Universities' Leadership Style in the Light of Governance Principles

Dr. YACOUB ADEL NASEREDDIN

Head of Trustee Council at the Middle East University

Middle East University, Amman / Jordan

E-mail: yacoub@meuco.jo

Tel: + 96264790222

Fax: +96264129613

Dr. ABDEL-AZIZ AHMAD SHARABATI

Facuty of Business Management,

Middle East University, Amman / Jordan

E-mail: APharmaArts@Gmail.Com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore which leadership style/styles are suitable for universities in the light of governance principles. This study is a qualitative study based on literature review. About 2000 previous studies were collected, after screening them; only 200 were suitable to be used to fulfill the purpose of this study. The study concluded that there is no leadership style that can suite all organizations and industries, even can fit for one organization, because leadership style depend on leader, context, followers and culture. In universities at least three leadership styles can be used based on the leaders and followers whatsoever the context and culture: shared leadership style among the governance board members, transformational leadership style for academicians and mid-level management, and finally transactional leadership style for other workers who perform routine work. The study recommends using different styles based on leaders, context, culture and followers' education, experience, position and readiness to be as team player.

Key Words: Universities' Leadership, Shared Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Governance Principles.

Introduction

Governance board is the body that is responsible for controlling and directing the organization towards its goals. Its main task is to solve problems and take decisions related to organization survival and development. It composes from persons who are representative of stakeholders. Governance refers to all actions, interactions, and processes that influence actors involved in organizational practices and decision-making. Governance is how rules, norms, policies and regulations are produced, regulated and sustained, and it includes the role, responsibility and accountability. It consists of processes, policies, laws and regulations that direct and control the relationships and cooperation among stakeholders. Governance includes how different stakeholders interact with each other to make decisions collectively on how to direct and control the organization. Governance covers stakeholders' rights and equitable treatment, other stakeholders' interest, board's roles, responsibility and accountability, integrity and ethical behavior, disclosure and transparency and so many other things. In another way, the governance means how to rationalize the use of power, influence and control over others and in decision-making, or how rational

actors create, maintain and sustain the organization in formal way. Good governance needs suitable leadership styles that have to be used by the governance board which affect all processes and activities, and directly and indirectly influence the organization in long term.

The debate about the relationship between governance and leadership is escalating over time. Some scholars and practitioners consider leadership as the ability of an organization or individual to guide or lead others such as individuals, groups and organizations. Other scholars and practitioners consider leadership as enhancing or forcing others to behave as leaders want. Nevertheless how we define leadership, it includes power, influence and control over others. Leadership styles depend on how the leader use the power to influence, direct, motivate and control the followers; it ranges from fully democratic to fully autocratic styles. Therefore, there are many leadership models and styles such as Authoritarian (autocratic), paternalistic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational, transactional, servant, situational, shared (participative), distributed, collective, collaborative, adaptive, innovative, entrepreneurial, authentic, and narcissistic styles. The aim of any leadership model or style is to solve the problems that face the organization and to take the suitable decisions to maintain and sustain the organization.

Until now, there is no consensus among scholars, researchers and practitioners about the best leadership style/styles that should be used and/or encouraged by governance to direct and control the organization. In addition, there is no agreement upon the best leadership style/styles that suite specific organization/industry. Higher education is highly professional sector, very sensitive and intellectual capital-intensive industry. Universities are the backbone of higher education and need good governance principles with suitable leadership style/styles. Therefore, this study aims to investigate what leadership style/styles are suitable to higher education industry? What are the governance principles and practices are most useful for higher education industry? Which leadership style/styles are suitable for higher education industry in the light of governance principles?

This study will start by discussing the leadership and leadership styles, and governance definition and principles. Followed by, reviewing the previous literature related to both topics and finally discussing the relationship between leadership styles and governance.

