CONTRIBUTION OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP TO THE HEAD DEPARTMENT LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Suhana
suhana.aziza@gmail.com

Lie Lianna
lieliana08@gmail.com

Tristiana Rijanti
tristianar@gmail.com;

Askar Yunianto
askaryunianto@yahoo.com

Vika Lutfiyani
lutfiyanivika@gmail.com
Universitas Stikubank Semarang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
Higher educations play important role in effort to develop a nation. Good quality of a higher education will contribute to the progress of the nation. The quality of higher education can be seen from the quality of its leader. Head of department has an important role in advancing the department head, then in turn contributing to the quality of a university. The current research aimed to examine the leadership styles of head of departments and their leadership effectiveness. The research used 60 lecturers to be respondents. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X (MLQ) was used. Research findings showed that the department heads exhibited combination of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. Research findings also indicated that dimensions of transformational leadership: idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration were consistent with the norm of MLQ (fairly often). While for dimensions of transactional leadership, contingent reward and management by exception-active and passive were also consistent with the norm of MLQ (sometimes). The rest were not suitable with the norm of MLQ, namely: idealized influence (attributed), intellectual stimulation, and laissez-faire. The findings also indicated that combinations of transformational and transactional leadership styles of head departments were more effective if compared with the single contribution of leadership style. The research findings implied empirically to the implementation of transformational leadership style in the field and theoritically to the body of transformational leadership style theory of department head.

Keywords: department head, transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles, leadership effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

Change in many sectors of life comes rapidly. Organization being able to adjust with the change will be able to sustain its life. Conversely, an organization that is not flexible to the environment change, the organization will be left behind with its competitors.

Indonesia as a developing country is also faced with the rapid change of world environment in the early of 21th century. The environment change also occurs in the education sector.

Higher education as a part of national education system has a povital role to participate to prepare future generation to be able to build the anvanced nation. Good quality of higher education describes the good quality of human resource. Thus Indonesia will be able to compete with other countries in the world. Moreover in the early of the year, era of MEA has been started.

One of efforts conducted by government to materialize the higher education vision is to rank the quality of higher educations in Indonesia by ministery of research and technology and higher education. Last year, 2015, was the first year the ranking of higher education institutions was conducted. The intension of the ranking is to motivate higher institutions to compete fairly to improve their quality. Besides, the ranking announced publicly will give good education to people as main stakeholder in choosing the institutions for their children education.

Two aspects assessed in the ranking are concerning quality of human resources and higher education governance. In the context, management of higher education will have strategic role. It means that the better the management of higher education, the more effective the higher educations will be. In the case, the leader of higher

ICOBAME

education has very important role. The higher education management takes organizational decision and is responsible to the running of organization. The indication is in line with the statement of Verma (2000) in Sadeghi and Zaidatol (2012) that university management was the key decision maker and quality of the decision will bring effect to the gaining of organizational goals.

Leadership has important role in managing an organization. The success of an organization will depend on the quality of its leadership. The importance of leadership quality will be more increased in lining with the very fast environment change. The statement is supported by Sarros &Santora, 2001) that leadership constitutes an important factor having capability to manage organization change. Leadership is one of basic needs of an organization to succeed. The indication is in line with what was said by Riaz dan Haider (2010) that leadership is an important element in elevating organization performance. Moreover, a leader predicting the future possibility and planning certain strategy to anticipate the uncertainty constitutes effective leader capability (Riaz & Haider, 2010). They can lead the organization to success by paying attention to the environment change, then in turn, help them to arrange planning and gain the organization goal. Shortly, an effective leader will give significant contribution to the gaining of competitive advantage of an organization.

Leadership style is one of important leadership elements giving contribution to the effectiveness of leadership. A leader improves the quality of his style in lining with his experience, education and also training. For many years, researchers have tried to explain how leadership style correlates with effectivity (Dessler, 2004 in Lerra, 2014. Transformational leadership style has been proved as an effective leadership style in leading an organization (Zadeghi and Zaidatol, 2012). The style has significant effect to the subordinate behavior and organizational output (Tickle et al., 2005).

