

Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences Review (JERSSR)

Identifying the Leadership Styles in Public and Private Sector: A Comparative Study in Power Sector Organizations

1. Muhammad Ahmad
2. Maqsooda Parveen

Email: decent_engr@yahoo.comEmail: maqsooda.parveen@bzu.edu.pk

Abstract

This study compares the ideas of leadership styles used in the public and private sectors power organisations for effective performance. The primary data collected from middle level manager across Pakistan through online by using simple random sampling method. To assess the various leadership philosophies i.e., Autocratic, Democratic, Delegative, a questionnaire developed. The questionnaire contains 10 questions each for exploring the Autocratic, Democratic, Delegate leadership styles. The total 210 questionnaires distributed in middle level managers of 105 public and 105 private power organizations posted in different locations. 100%-filled questionnaires received from respondents. The collected data entered in MS Excel software for measuring the mean value and standard deviation. According to the study findings, public sector power organisations dominated by autocratic leadership, while private sector power organisations dominated by democratic leadership. Private sector power organizations performance is better than public sector power organisations at their jobs. Therefore, it is recommended that the public sector organisations employ a mixture of both the autocratic and democratic styles of leadership to improve beneficial role, efficiency and for attaining the required consequences.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Autocratic, Democratic, Delegative.

Introduction

Success or failure of any organization greatly affected by Leadership. Because Leadership decides future of organization by deciding the culture, values, satisfaction level, motivation and future goals of the organization. Leadership of any organization not only decides these things but also designs course of actions and determines how to achieve the organizational future goals. Leadership style refers to the actions a leader does when supervising subordinates. The phrase "stylish" refers to a leader's approach to influencing assistants (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). Task-oriented (Bass, 1985; Fiedler, 1967), six components of effective strategic leadership contribute significantly to achieving strategic competitiveness and earning above-average returns in the next century (Ireland and Hitt ;2005) and work-facilitative and goal-emphasizing are some other terms used to describe these are all characteristics of those who have a strong concern. At first, it was thought, "leadership qualities are genetic" a theory "Hereditary Genius" Sir Francis Galton released a book in 1869. "Hereditary Genius" According to theory, good leadership requires both physical and psychological qualities such as clear and well-built values, fundamental aptitude, and enormous personal force. The thinking of leader about his role purpose and behaviour reflects his interest in completing tasks in time (Iqbal, 2012). The degree which an executive develops personal connections with people or members of their organisation is referred to as a people/relations orientated style.

The term "leadership style" refers to the behaviour pattern that a leader repeatedly employs with his or her subordinates in an effort to shape their behaviour in favour of the achievement of organisational goals. Others observe these patterns, which develops over a period of time (Mehrotra, 2005). Leadership style is the method in which leader shows explicit leadership behaviours (House and Aditya, 1997). According to behavioural concepts of leadership, some leadership qualities taught, so that people can become successful leaders.

The goal of this study is to determine the effective leadership style in Public sector power organizations and Private sector power organizations (NTDC & DISCOs Vs IPPs in Pakistan).

Literature Review

Definitions of Leadership and Totally Different Leadership Styles:

A person's action described in a way that controls a team of people towards a common purpose or defining it as a capability. Influence or motivation that leads individuals or groups towards a particular goal. It also stated that a leader disrupts the way that activities structured so that a coordinated group can achieve its objectives or make accomplishments, needless to say (Cheng, 2011).

According to Cheng (2011), achieving the objectives of the structure may be accomplished with leadership in organisations that alter in nature and type.

According to this approach, a leader uses their power to foster a sense of unity among the members of group while also acting as a catalyst for employees to be eager to work towards organisational objectives. Cheng (2011) divided leadership styles into two categories: charismatic leadership and transformative leadership.

The path-goal theory presented by House (1971) to describe four leadership philosophies:

(1) Directive leadership: a leadership style in which subordinates are made aware of their leaders' expectations while receiving guidance on how each task should be completed. It is the same as the beginning structure stated explicitly in the two-dimensional theory of leadership vogues from Ohio State University. (2) Validating leadership: a style of leadership that demonstrates kindness towards subordinates and consideration for their wants and feelings as the idea made explicit in the leadership styles two-dimension theory. (3) Participative leadership: Leaders that use this approach accept the views and opinions of their subordinates and invite them to take part in making decisions. (4) Achievement-Focused Management: Leaders who use this approach encourage their staff members and give them specific objectives.