Leadership and Leadership Styles

Leadership and Leadership Style Definitions

In general, leadership is about the ability of an individual or organization to lead or guide other individuals, teams, or entire organizations. Leadership style is a leader's style of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people (Lewin, et. al. 1939). Leadership is relationship-oriented, in which the leader is more focusing on the relationships amongst the group (Griffin and Ebert 2010). Each leader develops his/her unique style of leadership to fit the talents, maturity, and abilities of his/her followers (Landis 2011). Leadership development practices are similar across the private, public and not-for-profit sectors (Pinnington 2011). Leadership is a task-oriented in which the leader is focusing on the tasks that need to be performed in order to meet a certain goal (Manktelow 2012). It is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Attri, et. al. 2014; Ayinde, et. al. 2015), which carried out by both formal and informal leaders within an organization (Stincelli and Baghurst 2014). Leadership is a process of social influence in which one or more persons attempt to aid and support others to accomplish a task or tasks (Roger 2015). All leadership theories can be classified into two major groups, not exclusive but complementary: theories oriented to the leader as individual, and theories oriented to the relations between leader and followers (Silva 2015). In the last century, there have been rapid developments regarding organization, management and leadership theories (Gulcan 2015). Finally, leader can be defined as a person who has a power wither formally or informally, while leadership is about how the leader is using this power to reach specific objectives or general goals.

Why to Study Leadership and Leadership Styles in Universities

In today's dynamic organizations, leadership plays a central role in achieving organizational goals (Saeed and Ahmad 2012). The distribution of wealth and power should be encouraged for effective conflict management of universities (Faniran and Akintayo 2012). Nowadays the universities are experiencing massification and internationalization (Kavasakalis 2013), and there is much controversies and disputations about the nature, meaning and characteristics of the leadership (Chukwu and Eluka 2013). Numerous investigators have studied leadership styles in different cultures, occupations, organizational settings, but it was rarely examined among teaching faculty members of higher education institutes and universities (Ahmed and Abdo 2013). Understanding the evolved psychological mechanisms underlying leadership is critical for the development and integration of leadership theory, research, and practice (Vugt and Ronay 2013). Effective academic leadership is a complicated issue to investigate because of its intangibility and potential consequences (Hamidifar, et. al. 2013). Leadership in education requires certain key attributes, because leadership strategically and effectively influence teaching, learning and class activity (Attri, et. al. 2014). Today's, ever-changing educational environment has created a need for new leadership styles that encourage positive change and improvement (Sart 2014), taking into consideration that the specific roles and qualities of informal leaders are not well understood yet (Stincelli and Baghurst 2014). Therefore, the identification of the styles of management behavior has been among the topics of interest in the past few decades (Mokhtarpour, et. al. 2014). Also, the rapidly changing and complex environment in which leaders operate today requires a different way of thinking (Gummerson 2015), leadership has evolved over the years in some organizations to a more participative style (Malik, et. al. 2015).

In fact, there is no suitable leadership style/styles which suite all organizations/industries, even for the same industry there is no suitable leadership style/styles that suite all organizations worldwide. Leadership style depends not only on leader, follower and industry, but also on culture where the leader and the follower interact. The process of leadership depends on at least four elements: the leader, the context, the follower, and the culture, which plays a crucial role. Lewin, et. al. (1939) said, "different situations call for different leadership styles". Actually, there are many leadership models and styles which might be suitable for some cases and may not be suitable for other cases, such as: Authoritarian (autocratic), paternalistic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational, transactional, servant, situational, shared (participative), distributed, collective, collaborative, adaptive, innovative, entrepreneurial, authentic, and narcissistic styles.

Autocratic or Authoritarian (Authoritarianism) Leadership Style

Under the autocratic leadership style, all decision-making powers are centralized in the leader, as with dictators. The autocratic management has been successful as it provides strong motivation to the manager; it permits quick decision-making (Lewin, et. al. 1939). Unlike personalistic dictatorships, new forms of authoritarianism have institutionalized representation of a variety of actors; unlike totalitarian states, the regime relies on passive mass acceptance rather than popular support (Landman 2003). Linz distinguished new forms of authoritarianism from personalistic dictatorships and totalitarian states. An authoritarian style of leadership may create a climate of fear, where there is little or no room for dialogue (Salin and hoel 2011). Authoritarianism is a form of government characterized by strong central power and limited political freedoms (Shorten 2012). Authoritarian leaders are commonly referred to as autocratic leaders (Cherry 2016).