Head of department is an organization unit in higher education participating in determining the success of higher education. Generally, good department head will contribute to the gaining of higher education goals. The indication is in line with Coats (2000) stating that the success of each higher education will be measured by the department success. Bowman (2002) stated that deprtment head constitutes first line leader directly influencing the quality of the department.

Therefore, Thomas and Schuh (2004) mentioned that task scope of department head was managing department finance, leading curriculum change, conducting lecture and student evaluation, empowering lecturers, managing daily tasks of deparment, and organizing common activities of the department. Moreover, McArthur (2002) stated that head of department also facilitated the changing process of the department.

Research and literature concerning top management of higher education are so many. Meanwhile research in level of department head is still rare. In other side, the role of department head is very important (Coats, 2000). Thus there is still gap of knowledge dealing with the position of head department, especially his role in literature. Such rationality is the basic reason why the subject is important to study.

University of Stikubank is one of universities in central java. Basing on the the ranking launched by ministry of research and technology and higher education affairs, Unisbank places 105 rank of 2.324 higher education in Indonesia. Based on ranking category, for human resource and governance aspect, have been good. Therefore, for research and student activities category, the university is not good yet. Being able to be more competitive in the future, shown by the better ranking, Unisbank should conduct wholly evaluation and then plan real action to improve university quality covering four aspects mentioned.

The leader role of University of Unisbank is very important to materialize the planning. Having an effective department head is strategic effort to improve the quality of the university.

Problem Formulation

Research about the effectivity of department head is still rare, while the role of the department head to advance his department is important. Unisbank University as one of good reputation of universities in Semarang will be continuosly to evaluate the actions and then to improve the quality. Based on the description, the current research will focus on: 1) what the leadership style of deparment head are, 2) whether the combination of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership style are good predictors of department head leadership effectiveness in Unisbank University.

RESEARCH AIM

Based on the problem, the aim of the research is to identify what leadership style of department head and whether combinations of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire are good predictors of head department leadership effectiveness.

Theoritical Background
Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a relatively new concept of leadership attracting many researchers. There have been many researches conducted in the area. Transformational leadership constitutes a proactive leadership. He arises the awareness of subordinates concerning shared interests and helps them to gain their goals (Antonakis, 2003).

The theory of leadership is an integrative theory toward many previous leadership approaches. Integration intended is combination of trait, behavior and contingent theory. By combining the approach, the theory was developed (Lussier& Achua, 2007). The concept of transformational and transactional leadership constitutes a very popular approach to comprehend leader effectiveness. The phenomenon is supported by many researches strengthening the indication. The theory was developed by Burns in 1978. Bass (1985) built new version of leadership of Burns works and then Bass dan Avolio (1994) proposed full-range theory of leadership consisting transformational, transactional and laissez-faire one (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002).

A transformational leader supporting his subordinates to do their job exceeding the hope of an organization is proactive and helps the subordinates to gain the organizational goal (Antonakis et al., 2003). They moved their employees over their personal interest (Bass, 1999). The transformational leader is a model of integrity and fairness, plans clear goals, has a high hope, gives support and recognition, directs emotion and passion of subordinates and asks them to take aside individual interest to achieve organizational goal (Pierce & Newstorm, 2008 in Zaidatol et al, 2011). The type is an important antecendent to construct collective self confidence needed by successful group when facing difficult challenge (Bass et al., 2003)

Transformational leadership consists of five dimentions, namely: idealized influence (attribute and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Idealized influence describes a level where a leader is perceived as a role model giving inspiration to followers (Sarros & Santora, 2001). A leader is admired, respected and trusted. Followers identify and follow their leader (Bass et al, 2003). Idealized influence consists of two forms: idealized influence (attribute) in which a leader receives the trust and respect and idealized influence (behavior) in which a leader shows extraordinary behavior and sacrifices his personal interest to group interest (Moss & Ritossa, 2007 in Sadeghi and Zaidatol, 2012). Inspirational motivation depicts a leader motivating followers by giving meaning and challenge of their jobs (Bass et.al, 2003). A leader strengthens followers by seeing the future optimistically and such a way giving motivation people surrounding by giving a meaning and challenge to the followers's job (Bass et al., 2003, Antonakis et al., 2003).