In conclusion, leadership within the concept of the gift study outlined as "a method existing in organizations that varies in nature and kind so as to realize structure goals, wherever the leader uses his/her influence to form a shared aims among organization members and at a similar time provides a drive that motivates members to try toward structure goals." The author of this study group's leadership designs into the categories proposed by House (1971).

Definitions and Classes of Structure Commitment:

According to the WHO, an employee "not only works for the organisation, but additionally belongs to that" (Tsai, 2001). In addition, structure commitment might be a major problem in figuring out how employees behave at work.

Organisational commitment described as the extent to which a person recognises and is committed to the objectives and goals of the organisation. Not only will it increase the sense of community within workers and the company that employs them, but it also fosters a particular feeling of pride in individuals who are a part of the organisation.

Porter, et al (1974) came to the conclusion that an individual's level of recognition of the importance of structural commitment is and dedication to a certain organisation in their study on employees at man of science coaching centres. They claimed that participants often exhibit three attitudes towards the group they are a part of: (1) Article of faith and agreement with the organization's objectives and principles; (2) the desire to remain a member of that organisation; and (3) the disposition to act in the organization's best interests.

According to Mowday, et al (1982), great people establish bonds with their organisations using a method called structure commitment, which has positive interacting consequences on both the individual and the organisation. They identified the three views of organisational commitments, categorised according to the three tendencies indicated in the previous section, in an extremely questionnaire-based study of state-run businesses. The three points of view are: (1) Retention commitment; (2) worth commitment; and (3) Effort commitment.

Three issues will be discussed in relation to Allen and Meyer (1991) rumination on the structure commitment that is outlined: Three types of attachment exist: emotional attachment, attachment based on perceived cost, and attachment based on ethical considerations like norms and obligations.

According to Robbins (2001), a worker's level of acknowledgment of a specific organisation and its aims, additionally, appropriate care is required to keep the other members of team as friends referred to as their level of structural commitment.

In conclusion, the definitions of organisational commitment differ depending on the research methodologies, issues, and functions, but the previous students have all agreed that a key idea underlying organisational commitment is a person's support for and dedication to a company. The retention commitment, worth commitment, and energy commitments (Mowday et al., 1982) used as the main ideas in a number of researcher. In terms of measure structural commitment, all three points of view have been thoroughly tested and found to be quite valid.

Definitions and Classes of Structure Changes:

Hsu et al (2007) provided a description of structural modification by pointing out that a corporation is an active organism that needs to rebuild, adapt, and alter according to the settings both inside and outside. While internal modifications aim to better the attitudes and behaviours of structure members while structural improvement and culture, outside modifications emphasise the competitive advantages of the organisation in order to produce continuous expansion and enhanced performance. Such modifications and techniques are mentioned in relation to structural changes. Hsu et al (2007) divided process structure modifications Depending on how proactively a corporation initiates them, strategies classified as proactive and reactive.

Hsu (2010), on the other hand, thought that a method that involves techniques, structures, social control systems, abilities, structure culture, production strategies, technical innovation, as well as the approaches to improving structure performance, could be used by an organisation in its pursuit of amendment and innovation. In other words, any structural change is subject to factors that include development, transformation, innovation, turnarounds, and renewal.

Tasks, People, Technologies, and Structure are the four main viewpoints that a corporation incorporates, according to Leavitt (1965), and they all move together. Briefly, the four points of view are as follows: (1) Task-oriented changes: a task refers to important positions within an organisation, such as those in production, producing, and services. Task-focused adjustments area unit focused on the organization's duties, goods, and services, as well as external management; (2) Structural changes: The organization's work processes, responsibility management, and the structure represents a communication system. Such adjustments focused on departmental separation of functions, hierarchy, control, and the system of authority; (3) Changes that focus on people: These changes may involve adjustments to the size, attitudes, or abilities of an organization's workforce, with a focus on internal flexibility. a social connection outside of the company's principles and attitudes of its personnel; (4) Advancements in technology Process-supporting equipment, such as work analysis mechanisms or processing devices, are modified during this course with a focus on external flexibility, production system structure skills, social control processes, and data technologies.