Paternalistic Leadership Style

Paternalistic leader works is by acting as a father figure by taking care of their subordinates as a parent would. In this style of leadership, the leader provide complete concern for his followers or workers. In return, he receives the complete trust and loyalty of his people (Erben and Guneser 2008). Paternalistic leadership has three dimensions: authoritarianism, benevolence and morality (Niu, et. al. 2009). Paternalistic leaders, who promote followers' professional and personal welfare but still maintain their

authority (Xu 2011). Paternalistic leadership is characterized by a totalitarian and authoritarian style of management (Afsar and Rehman 2015). Many scholars called this style Asian style.

Democratic Leadership Style

Democratic leadership can be defined as the performance of three functions: distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group's decision-making process (Gastil 1994). Democratic leadership style consists of the leader sharing the decision-making abilities with group members by promoting the interests of the group members and by practicing social equality (Foster 2002). Democratic leadership style is one of the most effective and creates higher productivity, better contributions from group members and increased group morale (Martindal 2011). Democratic leadership style is a very open and collegial style of running a team. Democratic leadership is also known as, participative leadership, where members of the group take more participative role in the decision-making process (Ray and Ray 2012).

Laissez-faire or Free-rein Leadership Style

In laissez-faire or free rein leadership, decision-making is given to the followers. The followers are given the right and power to solve problems and make decisions. The laissez-faire leader as who gives the majority of control in the decision-making process to the followers (Jones and Rudd 2007). This style can be performed only when followers are highly skilled, experienced, and educated; the leader will not provide regular feedback to their followers (Malos 2012). The laissez-faire leadership style is where all the rights and power to make decisions is fully given to the worker (Hackman and Johnson 2013). Laissez-faire leadership style provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible (Sharma and Singh 2013).

Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership is a leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems (Damirch, et. al. 2011). In transformational leadership a leader focuses on transforming others to help each other, to look out for each other, and to pay attention towards organization as a whole (Paracha, et. al. 2012). Transformational leaders exhibit no controlling powers, but inspire empowerment and motivation of the subordinates (Felix, et. al. 2012). Transformational leaders are described to hold positive expectations for followers; it increases levels of motivation and morality (Johnson 2015). Transformational leadership is a style of leadership where the leader works with employees to identify the needed change, creating a vision to guide the change, and executing the change (Business Dictionary 2016). Transformational leader main objective is to work to change or transform his or her followers' needs and redirect their thinking. It needs charismatic leadership with individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation (Schultz and Schultz 2016).

Transactional Leadership Style

Transactional leadership is a style of leadership in which the leader promotes compliance of his/her followers through both rewards and punishments (Bass 2008). Transactional leaders focus on increasing the efficiency of established routines and procedures. They are more concerned with following existing rules than with making changes to the organization (Malos 2012). Transactional leadership means the leaders lead primarily by using social behavior exchanges for maximum benefit at low cost (Chaudhry and Javed 2012). Transactional leadership style known as managerial leadership, it focuses on the role of supervision, organization, and group performance (Akhigbe, et. al. 2014). Transactional leadership is based on the principle of exchange of rewards between leaders and subordinates (Mottoh 2015).

Servant Leadership Style

The servant-leader shares power, responsibility and authority with others, and puts the needs of others first and helps them to develop and perform better. Robert Greenleaf who first used the concept "servant leadership" in 1970 said, "The servant-leader is servant first… It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first" (Greenleaf Center 2016). Servant leadership is a choice made by the individual to serve rather than occupy a leadership position (Iyer 2013). Servant leadership is a person's ability to make social relationships by persuasion, develop and serve others as the first priority in process of achieving organization's goal (Setiawan, et. al. 2014). Servant leader has a tendency to prioritize the needs, interests and aspirations of the people they lead at the top (Rau, et. al. 2015). There are five dimensions in servant leadership such is love, empowerment, trust, humility and vision (Tomigolung 2015). Servant leadership emphasizes the growth of the follower as a way to achieve organizational objectives (Amah 2015). Servant leadership has been conceptualized to balance leaders and employees (Gupta 2015).

Situational Leadership Style

Fundamental underpinning of the situational leadership theory is that there is no single best style of leadership. Effective leadership is task-relevant, effective leadership depends on the person or group and on the task, job or function (Hersey and Blanchard 1977). The theory behind situational leadership is based on using the style needed to others to get up to speed by working closely with them (Cirstea and Constantinescu 2012). Situational leadership is based on that each person has a maturity degree to develop a specific task and this maturity increases with the experience (Perales, et. al. 2012). Situational leadership theory assumes that leaders behave according to situation (Parveen and Tariq 2014).