Intellectual stimulation explains a level in which a leader stimulates followers effort to be more innovative and creative and accepts challenge as a part of his job (Sarros & Santora, 2001, Bass et. al., 2003). Individualized consideration deals with the basic behavior of transformational leadership style treating individuals as a side giving significant contribution to the organization. A leader using the type shows good attention to the followers need (Sarros & Santora,2001). The leader listens seriously to the need of followers and delegates certain responsibility to help followers grow through personal challenge (Judge&Piccolo, 2004)

Leadership and organization effectiveness is a superiority of transformational leadership if compared with transactional one. Many experts believe that transformational leadership results in bigger effect if compared with transactional leadership (Erkutlu, 2008). Though implementing transactional leadership style results in outcome hoped, transformational leadership is better in gaining hoped performance and toward better organization (Erkutlu, 2008). A leader showing transformational leadership behavior can direct his organization to the effectiveness and productivity direction.

The important issue is that the implementation of combination of transformational and transactional leadership is better than alone. The new paradigm adds transformational leadership to the previous transactional leadership model (Avolio&Bass, 2004 in Sadeghi and Zaidatol, 2012). According to Rukmani et al., (2010), the combination of the both will result in bigger outcome. Bass and Avolio during their study found complementary effect of transformational leadership over transactional one. They trust that transformational leadership is not the substitution of transactional leadership, but it complements the transactional leadership in gaining the goals of leader, peers, group and organization (Rukmani et al., 2010)

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership constitutes second part of theory of transformational leadership. The type of leadership is an exchange process basing on the fulfillment of contractual obligation. Transactional leader determines a goal, monitors and controls follower's output (Antonakis, 2003). A leader helps followers to fulfill their personal needs (Bass, 1999). A transactional leader pays attention to the benefit and cost, as well as economic exchange with the followers. In the context, material needs of followers are fulfilled as a reward of their good performance (Sarros and Santora, 2001).

Of the elaboration, it can be concluded that a transactional leader helps followers to identify what shoud be done to accomplish output targeted, like: better quality of output, better service and better production cost.

Transactional leadership consists of three dimentions, namely: contingent reward, management-by-exception-active, dan management-by-exception-passive. Contingent reward describes a level in which a leader determines reward as compensation of their effort to materialize the organizational goal. Management-by-exception-active depicts a level

in which a leader observes his subordinates carefully over the mistake done or the breaking of role (Antonakis et al., 2003). A leader proactively checking the follower's behavior, predicts problems and takes corrective action before the behavior causes the worse difficulties (Judge&Picolo, 2004). For management-by-exception-passive, a leader waits for certain breaking, mistake conducted, and then does corrective action (Judge&Picolo, 2004). They do not actively look for deviation of desired performance and just does corrective action when a problem occures (Antonakis, 2003). The type of leader avoids the agreement, the explanation of hope and standard achieved by followers, but he will intervene when special problem appears.

Laissez-faire Leadership

Leadership of laissez-faire represents a behavior type in which a leader shows his passive attitude to the followers. The leadership represents the absence of leadership because he avoids to make decision, releases responsibility and not use his authority (Antonakis, 2003). The theory of leadership is not effective theory of leadership. Main indicator of the behavior is the disability of a leader gets involved in an organization. A leader works on purpose to avoid the involvement and confrontation and also to minimize interaction with his followers (Sarros and Santora, 2001)

Laissez-faire behavior depicts a lazy leader and has no good commitment. The approach destroys organization goodwill and makes frustration of subordinates working hard (Sarros and Santora, 2001). Principally, a laissez-faire leader is not a leader. The type of leader tends to be passive of leader role and gives little direction and support. They are often absent when needed by followers. As consequency, followers are often involved in conflict concerning their role and responsibility (Kirbride, 2006)

Department Head Leadership

In higher education institution, a department head constitutes a first line manager directly influencing the quality of the department. Position of department head in a university constitutes a position needing administrative and leadership skill. The leadership bridges the gap between faculty and administration (Rashed and Daud, 2013).