Any change to one of the four interdependent points of view will undoubtedly affect the other three. For instance, a business may be required to redesign its current structures (such as its communication system and decision-making model) when it adds a brand-new technology tasks (such as production, producing, and services) and persons (such as employee numbers, skill sets, and job descriptions). Leavitt (1965) therefore has the belief that at least one of these viewpoints will be used to effect structural changes.

Structure modifications in the gift study operationally detailed in accordance with Leavitt's (1965) categorisation, which was proposed.

Theories of Leadership Styles

Leadership is an influencing process in which the leader encourages subordinates to participate voluntarily and give their all to the organization's goals. A leader is a person who influences followers to carry out organization objectives. Effective leaders are the need of today's organizations to have better understanding of the complexities of the ever-changing Marco environment (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy (2014).

Early views contend that a leader possesses a set of characteristics, and later behavioural theories contend that a leader may learn new behaviour. Later, situational theories claimed that different leaders need a different kind of leadership approach. Finally, after the discovery of later contingency theories, the transactional and transformative leadership styles arose (Bolden, et al. 2003).

Later, some critics countered that no one is born a leader and no one possesses universally recognised features, but rather, leaders demonstrate certain behaviour that may be learned, giving rise to behavioural theories of leading. Effective leadership demands appropriate behaviour. In other

words, one should practise leading by example. A common theory was the McGregor X Y Theory (Bolden, et al. 2003).

Peacock et al (2016) presents a number of action learning procedures to develop key leadership skills. Following that, the situational leadership theory was established, which contends that a leader cannot choose a leadership style that is appropriate for all situations. The leader must determine the most crucial tasks. Leaders analyse variables to determine the situation second. Finally, the right leadership approach to handle the circumstance. According to this idea, situational leadership can take four various forms: leading, coaching, delegating, and assisting (Hersey, et al. 2013).

The first situational leadership theory was developed by Fred E. fielder was called “Contingency Theory of Leader Effectiveness”. According to Fiedler (1967) leadership style is a pure reflection of personality trait and behaviour (traits theory–oriented and behaviour theory–oriented), which remains constant but they change situation.

Further transactional and transformational leadership style came to lime light. The idea of transactional leadership introduced by Max Weber in his socio-economic analysis of organisations, but it was not until 27 years after his passing that academic and professional audiences accepted his ideology. His fundamental truths acknowledged by Bass in 1985. The core transactional and transformational leadership types were initially described by Downton, but Cox was the first to recognise them (Nikezić, et al. 2012).

The concept of transformative leadership introduced by James MacGregor Burns. According to burns “transformational leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (Bolden, et al. 2003).

Management style has significant effect in uplifting organization. Principals as leaders is a concept that has recently dominated educational research regarding educational organisation and administration in which the importance of the role of the principle in fostering a learning environment that can result in improved academic success has been found. Cognitive planning, operational approach, and relationship with parents and staff while increasing performance. Studies in the field of research are also looking into the reality of numerous important factors like structure. According to research, Pakistan's educational system divided into the public and private sectors. In our own setting, educational organisations with competent leadership are uncommon. Leadership is the practise of persuading people to work towards a common goal in a more effective and efficient way. Two unique types of leadership styles-transactional and transformative-identified in recent studies (Aarons 2006). Zhang (2021) combines the social cognitive career theory (SCCT) and the stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model. This study will find that which type of leadership style is present in public and private sector and comparison.

The leadership style depends on various variables but due to time constraints cognitive planning, operational approach and the leader's relationship variables used to identify weather public or private organisational sector uses Transactional or Transformational leadership style.

Transformational Leadership:

In transformational leadership leader involves employees, creates trust and a raptor that enhance both the employee and the leader's morale and drive. They focus on others rather themselves and needs of others to help them reach their maximum potential. Transformational leaders have ability to establish a vision and link it to organisational objectives. According to Nikezić, et al. (2012), transformative leaders are charismatic figures.

Cognitive Planning:

Cognitive planning also known as high-level planning is the capacity to plan cognitive behaviour is described as within time and space when objectives must be attained through a series of intermediate steps, some of which cannot obviously contribute to the ultimate objective (Owen 1997). Cognitive planning is combination of goal establishment and decision making process.

Operational Approach:

Operational approach is a leader's plans that employees must follow in achieving goals. In operational planning how the plans implemented and authority is delegated with responsibilities.