Shared Leadership (Participative) Style

The shared leadership style consists of the leader sharing the decision-making with other members according to their interests and by practices social equality. Shared leadership theory recognizes leader influence throughout the organization, not just from the top down (Cawthorne 2010); it is about collaborative, participatory leadership that takes employees' views and interests on board in decision-making and leadership process (Nwagbara 2011). Shared leadership includes shared vision, goals, power, resources, and responsibilities (Morton and Brown 2011), it is "a process where different individuals´ complementary competences meet to deliver better decisions" (Hagen 2011). It is participatory management, which empowers members to participate in organizational decision-making (Guyot 2011). It is a leadership that is broadly distributed, such that people within a team and organization lead each other (Bolden 2011); it is an emergent team property that results from the distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members (Erkutlu 2012); it implies that no individual performs all of the leadership functions; collectively perform the activities (Clarke 2012). "Shared leadership occurs when two or more members engage in the leadership of the team in an effort to influence and direct fellow members to maximize team effectiveness" (Bergman, et. al. 2012), it arises from within a team (Afridi 2013). Shared leadership is a collective team leadership and it is characterized by collaborative decision-making and shared responsibility for outcomes (Hoch and Dulebohn 2013).

Distributed Leadership Style

Distributed leadership is a conceptual and analytical approach to understanding how the work of leadership takes place among the people and in context of a complex organization (Benson and Blackman 2011). It focuses on the leadership of all team members (Salahuddin 2011); it requires shared mission, vision and goals (Vlachad and Ferla 2013). Distributed leadership promotes a less formalized model of leadership dissociating leaders from the organizational hierarchy and making them team members (Shah 2014); it implies that leadership is not held by one leader only, but leadership roles are distributed among the rest of the school management team (Botha 2014). Implementation of change is a process that requires sharing and

distributing leadership style (Rabindarang, et. al. 2014); it focuses on the social dynamics that emerge from combined effort of people talking, sharing, and responding to change proactively as a team (Majoni 2016).

Collective Leadership Style

Collective leaders can provide the field with a different viewpoint of how individuals and organizations collaborates to solve complex problems (Wooten, et. al. 2006). Collective leadership emerged through joint actions across fields (Ritchie, et. al. 2007); it supports a culture in which trusting relationships are valued and members of the organization experience a sense of self-empowerment. It focuses on "we" rather than "me" (Johnson, et. al. 2012). It is a collective engagement leadership by multiple individuals who shares multiple leadership roles through both formal and informal relationships (Cullen and Yammarino 2014).

Collaborative Leadership Style

Collaborative leadership is a management practice, which focuses on the leadership skills across functional and organizational boundaries. It is used for critical business relationships "that cannot be controlled by formal systems but require dense web of interpersonal connections" (Kanter 2003). Collaboration within a group or across organizational levels is central to the idea of distributed or shared leadership (James, et. al. 2007). Collaborative leadership is often argued as an essential aspect of dealing with change (Edwards and Smit 2008). The collaborative leadership depends on the ability of leaders to engage and collaborate with the business, government and social sectors (Lovegrove and Thomas 2013). Collaborative leadership is defined as employees interfere in different levels in the organization to identify problems, analyze situation, and achieve solutions (Arbabi and Mehdinezhad 2016).

Adaptive Leadership Style

Adaptive leadership is the practice of mobilizing people to tackle tough challenges. Successful adaptations are thus both conservative and progressive (Heifetz, et. al. 2009). Flexible and adaptive leadership involves changing behavior in appropriate ways as the situation changes (Yukl and Mahsud 2010). Adaptive leadership is seen as a complex dynamic involving all, rather than only a role or attribute within a hierarchy (Ford 2010). Adaptive leadership includes being a change agent, which means helping other members of the organization recognize that an environment is changing and building consensus as change is occurring (Cojocar 2011). Adaptive leadership must have the ability to absorb shocks, failure, and shortage (Ait-Yassine 2012). Adaptive leadership is a concept designed to mobilize people and organizations to adapt to change, and to thrive as a result (Kemp and Paulauskas 2013). In adaptive leadership, the expert providers must support frontline in their efforts to develop high quality and person-centered solutions (Corazzini and Anderson 2014).