They have different responsibility in their department, like: department member, motivator, spokeperson, good listener, syllabi design and also mentor (Thomas & Schuh, 2004, Bowman, 2002). Moreover, a department head is hoped to play more important role to make sure that change process will run in their department (McArthur, 2002).

Education sector has undergone significant progress recently. In lining with the progress, a higher education leader faces different change in their own institution. For this, a department head should be an effective leader. Transformational leadership is one of integrative leadership theory directing an organization to the effective direction.

Effectiveness of Leadership

Effectiveness of leadership is important to gain to guarantee the success of an organization. To what extend an organization is able to achieve its goal and conduct its tasks constitutes common measurement concerning leadership effectiveness (Erkutlu, 2008). An effective leader is able to fully tighten his followers in organizational strategy.

In lining with contingency theory, the leadership style fitting is as an important factor affecting a leader effectiveness. A leader must be smart to diagnose organization condition, then he applies certain leadership style fitting with condition of organization. If it can be done well, an organizational effectiveness will be gained.

To be effective, a leader should need good relationship with the followers. Good relationship will increase convenience and performance of the followers (Hogg et al, 2005). A transformational leader because of very closed relationship with followers should be more effective if compared with other type of leadership.

A leader with transformational behavior can direct his organization to the effective and productive direction. He motivates followers to be extra effort, increases job satisfaction, and increases performance beyond the expectation and plants creativity and innovation (Zaidatol et al, 2011). Moreover, the type of leadership has positive effect on leader effectiveness and performance (Judge&Picolo, 2004). Output gained by transformational leadership is bigger that transactional one.

Research findings in different contexts shows relations that are statitistically significant between leadership effectiveness and dimentions of transformational and transactional leadership (contingent reward and management–by–exception) (Lowe et al, 1996). Findings of Erkutlu (2008) expressed that all transformational leadership dimentions positively relate to leadership effectiveness, while laissez-faire leadership affects negatively. Webb (2003) indicated that combination of idealized influence attribute, individualized consideration and transactional contingent reward was significant predictors of leadership effectiveness of president in Evangelical Colleges and universities if compared with transformational and transactional leadership individually. Laissez-faire affected negatively. Masson (1998) in Sadeghi and Zaidatol (2012) found that transformational leadership and also combination of idealized influence attribute, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception- active dan laissez-faire had the same predictive effect on effectiveness of leadership in higher education in America.

ICOBAME

RESEARCH METHOD

Design and Sample

The research is a descriptive-correlational research. Population of the research is all permanent lectrurers in University of Stikubank having tenure minimum 3 years and not occupying as department head. Of the criteria, the number of population is 136 lecturers. One hundred questionnaires are spread out excidentally to the lecturers of University of Unisbank. Of 100 questionnaires, 68 questionnaires returned. Nine questionnaires can not be used because of not competleted in content. Thus the response rate is 69%.

Instrument

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) form 5X is used to measure leadership style and effectiveness of head of department. The number of questionnaire items is 45 consisting 36 items for variables of transformational, transactional and lassez-faire leadership style, while nine items are for leadership effectiveness. Variable of transformational leadership consists of 5 dimentions with 4 items of each dimension. Meanwhile variable of transactional leadership consists of 3 dimensions with 4 items of each dimention. Variable of laissez-faire consiss of 3 dimensions with 4, 3 and 2 items subsequently. Rate scale used is: never at all (0), once a while (1), sometimes (2), fairly often (3), often if not always (4).

