| | <i>M(SD)</i> | <i>M(SD)</i> | | |
| Coaching | 32.15(3.26) | 31.20(4.03) | 1.140 | .257 |
| Affiliative | 30.39(3.95) | 31.50(3.73) | .990 | .250 |
| Democratic | 32.86(3.44) | 33.80(4.00) | -1.201 | .281 |
| Pace Setting | 32.53(3.84) | 32.55(2.94) | -.022 | .983 |
| Commanding | 28.72(5.29) | 25.15(4.53) | 2.816 | .006 |
| Visionary/Autocratic | 35.22(4.11) | 36.00(3.46) | -.790 | .430 |

Table 2 shows the difference between the self reported leadership styles of the male and female HoDs at university level in Pakistan. To find out the differences, t test was applied. The test results show that there is a significant difference ($p < .05$) between mean scores of male HoDs ($M=28.72$, $SD=5.29$) and female HoDs ($M=25.15$, $SD=4.53$) regarding the commanding leadership style. Mean scores tell that female HoDs report themselves as less commanding than the male HoDs. On the basis of mean scores, male HoDs tend to use more coaching ($M=32.15$, $SD=3.26$) and commanding ($M=28.72$, $SD=5.29$) leadership styles than female HoDs. While, on the basis of mean scores, female HoDs report themselves as more affiliative ($M=31.50$, $SD=3.73$), democratic ($M=33.80$, $SD=4.00$) and visionary ($M=36.00$, $SD=3.46$) leaders than the male HoDs. Hence researcher fails to accept the null hypothesis, and alternative hypothesis is accepted that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the instructional leadership styles of the male and female HoDs at the university level in Pakistan.

Table 3

Leadership Styles Based On Teaching Experience of The HoDs

| Leadership Style | Teaching Experience (years) | | | | ANOVA | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------|------|------|
| | <5 (n=15) | 6-10 (n=21) | 11-15 (n=28) | >15 (n=56) | F | p | HSD |
| Coaching | 31.60(3.06) | 32.19(3.72) | 31.79(2.85) | 32.12(3.68) | .14 | .930 | |
| Affiliative | 30.81(4.50) | 30.24(3.25) | 30.32(3.37) | 30.75(4.31) | .15 | .928 | |
| Democratic | 32.87(3.39) | 32.57(3.12) | 31.61(3.60) | 33.93(5.52) | 2.97 | .035 | .023 |
| Pace Setting | 32.97(4.39) | 33.10(4.33) | 31.29(4.09) | 32.84(3.75) | 1.42 | .240 | |
| Commanding | 29(4.91) | 28.57(5.22) | 29.32(5.12) | 27.12(5.51) | 1.32 | .270 | |
| Visionary/ Autocratic | 36(4.05) | 35.48(2.80) | 33.75(5.52) | 35.93(3.31) | 2.06 | .109 | |

Table 3 shows the difference between the self-reported data of HoDs regarding leadership styles based on teaching experience. To find out the differences ANOVA was applied. The test results show that there is no significant difference between the leadership styles of HoDs based on their teaching experience, except in democratic style. There is a significant difference ($p < .05$) regarding democratic style between the teaching experience based groups of instructional leaders. The HoDs with more than 15 years of teaching experience ($n=56$, $M=33.93$, $SD=2.97$) tend to be more democratic than all the other HoDs. It was further confirmed by applying Post Hoc, Tukey HSD test ($p=.023$). showing that this difference is between HoDs with >11years teaching experience and the HoDs with <5 and 6-10 years teaching experience. Hence the researcher fails to accept the null hypothesis, and alternative hypothesis is accepted again there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the instructional leadership styles (based on teaching experience)of HoDs at university level in Pakistan.