Innovative Leadership Style

Innovative leadership is a philosophy and technique that combines different leadership styles to influence employees to produce creative ideas, products, and services (Gliddon 2006). Innovative leadership is a process of fostering innovation through developing innovation friendly culture and setting strategic direction that guide and build trust among the employees to innovate (Sultana and Rahman 2012). Innovative leadership considers problems as a challenge. Innovative leaders seek problems rather than waiting for problems to occur (Othman and Abd Rahman 2013).

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style

The role of entrepreneurial leadership is to develop indigenous business enterprises and entrepreneurship (Mapunda 2007). Entrepreneurial leadership is based on the attitude that the leader is self-employed (Bremer 2009). Entrepreneurial leadership is effectively using the skills associated with successful

individual entrepreneurs and applying those within the environment of the larger organization (Roebuck 2011). It is a process of influencing the organization to promote all members to identify and pursue entrepreneurial opportunities (Acs and Audretsch 2012). Entrepreneurial leaders themselves engage in opportunity-focused activities, and they influence their followers, motivating and encouraging them to pursue entrepreneurial opportunity-focused behaviors (Mokhber, et. al. 2015).

Authentic Leadership Style

Authentic leadership is an approach that emphasizes leader's legitimacy through honest relationships with followers which value their input and are built on an ethical foundation (Gardner, et. al. 2011); it is based on trust, credibility, integrity and adherence to ethical and moral principles (Morales and Santaolalla 2013). Authentic leadership is a kind of leadership that inspires and promotes positive psychological capacities; underlining the moral and ethical component of behavior (Lopez, et. al. 2015); it is positively related to work attitudes and behaviors (Ozkan and Ceylan 2016).

Narcissistic Leadership Style

Narcissism is an attribute of many powerful leaders (Rosenthal and Pittinsky 2006). It is a leadership style in which the leader is only interested in himself/herself. Their priority is themselves at the expense of their people/group members. Narcissism is most often described as unhealthy and destructive (Neider and Schriesheim 2010).

Governance

Until now, there is neither consensus on the definition of governance, nor an agreement upon its component. Merendino (2013) stated until now, a unique and agreed definition of governance is not achieved yet, because every organization has its own features so it is difficult to define it in general terms.

Governance Definitions

Corporate governance broadly refers to the mechanisms, processes and relations by which corporations are controlled and directed (Shailer 2004). Governance refers to the process of policymaking and macro-level decision making within higher education (Kezar 2004). Governance is the way an institution is managed and capable to link the day-to-day action to the implementation of strategic objectives (Baschung, et. al. 2006). A governance structure is the way an organization divides and integrates responsibility and authority (Melo, et. al. 2008). Corporate governance includes the processes through which corporations' objectives are set and pursued in the context of the social, regulatory and market environment (Tricker 2009). Governance relates to "the processes of interaction and decision-making among the actors involved in a collective problem that lead to the creation, reinforcement, or reproduction of social norms and institutions" (Hufty 2011). Governance structures and principles identify the distribution of rights and responsibilities among different participants in the corporation and include the rules and procedures for making decisions in corporate affairs (Lin 2011). Governance is "all processes of governing, whether undertaken by a government, market or network, whether over a family, tribe, formal or informal organization or territory and whether through laws, norms, power or language" (Bevir 2013). Governance is the rules of the political system to solve conflicts between actors and adopt decision (Ramanthan and Dutta 2014). In higher education, the term governance is used to describe the different structures, processes and activities involved in the planning and directing the institutions and people working in education (El Said 2014). University governance refers to the structure and process of the decision making of the key issue concerned by the related party (Li 2014). Corporate governance concept refers to the set of rules, principles of action, behaviors that apply to a group and the level of transparency towards stakeholders (Zhang and Thiam 2014). The word governance has been derived from Latin origin, which means steering. It means the process through which and how an organization controls its activities (Sundaram 2015). Finally, OECD

(2004) reports covered the following main points of governance: Rights and equitable treatment of shareholders; Interests of other stakeholders; role and responsibilities of the board; integrity and ethical behavior; and disclosure and transparency.