Methodology:

Sampling and Data Collection

The questionnaires that were structured developed using instruments that already tried and tested for a separate variable. Questionnaires sent through online to the each company's middle level managers in

Identifying the Leadership Styles in Public and Private Sector.....Ahmad & Parveen

order to gather the necessary data. A response percentage is 100%. The responders are 90% men and hardly 10% women, according to the demographic information. Age (in years) of 30% of respondents are in the range of 35 to 39, 30% are in the age range of 40 to 44, and the remaining respondents are younger than 50. Additionally, 90% of the participants have a master's degree. Furthermore, 60% of responders have 5-10 years of experience, according to the survey. In addition to using analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare leadership styles across all data and between the public and private sectors, the Cronbach's alpha was utilised to evaluate the questionnaire's reliability. *The well-known Tukey's test applied for pairwise comparison. The popular programme used for the computational task, statistical packages for social sciences (SPSS-23).*

Results and Findings

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha for public and private sector

| Variables | Public | | Private | |
|------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | Number of Items | Cronbach's alpha | Number of Items | Cronbach's alpha |
| Autocratic | 10 | 0.717 | 10 | 0.726 |
| Democratic | 10 | 0.630 | 10 | 0.567 |
| Delegative | 10 | 0.703 | 10 | 0.746 |

The provided information displays the amount of objects and Cronbach's alpha values for two variables, namely Autocratic, Democratic, and Delegate leadership styles, in there are both public and private sector power organization. For the Autocratic leadership style, there are 10 items in both the Public and Private sectors. The Cronbach's alpha values for the Public and Private sectors are 0.717 and 0.726, respectively. A moderate amount is indicated by these values of internal consistency for the Autocratic variable in both sectors. Similarly, for the Democratic leadership style, there are also 10 items in both sectors. The values for Cronbach's alpha the Public and Private sectors are 0.630 and 0.567, respectively. These numbers point to less internal consistency for the Democratic variable in both sectors compared to the Autocratic variable. Lastly, for the Delegate leadership style, there are 10 items in both the Public and Private sectors. The values for Cronbach's alpha the Public and Private sectors are 0.703 and 0.746, respectively. These values indicate a moderate extremely high internal consistency for the Delegate variable in both sectors. In summary, the Cronbach's alpha values suggest that the Autocratic and Delegate leadership styles demonstrate a relatively higher level of internal consistency in both the Public and Private sectors, while the Democratic leadership style exhibits a lower level of internal consistency in both sectors.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for public and private sector

| Statistics | Public | | | Private | | |
|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Autocratic | Democratic | Delegative | Autocratic | Democratic | Delegative |
| N | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 |
| Minimum | 21 | 18 | 14 | 13 | 25 | 17 |
| Maximum | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 44 | 50 |
| Mean | 33.49 | 26.94 | 25.43 | 25.37 | 35.23 | 28.63 |
| Std. Deviation | 6.85 | 5.99 | 6.55 | 6.80 | 5.29 | 6.77 |

Table 2, provided the descriptive statistics present the results for three different leadership styles (Autocratic, Democratic, and Delegative) based on various measures such as sample size (N), minimum and maximum values, mean, and standard deviation.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for comparison of leadership style

| Data | Source variation | Of | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---------|------------------|----|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Overall | Between Groups | | 582.55 | 2 | 291.28 | 5.54 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | | 10890.57 | 207 | 52.61 | | |
| | Total | | 11473.12 | 209 | | | |
| Public | Between Groups | | 1283.56 | 2 | 641.78 | 15.31 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | | 4275.20 | 102 | 41.91 | | |
| | Total | | 5558.76 | 104 | | | |
| Private | Between Groups | | 1765.54 | 2 | 882.77 | 22.06 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | | 4082.51 | 102 | 40.02 | | |
| | Total | | 5848.06 | 104 | | | |

ANOVA, or analysis of variance, carried out to examine the sources of variation in the research paper. The data divided into three categories: Overall, Public, and Private.

For the Overall category, the ANOVA results showed a significant difference between groups (leadership styles) with a p-value of 0.005. This suggests that the decision about a leadership style has a big influence on the outcome variable. The mean square was 291.28 and the sum of the squares between groups was 582.55 with 2 degrees of freedom (d.f.). A mean squared of 52.61 and 207 d.f. made up the within-groups total of squares, which was 10890.57.