Table 4

Leadership Styles of the HoDs Based on the Leadership Experience

| Leadership Style | Leadership Experience (years) | | | | ANOVA | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------|------|
| | <5 (n=45) | 6-10 (n=38) | 11-15 (n=14) | >15 (n=23) | F | P |
| Coaching | 31.67(2.80) | 32.37(3.83) | 32.14(2.79) | 31.91(4.14) | .29 | .826 |
| Affiliative | 30.18(3.63) | 30.95(4.38) | 29.14(3.71) | 31.61(3.67) | 1.43 | .236 |
| Democratic | 32.27(3.29) | 32.61(3.68) | 32.64(3.43) | 35.39(3.02) | 4.74 | .004 |
| Pace Setting | 32.16(3.91) | 32.21(3.70) | 33.29(3.58) | 33.35(3.33) | .81 | .489 |
| Commanding | 27.93(5.41) | 28.03(5.75) | 27.43(5.28) | 29.09(4.60) | .34 | .791 |
| Visionary/ Autocratic | 35.04(4.06) | 35.71(4.31) | 34.00(3.32) | 36.17(3.72) | 1.04 | .377 |

Table 4 shows difference among the leadership styles of the HoDs based on the leadership experience. ANOVA was applied to check the difference. Test results show that mainly there is no significant difference ($p > .05$) between the mean scores of leadership styles of the HoDs based on leadership experience; but there is a significant difference ($p < .05$) only in the democratic leadership style of the HoDs. The HoDs with >15 years of leadership experience ($M=35.39$, $SD=3.02$) are more democratic than the HoDs with <5 years, and 6-10 years of leadership experience. Further to determine the difference, Tukey's HSD Post Hoc test was applied on all leadership styles. The test showed that there is a difference between the mean scores on the democratic leadership style of the HoDs with >15 years of Leadership experience ($M=35.39$, $SD=3.02$) and the HoDs with < 5 years experience ($p=.03$) and HoDs with 6-10 years leadership experience ($p=.012$), but no difference was found for the HoDs with 11-15 years of experience. Hence the researcher fails to accept null hypothesis; and alternative hypothesis is accepted that there is a significant difference between the leadership styles of the HoDs with different leadership experience. It means that HoDs having more than 15 years leadership experience are more democratic than HoDs with less than 5 years leadership experience and HoDs with 6-10 years leadership experience.

Findings and Discussion

Significant differences were found among the HoDs leadership styles based on gender, teaching experience and leadership experience. These results are consistent with

Thrash (2009), who found significant differences among the leadership styles and the independent variables (age, leadership experience) of deans of universities. Furthermore on the bases of gender the results are consistent with the findings of Rebecka (2012) who also found that female leaders in higher education use transformational leadership styles. Additionally the results of this study are also aligned with Hough (2011) who conducted a leadership style study (with age, teaching experience, leadership experience, academic and professional qualifications, and other demographical variables) on the leadership styles of female administrators in higher education.

Recommendations

In the light of the above mentioned findings and discussion, the following recommendations are made:

1. It is highly recommended that gender, leadership experience and teaching experience as sole appointing criteria for HoDs should be used carefully. In certain situations democratic leadership style and commanding leadership style both may affect organizational environment adversely as reported by Goleman.
2. The HEC and the ministry of higher education of the concerned provinces with the help of the universities should arrange leadership courses for the Heads of the Departments of both the public and private sector universities.

Bibliography

- Bambi, A. (2011). *The Role of Head of the Department as Instructional Leader at Secondary School*. Retrieved May 23, 2013 from <https://ujdigispace.uj.ac.za/handle/10210/8384>
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: Principals' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37(2), 476-498.
- Bliss, S.E.(2009). *The affect of Emotional Intelligence on a modern organizational leader's ability to make effective decisions*. Retrieved on 31 December , 2013 from www.hci.org/lib
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., and Dennison, P. (2003). *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks Centre for Leadership Studies*, Edited Version of a Report for Chase Consulting and the Management Standards Centre; Centre for Leadership Studies University of Exeter