Why to Study Governance

The corporatization of the university sector brought a unique set of problems to which senior university management had not previously been exposed. The solution includes developing governance systems to guide strategic decision-making based on well-developed ethical principles and through appropriate delegation and empowerment (Watts, et. al. 2005). In the past three decades, higher education reforms took place almost everywhere in the world (Cai 2009). Today, higher education institutions have to respond to an increasing number of societal and economic demands (Sanchez and Elena 2010). In United Kingdom, the governance issues have mostly been concentrated around questions of internal academic and student representation in decision taking (Shattock 2010). The OECD and the World Bank encouraged the East-Central European states to adopt and implement codes of conduct and corporate governance principles to minimize risk, boost performance, improve business access on stock markets, strengthening the market position of firms, professional management, demonstrating transparency and social responsibility (Daniela, et. al. 2010). During the last decades, there were dramatic changes in decision-making processes worldwide, which resulted in a shift from government to governance mode (Grasic, et. al. 2011). The past three decades have witnessed radical changes to universities, largely due to the influence of neoliberal ideology (Blackmore, et. al. 2011). Higher education systems in Europe are currently undergoing profound transformations (Krucken 2011). Both the university's internal structures of governance and the overall set up of the higher education system have been passed through several processes of change to respond to the new political and economic realities (Goransson and Brundenius 2011). University governance is the key to the orderly development of universities (Zeng 2012). In 21th century, expectations from society have enlarged the university goals, and in order to reach these goals, university needs new governance processes both at institutional and state level (Stefenhagena 2012). University governance has become an important international issue in higher education. The structure and organizational arrangements of many Canadian university senates have been changed over the last ten years (Pennock, et. al. 2012). Governance is not only concerns about interpersonal relationships, but also responsible on how to use scarce resources (van Winden 2012).

Due the current changes and governance complex context, the issues of governance of the higher education sector arouse across most of the European countries (Ciucanu 2013). Governance emphasizes coordination instead of control, which is more effective for achieving the objectives (Ma 2013). The University of Sheffield (2013) has six governance guiding principles that underpin the University's mission that direct all its strategic decisions, which include a shared framework for its activities. European Higher Education Institutes recently reported facing many internal obstacles, therefore governance arrangements have become major tools for improving quality in all aspects of higher education (Glass 2014). There are major structural issues in the higher education system in Pakistan leading to poor governance of institutions and questionable quality of education (Usman 2014). Governance is becoming increasingly important in universities just as it is in the wider world of commerce and banking (Shattock 2014). Many European governments have recently transformed their higher education systems. A key objective of the reforms was to modernize university governance in order to prepare universities for a more complex, international, and highly competitive environment at various levels (Antonowicz and Jongbloed 2015). The Dutch universities currently suffer from a triple democratic deficit: in the relation between society and the university, between university administration and the academic community, and between the academic community and society (Claassen and Duwell 2015). Indonesian higher education has experienced significant changes over the last decade. Indonesian higher education reforms have forced universities to restructure their internal university governance to become more entrepreneurial (Ngo, et. al. 2015). Shared governance is the epicenter of academic freedom and professional autonomy (DeBoy 2015).

Now-a-days many concepts are adopted to describe the best leadership style/styles that should be used by governance board such as shared leadership, adaptive leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, situational leadership, servant leadership. Almost all of these concepts involve interaction, participation, collaboration, cooperation, and redistribution of power.

Literature Review

In the coming section the previous related studies will be discussed, they will be divided into two parts: first part deals with leadership previous studies, while second part will tackle governance previous studies. Anyway, due to limited space only a snapshot from each previous study will be presented.

Leadership Previous Studies

Al-Omari, (2005) studied the relationship between leadership styles and adaptability at three public universities in the northwest region of the United States (selling, telling, participating and delegating). The results showed that there is relationship between the leadership styles of selling, telling, participating, and delegating with adaptability. The leadership style of participating was found to be based upon experience. Finally, results showed that leaders have moderate degree of adaptability with less flexibility. Jones, and Rudd, (2007) investigated the leadership styles (transactional, transformational or laissez-faire) of academic program leaders at Land-Grant institutions. Results showed that academic program leaders have a more transformational leadership style than other styles. Wiratmadja, et. al. (2008) explored the influence of transformational leadership style on the job satisfaction in a state university in Bali, Indonesia. Results showed that transformational leadership style has a significant influence on the job satisfaction of the university's lecturers. Pinnington (2011) examined five leadership approaches (charismatic, transformational, authentic, servant and spiritual) and the common leadership development practices across private, public and not-for-profit sectors for leadership development. Results concluded that leadership development practices are similar across the private, public and not-for-profit sectors. Furthermore, charismatic and transformational approaches do not appear to discriminate effectively between private and public sector leadership.