Data Analysis

Based on minimum and maximum scores of variable of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership, score of each dimention is calculated, rated and then grouped. To know the constribution of leadership variables to effectiveness of leadership variable, simple and double regression analysis were done. Before being analysed, test of validity and reliability of the constructs was conducted.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on research findings, it is known that respondents perceived that department head used transformational leadership style within criteria "fairly often" and " sometimes" for transactional leadership style. Meanwhile for laissez-faire leadership style, respondents perceived deparment head "once a while". Based on MLQ norm, it can be concluded that for transformational leadership style is suitable with MLQ norm, namely: " fairly often" and "sometimes" for transactional leadership. While for laissez-faire leadership style exceeded the norm of MLQ. Norm of laissez-faire leadership style is "never at all". A leader having score ranging in norm will be relatively succeessful (Sudaghi dan Zaidatol, 2012)

The result showed that among dimensions of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire, idealized influence (behavior) has the highest score (2.8) and within the range "fairly often". The soce range is appropriate with MLQ norm. Thus department head in leading is fairly often to talk about values and beliefs that are important for organization, the importance of an organization having strong and clear goal (Bass, 1999). The finding also indicated that deparfment head considered moral and ethic consequency in each desicion and suppressed on the importance of an organization having shared vision (Antonakis, 2003).

The second highest score of transformational leadership style dimension is inspirational motivation (2.7) within score criteria "fairly often" and consistent with norm of MLQ. Of the findings, it indicates that department head fairly often talks about future of the department optimistically. Head of department also talks about what should be accomplished soon. Besides, department head articulates vision of department well and is sure that the goal of deparment will be gained (Bass, 1999)

The third highest score of transformational leadership style dimension and within score criteria "fairly often" and consistent with MLQ norm is individualized consideration. The dimension suppressed on attention of head department to the lecturers. The finding indicated that department head treated lectrurers well, paid attention to the different need and aspiration as well as helped lecturers to improve their capacity.

Of dimensions of transformational leadership style, the biggest three of score is individualized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation and individualized consideration. It shows that department heads of University of Stikubank give and explain vision of department well, motivate lecturers to improve the capability and treat lecturers well. Though department heads indicate effective leaders, they are not optimum yet. According to Bass dan Avolio (2003), optimum score for effectivity of leadership is more than 3.0. Thus it can be said that the department heads in University of Stikubank are in medium level as transformational leaders. The finding is in line with the research findings of Voon et al., 2011, Lo et al., 2009 and Sudaghi and Zaidatol, 2012 placing dimensions of idealized influence and inspirational motivation as dimentions getting high score.

368

ICOBAME

Meanwhile two dimensions of transformational leadership style, namely: idealized influence (attribute) and intellectual stimulation get lower score, 2.3 of each.Thus, the two dimensions are within ranging score "sometimes", not consistent with norm of MLQ, "fairly often". The result indicates that head of deparments do not know yet well about dimensions of transformational leadership. Remining the important role of the two dimensions in trying to improve leadership effectivenss of department head, so that the improvement of knowledge about the two is important to do.

Meanwhile for transactional leadership style, all dimensions (contingent reward, management -by exception-active dan management- by exception-passive get mean score from the highest: 2.4, 2.3 and 1.7 successively and within score criteria "sametimes", consistent with norm of MLQ. Contingent reward department heads give reward of lecturers performance. Besides, department head talks about who is responsible to attain target fixed by the department. Department head also expressed his satisfaction when lecturers performance meet the target fixed (Bass, 2003, Antonakis et al., 2003 and Nguni et al, 2006).

The second highest score of transactional leadership style dimension is management by exception-active, with point 2.3, within score criteria "sometimes" and consistent with norm of MLQ. Management- by exception-active head departments focus on standard, directly monitor behavior and performance of followers and actively prevent mistake happen (Antonakis et al, 2003, Nguni et al., 2006). Besides, department heads paid attention mistake happened to meet standard fixed.

The third dimension of transactional leadership style is management- by exception-passive. The mean score of the dimension is 1.7, within score criteria "sometimes", and consistent with norm of MLQ. The finding indicated that department heads do not intervene up to the problem is worse. It is in line with statement of Bass (2003) that management-by exception-passive department heads wait for mistake happen and problem appears before taking action and just intervene if standard fixed is not achieved.