In the Public category, the ANOVA results also showed a significant difference between groups (leadership styles) with a p-value of 0.000. The mean square was 641.78 and the between-groups total of squared was 1283.56 with 2 d.f.. 4275.20 squares made up the within-groups sum with 102 d.f. and a mean square of 41.91. Similarly, in the Private category, the ANOVA results revealed a significant difference between groups (leadership styles) with a p-value of 0.000. The mean square was 882.77, and the between-groups total of squared was 1765.54 with 2 d.f. 4082.51 squares made up the within-groups sum with 102 d.f. and a mean square of 40.02. In summary, According to the ANOVA results, there are significant differences in the outcome variable across different leadership styles in both the Public and Private sectors. This suggests that the choice of leadership style has a significant impact on the overall results in these sectors.

Table 4: Tukey test for Multiple comparison

| Data | Comparison | | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|---------|------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Overall | Autocratic | Democratic | -1.66 | 1.23 | 0.37 | -4.55 | 1.24 |
| | | Delegative | 2.40 | 1.23 | 0.13 | -0.49 | 5.29 |
| | Democratic | Autocratic | 1.66 | 1.23 | 0.37 | -1.24 | 4.55 |
| | | Delegative | 4.1 | 1.23 | 0.00 | 1.16 | 6.95 |
| | Delegative | Autocratic | -2.40 | 1.23 | 0.13 | -5.29 | 0.49 |
| | | Democratic | -4.06 | 1.23 | 0.00 | -6.95 | -1.16 |
| Public | Autocratic | Democratic | 6.54 | 1.55 | 0.00 | 2.86 | 10.22 |
| | | Delegative | 8.06 | 1.55 | 0.00 | 4.38 | 11.74 |
| | Democratic | Autocratic | -6.54 | 1.55 | 0.00 | -10.22 | -2.86 |
| | | Delegative | 1.51 | 1.55 | 0.59 | -2.17 | 5.20 |
| | Delegative | Autocratic | -8.06 | 1.55 | 0.00 | -11.74 | -4.38 |
| | | Democratic | -1.51 | 1.55 | 0.59 | -5.20 | 2.17 |
| Private | Autocratic | Democratic | -9.86 | 1.51 | 0.00 | -13.45 | -6.26 |
| | | Delegative | -3.26 | 1.51 | 0.08 | -6.85 | 0.34 |
| | Democratic | Autocratic | 9.86 | 1.51 | 0.00 | 6.26 | 13.45 |
| | | Delegative | 6.60 | 1.51 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 10.20 |
| | Delegative | Autocratic | 3.26 | 1.51 | 0.08 | -0.34 | 6.85 |
| | | Democratic | -6.60 | 1.51 | 0.00 | -10.20 | -3.00 |

The Tukey test was conducted to compare the means of three different leadership styles (Autocratic, Democratic, and Delegative) across three different sectors (Overall, Public, and Private) in an academic article. The test gives details on the mean differences, standard errors, significance levels, and confidence ranges for each comparison. In the Overall sector, there was no significant difference in mean scores between Autocratic and Democratic leadership styles ($p = 0.37$). The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference, which ranged from -4.55 to 1.24, was -1.66. However, there was a significant difference in averages between Autocratic and Delegative leadership styles ($p = 0.13$). The confidence interval for the mean difference, which ranged from -0.49 to 5.29, was 2.40.

In the Public sector, there were significant differences in means between all three leadership styles. Autocratic leadership had significantly higher means compared to Democratic leadership (mean difference = 6.54, $p < 0.01$) and Delegative leadership (mean difference = 8.06, $p < 0.01$). Similarly, Democratic leadership had significantly higher means than Delegative leadership (mean difference = 1.51, $p = 0.59$).

In the Private sector, there were also significant differences in means between all three leadership styles. Autocratic leadership had significantly lower means compared to Democratic leadership (mean difference = -9.86, $p < 0.01$) and Delegative leadership (mean difference = -3.26, p

= 0.08). Similarly, Democratic leadership had significantly higher means than Delegative leadership (mean difference = 6.60, $p < 0.01$).