Dehkordi, et. al. (2012) investigated the relationships between transformational and transactional leadership styles with employee's organizational citizenship behaviors. Results revealed that transformational leadership style was correlated with organizational citizenship behaviors, while transactional leadership style was not correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. Saeed and Ahmad (2012) investigated the impact of perceived transformational leadership on employees' organizational citizenship behavior in Punjab University, Lahore. The results suggested that transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior are positively correlated. Islam, et. al. (2012) studied the relationship between both transactional and transformational leadership styles with motivation and academic performance. Results showed that the relationship between transformational leadership style and motivation was found to be greater on academic staff, while transactional leadership style have greater impact on the academic performance of the students. Karn, et. al. (2012) investigated the relationship between the perceived leadership behaviors (transformational and transactional) and job satisfaction of university teachers in China. Results showed that transformational style has more effect on employee job satisfaction than transactional style. Nwafor, (2012) found that most of the principal officers' choice directive and bureaucratic leadership styles in public universities in Nigeria.

Abdollahi, et. al. (2013) investigated the impact of servant leadership style on employees trust in Ilam University of medical sciences. Results suggested that there is a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership style and trust of employees. Al-Khasawneh, and Futa (2013) examined the impact of three leadership styles (Autocratic, Laissez-Faire and Democratic) on modifying student's behavior in Jordanian universities. The findings indicated that just the democratic leadership style had an impact on modifying students' behavior. Amin, et. al. (2013) explored the interplay between leadership

styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and faculty job satisfaction in a public university of Pakistan. The findings highlighted that the transformational leadership style, was having the highest positive effect on overall job satisfaction, and the laissez-faire leadership style, relatively, has weak positive effect on faculty's overall job satisfaction. While, transactional leadership style was having a weak negative effect on overall job satisfaction. Bo (2013) studied the relationships between transformational leadership and teacher's organizational commitment and educational quality in Chinese universities. The results showed that transformational leadership affect teacher's organizational commitment and educational quality. Therefore, effective leadership improves teachers' autonomous motivation and organizational commitment. Hamidifar, et. al. (2013) investigated the effective academic leadership style for Islamic Azad University in Iran. The results showed that the barriers to effective academic leadership were proved centralization and bureaucratic hierarchy structure, budget deficiency, ineffective networking in communication, and social, political and cultural intervention; insufficient high qualified and merit human resource. Negussie and Demissie (2013) investigated the relationship between leadership style of managers and job satisfaction in Jimma University Specialized Hospital. The result indicated that managers prefer transformational leadership style over transactional leadership style and had moderate-level on job satisfaction. Ramalu, and Darus, (2013) examined the relationships between transformational leadership style, organizational structure, and knowledge management in one public university in Malaysia. The findings revealed that transformational leadership style is a vital in promoting knowledge management practices in the university. Organizational structure found to moderate the effects of transformational leadership on knowledge management indicating that organizational structure plays a crucial role in assisting the leaders to manage knowledge across the organization. Othman, et. al. (2013) explored the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment among Nigerian public university lecturers. The result indicated that transformational and transactional leadership styles are positively related to employee organizational commitment among Nigerian public University lecturers. Odumeru and Ogbonna (2013) examined how transactional and transformational leadership styles attract the interest of many researchers in recent time. The paper concluded that although they are conceptually different, some elements of transaction leadership exist in transformational leadership.