While for laissez-faire leadership style, it is found mean score 1.5 and within scoring criteria "once a while", so that the finding is not consistent with the norm of MLQ. Norm of MLQ for the dimension is "never al all". To be an effective head of department, one should decrease behavior frequency of laissez-faire leadership style from "once a while" to "never at all". Rational explanation over laissez-faire leadership style exceeding the normof MLQ by department head can be caused by less comprehension of the style. If they get knowledge and comprehension about the style, they will use the style in lining with the norm of MLQ (Sadeghi and Zaidatol, 2012)

Based on data, the finding indicates department heads in University of Stikubank use combination of the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership with different frequency. The research finding supports previous research findings, like: Brown and Keeping (2005), Erkutlu, (2008), Rukmani et al. (2010), Sadeghi and Zaidatol (2012). From the finding, it can be concluded that transformational and transactional leadership have complementary effect and improve leadership effectiveness. Such indication is found in the current research.

Based on simple and double regression analysis conducted, it is known that all models fit and can be continued to the next step. Of simple regression analysis done, it is known that variable of transformational leadership positively and significantly affect to the leadership effectiveness. The indication can be seen from value of significancy that is under 0.5 (<0.5). For transactional leadership, based on simple regression analysis, it is known that transactional leadership style positively and significantly affect leadership effectiveness with significant value less than 0,5. Such finding is also indicated by laissez-faire leadership style, but the direction is negative, variable of laissez-faire positively and negatively affect the leadership effectiveness. Successively, determination coefficient value of three variables is 71,3%, 51,6% and 28,3%. It means that transformational leadership style contributes to the leadership effectiveness amounted 71.3%, while the rest, 28.7%, is contributed by other variables out of the model. Meanwhile transactional leadership style contributes to leadership effectiveness amounted 51.6%, while the rest, 48.4% is contributed by other variables out of the model. Variable of laissez-faire leadership style contributes to the leadership effectiveness amounted 2.8%, while the rest, 71.7%, contributed by other variables out of model.

To know contribution of three variables to the effectiveness of leadership, double regression analysis is done. The result shows that the three variables contribute to leadership effectiveness amounted 72.4%. The finding indicates that combination of the three variables is higher contribution than contributtion of each variable alone. The finding supports the previous research findings, like: Lowe et al. (1996), Web (2003), Erkutlu (2008), Jung et al. (2009), and Sadeghi and Zaidatol (2012).

CONCLUTION AND IMPLICATION

The research in the area is still rare to conduct. In other side, the role of department head to advance his department is important. The current research is a continued step to give clearer description concerning the effect of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership style to the leadership effectiveness of department head. The findings show that department heads in University of Stikubank use combination of the three variables, transformational, transactional and laizzes-faire leadership style. Therefore, they do not use the styles at optimum level. It is seen from mean score for transformational leadership style that is less than 3.0, while for more optimum, mean score should be more than 3.0. Besides, of five dimensions of transformational leadership, two of them have mean score

ICOBAME

less than norm of MLQ, namely: individualized influence (attribute) and intellectual stimulation with mean score 2.3 of each. For transactional leadership style, three dimensions are within score range that is consistent with norm of MLQ. Meanwhile for laissez-faire leadership style, the mean score is 1.5, within score criteria "once a while" that is not consistent with norm of MLQ. Norm of MLQ for the style is "never at all" and on mean score less than 0.65.

The finding also shows that transformational leadership style has biggest contribution to leadership effectiveness of department head. Nevertheless, effectiveness of department head is higher if they are combined.

The result of the research has many implications, namely: the importance of management arranges development program of leadership to increase leadership effectiveness, especially for dimensions of idealized influence (attributes) and intellectual stimulation. In order to be more effective, a department head is necessary to improve behavior of transformational leadership and decrease behavior of laissez-faire leadership style. The research finding also has contribution empirically to the implementation of transformational leadership theory in the field and also theoretically to the transformational leadership style by determining to what extent the role of transformational leadership style contributes to the leadership effectiveness in department head..

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). *Leader Distance: A Review and a proposed theory*. The Leadership Quaterly. 673-704.

Antonakis, J. Avolio, B.J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The Leadership Quarterly. 14 (3), 261-295.

Avolio, B.J., , & Bass, B. M. (2004) Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual and sampler set (3rd). Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B.J., et al. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 951-968.