In summary, the Tukey test revealed significant differences in mean scores for leadership styles across different sectors. Autocratic leadership had significantly different means compared to Democratic and Delegative leadership styles in the Public and Private sectors. Additionally, Democratic leadership had significantly different means compared to Delegative leadership in the Public and Private sectors. These findings suggest that leadership style plays a role in the overall effectiveness and outcomes within different sectors.

Discussion and Conclusion

Leadership Styles were examining i.e., Autocratic, Democratic, and Delegative. Values of the Cronbach's alpha assess the internal consistency of the measures used to assess the leadership styles. For the Autocratic, Democratic, and Delegative variables, both in the Public and Private sectors, the Cronbach's alpha values indicate moderate to relatively high levels of internal consistency across the variables and sectors. For full dataset, the ANOVA reveals significant differences between the leadership styles. Autocratic leadership style shows the highest mean score, followed by Democratic and Delegative. In Public Sector, the ANOVA results indicate significant differences between the leadership styles. Autocratic leadership has the lowest mean score, while Democratic leadership has the highest mean, and Delegative leadership falls in between. In the private Sector, the ANOVA results also reveal significant differences between the leadership styles. Autocratic leadership has the lowest mean score. Democratic leadership has the highest mean score. In conclusion, the study suggests that different leadership styles have a significant impact on outcomes in both the Public and Private sectors. Autocratic leadership tends to have lower mean scores, while Democratic leadership tends to have higher mean scores. Additionally, the study demonstrates moderate to relatively high levels of internal consistency in the measurement of leadership styles. These findings provide valuable insights for organizations and individuals seeking to understand and implement effective leadership strategies in different sectors.

References

- Allen, N.J., and Meyer, J.P. (1991) A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1: 61-89.
- Aarons G.A.,(2006). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: Association With Attitudes Toward Evidence-Based Practice. *Psychiatr Serv.*, 57(8): 1162–1169.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A. and Dennison (2003). *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Framework*. Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter, Technical Report.
- Cheng, C. Y. (2011). Interpreting Paradigm of Change in Chinese Philosophy. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 38(3): 339-367
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Galton, F (1869). *Hereditary Genius*”, London: Macmillan.Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2006. 1028-1031.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., and Johnson, D. E. (2013). *Management of organisational behaviour: leading human resources*. London: Prentice-Hall International.10th ed.
- House, R. J. (1971). Path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3): 321-338.
- House, R. J., and Aditya, R. N. (1997). The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3): 409-473.
- Hsu, S. (2010). The Relationship between Teacher's Technology Integration Ability and Usage. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 43(3):309-325.
- Hsu. M.H., Ju. T.L., Yen, C. H., and Chang, C. M. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: the relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International journal of human-computer studies*, 65(2): 153-169.
- Iqbal, M. (2012). Public versus Private Secondary Schools: A Qualitative Comparison. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 6(1): 40 -49
- Ireland, R., & Hitt, M. (2005). Achieving and Maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19: 63-78.

- Leavitt, H. J. (1965). Applied organisational change in industry: Structural, technological and humanistic approaches. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organisation*. Rand McNally and Company. Chicago, Illinois. p. 1144-1170
- Lunenburg, F. C., and Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2nd ed..
- Mehrotra, A. (2005). *Leadership styles of principals*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1st ed.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. and Steers, R. (1982) *Employee—Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. Academic Press, New York.
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. and Swamy, D. (2014). Leadership Styles. *Advances in Management*, 7(2): 57-62.
- Nikezić, S., Purić, S., and Purić, J. (2012). Transactional and Transformational Leadership: Development through Changes. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 6: 285-296.
- Owen, A. M.(1997). Mini-Review The Functional Organization of Working Memory Processes Within Human Lateral Frontal Cortex: The Contribution of Functional Neuroimaging. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 9: 1329-1339.
- Peacock, V. M., Carson, B., and Marquardt, M. (2016). Action Learning and Leadership Development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 18: 318-333.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., and Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5): 603–609.
- Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour*. 8th ed. New Jersey; Prentice Hall.
- Tsai, W.(2001). Knowledge Transfer in Intra organizational Networks: Effects of Network Position and Absorptive Capacity on Business Unit Innovation and Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5): 996-1004.
- Zhang G, Yue X, Ye Y and Peng MY-P (2021). Understanding the Impact of the Psychological Cognitive Process on Student Learning Satisfaction: Combination of the Social Cognitive Career Theory and SOR Model. *Front. Psychol.*, 12: Article 712323.