- Business Psychologist.(2012). *Daniel Goleman's 6 Leadership Styles*, retrieved on May 22, 2012 from www.psych-pcs.co.uk
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating High Achievement: High School Principals' Reflections on Their Successful Leadership Practices. *Journal Of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-580.
- Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader. *ATA Magazines*, 69(3), 19-22, 47- 49.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gabriel, Y. (2011). *Psychoanalytic approaches to leadership*. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K.; Grint, G. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 393– 404). London: Sage.
- Goleman, D. (1998) *Harvard Business Review on What Makes a Leader?* Harvard Business School Press
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working With Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J.F. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational leadership*, 45(1), 54-61.
- Hallinger, P. (2009). *Leadership for 21st Century Schools: From Instructional Leadership to Leadership for Learning*; The Hong Kong Institute of Education
- Hough,M.A.(2011). *Leadership styles of effective female administrators in higher education*. [unpublished Dissertation] retrieved December 25, 2013 from <http://udini.proquest.com/preview/leadership-styles-of-effective-goid:902033280/>
- House, R.J. (1977). A theory of charismatic leadership. In: Hunt J.G., Larson L.L. (eds) *Leadership: the cutting edge*. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*, 9th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W.K. , & Brown, B.L. (1988). Leadership behavior of principals and the zone of acceptance of elementary teachers. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26 (1), 23-38.
- Ilgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2005). Teams in organizations: From input–process–output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 517– 543.
- Iqbal, M., & Iqbal, M.Z. (2011). *Educational Leadership for Managing Quality: Problems, Issues, and Ethical Behavior*. Presentation at ICQI-Lahore, 2-3 May 2011. Retrieved form http://piqc.edu.pk/casestudies/Dr_Muhammad_Iqbal_Educational

- Kets de Vries, M., & Balazs, K. (2011). *The shadow side of leadership*. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, G. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 380–392). London: Sage.
- Khan, K.M. (2001). *Self Perceptions Of Leadership Role Of The Secondary Schools Heads Towards Improvement Of Standards Of Education*. Retrieved August 15, 2010 from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.co>
- Lashway, L. (2012, July). *Developing instructional leaders* [electronic version]. *Eric Digest 160*. Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon.
- Lewin, K.(1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, vol.10, pp. 271-301
- Loeb, S. & Horing, E. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(3), pp. 66-69
- Maccoby, M. (2007). *The leaders we need and what makes us follow*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Mahmood, K. (2007). Least common multiple of teacher leadership styles: Implication for classroom. *Quality in Education: Teaching and leadership in challenging times*, pp. 306- 331.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Murphy, J. (1987). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. *Canadian Administrator*, 27 (3), 1-9.
- Myatt, M. (2012). Five ways to free yourself from a leadership rut. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/mikemyatt/2012/01/03/5-ways-to-free-yourself-from-a-leadership-rut>
- National Education Policy (2009). Ministry of Education , Paksitan.
- Northouse, P.G.(2013). *Leadership: theory and practice*.(6th ed.) NewDehli: Sage Publication India pvt. Ltd.
- Onorato, M.(2013). Transformational Leadership Style In The Educational Sector: An Empirical Study Of Corporate Managers And Educational Leaders. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 17 (1) p. 33-43 Retrieved December 28,2013 from <http://udini.proquest.com/preview/transformational-leadership> style-goid:1368593704

- Pashiardis, P., & Savvides, V. (2011). The Interplay Between Instructional and Entrepreneurial Leadership Styles in Cyprus Rural Primary Schools; *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (2009). Where do we go from here? Is shared leadership the key to team success? *Organizational Dynamics*, 38(3), 234–238.
- Rebecka, M. (2012). *Women in leadership in higher education: Leadership styles and the "glass ceiling"*[unpublished Dissertation] retrieved December 25, 2013 from <http://udini.proquest.com/preview/women-in-leadership-in-higher-goid:1413329717/>
- Rehman, A. (2011). Higher Education in Pakistan, stuck in a state of disarray. *The Daily Nation*, retrieved from <http://www.interface.edu.pk/students/Nov-08/Higher-Education-in-Pakistan.asp>
- Seunghyun H., Deborah L., Feltz & Lee. (2013). Emotional intelligence in coaching: Mediation effect of coaching efficacy on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership style; *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11:3, 292-306, DOI: 10.1080/1612197X.2013.763489
- Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., & Burke, C. S. (2007). *Best practices in team leadership: What team leaders do to facilitate team effectiveness*. In J. A. Conger & R. E. Riggio (Eds.), *The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders* (pp. 172–197). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thrash, A.B. (2012). Leadership in Higher Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(13)
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), pp.1228–1261.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organisation*. Talcott Parsons (Ed). New York: Free Press.
- Yukl, G. A. (2012). *Leadership in Organizations*, (8th.ed.), State University of New York, Albany