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of work and organizational psychology, 8(1), 9-32.

Bass, B.M. et.al. (2003) The multifactor leadership questionnaire report. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, M.B. et al. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of applied psychology Vol. 88 Number 2. 207-218.

Bowman, R.F. (2002). The real work of department chair. The clearing house, 75(3), 158-162.

Brown, D.J & Keeping, L.M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. The leadership quarterly. 16((2005), 245-272.

Coats, L.T.(2000). Interpersonal behavior and the community college department chairperson. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24, 747-767.

Conger, J.A. Kanungo, R.N., & Menon., S.T. (2000). Charismatic Leadership and follower effects. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 747-767.

Erkutlu, H. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness the Turkish case. Journal of Management Deveopment, 27(7), 708-726.

Hogg, M.A, et.al., Effective leadership in salient group: Revisiting leader-member exchange theory from the perspective of the social identity theory of leadership. Personality and Social PsychologyBulletin, 13 (7), 991-1004.

Judge, T.A., & Piccolo., R.F. (2004) Transformational and Transactional leadership: A Meta-Analytic test of their relative validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755-768.

Jung et al. (2009). Moderating role of subordinates's attitudes on transformational leadership and effectivenss: A multi-cultural and multi-level perspective. The leadership Quarterly 20, 586-603.

Kirkbride, P. (2006). Developing transformational leaders: the Full Range leadership model in action. Industrial and Commercial Training, 38 (1), 23-32.

Lerra, (2014). Satff Perception towards Leadership in Transforming Wolaita Sodo University: Qualitative Inquiry. Open Access Library Journal.

Lo, M.C., Ramayah, T., & Min, H.W. (2009) Leadership styles and organizational commitment: a test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. African Journal of Marketing Management, 1(6), 133-139.

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.

Lussier, R., & Achua, C.F. (2007). Leadership Theory, application and skill development. Cincinnati, OH: South Western Publishing.

McArthur, R.C. (2002). Democratic leadership and faculty empowerment at the community college: A Theoritical Model for the Department Chair. Community College Review, 30(3), 1-10.

ICOBAME

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effect on teacher's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. School Effectiveness and School Improvement 17 (2), 145-177.

Pounder, J.S. (2001). "New Leadership" and university organizational effectiveness: exploring the relationship. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 22(6), 281-290.

Rashed, F. & Daud, K. (2013). Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment at University Department Level. International Seminar on Quality Affordable Education.

Riaz, A, & Haider, M.H. (2000). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Business and Economic Horizons, 1(1), 29-38.

Rukmani, K., Ramesh, M. & Jayakrishnan, J. (2000). Effects of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness. European Journal of Social Sciences, 15(3), 365-370.

Sadeghi and Zaidatotl. (2012). Tranformational Leadership and Its Predictive Effects on Leadership Effectiveness. International Journal Business and Social Science. Vol. 3 No. 7. April. 2012.

Sadeghi, A., Zaidatol Akmaliah. (2013). The role of transformational leadership style in enhancing lecturers' job satisfaction. International Journal of Business & Social Sciences. Vol. 4 Number 8.

Sarros, J.C. & Santora, J.C., (2001). The transformational-transactional leadership model in practice. Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 22(8), 383-393.

Thomas, J.R., & Schuh, J.H., (2004). Socializing New Chairs. New Directions For Higher Education, Summer (126), 11-25.

Tickle, E. L., Brownlee, J., & Nailon, D. (2005). Personal Epistemological beliefs and transformational leadership behaviors. Journal of Management Development, 24(8), 706-719.

Voon, M.L., M.C., Ngui, S.K.., & Peter, S. (2010). Leadership styles in context of institution of higher education in Malaysia.

Webb, K.S. (2003). President's leadership behaviors associated with follower's job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and presidential effectiveness at Evangelical colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Texas.

Zaidatol Akmaliah, L.P., Sadeghi, A., & Habibah E. (2011). Analysis of heads of departments leadership styles: Implication for improving Research University management practice. Procedia-Social and Behavior Sciences, 29 (2011), 1081-1090.

ICOBAME