Attri, et. al. (2014) examined the leadership attributes in education. Study concluded Leadership in education requires certain key attributes. A leader must set a direction; equip those he leads to go in the direction he sets; and design the organization he leads around instruction. Haghighat and Esmaily (2014) investigated the relationship between educational managers' thinking style and transformational leadership style in Sari branch of Islamic Azad University. The findings revealed that the transformational leadership style of the educational managers is an ideal-influence model. Hosseinzadeh, et. al. (2014) investigated the relationship between the transformational leadership style and reduced job alienation among the employees of Islamic Azad University. The results indicated that the transformational leadership style has strong impact on the reduction of university employees' job alienation. Mokhtarpour, et. al. (2014) studied the correlations between leadership style (transformational and transactional) and job satisfaction. The results indicated that leadership style has direct and indirect impact on job satisfaction and motivation. The concept of transformational leadership styles of managers showed the greatest effect on job satisfaction. Nazem and Mozaiini (2014) investigated the relationship between leadership style (transformational and pragmatic) and job involvement of employees at Islamic Azad University. The results indicated that there is a relationship between the leadership style and employees' job involvement. Sakiru, et. al. (2014) investigated the relationship between leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and job satisfaction among the head of departments and lecturers of Nigerian public universities. The findings revealed that the most commonly used leadership styles of Nigeria public university is transformational leadership styles. The result also revealed that there is a relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction in public universities. Sanati and Nikbakhsh (2014) investigated the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior in University of Applied Science and Technology. The results indicated that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Sart (2014) analyzed the role of leadership styles of university management in creating a learning environment for innovation and entrepreneurship. Results

showed that the participatory democracy is an important style that can empower innovation and entrepreneurship, and identified the important role of intensive collaboration and frequent consultation for university transformation. Tsheola and Nembambula (2014) argued that the South African University interventions have ironically reinforced managerialim over transformational leadership in the governance of the South African University. The article concluded that the potential for transformational leadership has faced intractable governance dilemmas that oppose qualities of charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration.

Malik, et. al. (2015) concluded that previous research indicated that the transformational style of leadership augments the transactional style, but not vise-versa. It also emphasizes that leaders need to become more transformational toward employees and allow them to participate in the decision-making process to meet their employees' needs and motivate them toward success and self-actualization. Soltani and Esmaelian (2015) studied the relationship between spirituals intelligence and leadership styles at university of Isfahan. Results showed that there is significant relation between spirituals intelligence and transformational leadership style of chairpersons, but there is no significant relationship between spirituals intelligence and both transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. Vumilia (2015) examined the dynamics of leadership roles exhibited in private universities and how leadership styles align to achieve success within Tanzania's Catholic Universities System. The analysis revealed that the leadership styles depend on academic leaders, and cross-cultural forces that govern, sustain, and sometimes frustrate leadership appointments.

In summary, most of the previous studies indicated that transformational leadership style is the most suitable style for universities' academic style. While transactional style is the most effective style for other universities' employees. The leadership style depends on the leader, the followers, the context, and environment including culture.

Governance Previous Studies

Grasic, et. al. (2011) studied the principles of good governance (legitimacy, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness, fairness, integration, capability and adaptability). The results pointed out that the principles of legitimacy and integration are recognized through multilevel decision-making process and clear definition of rights and duties of the principle of transparency is achieved by informing public and promotion of cooperation. Akomolafe and Ibijola (2012) investigated the rationale for students' participation in university governance and organizational effectiveness. Results found a significant relationship between organizational effectiveness and the rationale for students' participation in university governance. Pennock, et. al. (2012) analyzed the changes in senate members' role and structure over the last decade in Canadian universities. Study concluded that the challenges to university governance were growing number of internal pressures, including tensions between the role of academic senates in overseeing the academic mission of the university and the work of labor unions representing faculty members' interests. Zeng (2012) investigated the governance structure in current Chinese universities from three dimensions: educational policy; the culture of official standard of powers; and interest game and institutional equilibrium. Study showed that the university governance structure in China remains power imbalance, ill-defined duties, weak supervision, poor public welfare, diversity deficiency, and theoretical research on delay. These limitations greatly restrict the further improvement of current higher education system. Bakioglu and Dalgic (2012) investigated whether the same or similar challenges are dominating a Muslim-European-Asian country as western countries. Findings revealed that globalization has affected university policies in the areas of goals, marketing policies and the professional development opportunities provided for academics. While western countries are coping with the challenges arising from globalization, Turkey is slow adapting to the challenges.

Abdul Wahid, et. al. (2013) examined the relationship between intellectual capital and corporate governance at two Malaysian universities (one public and one private). The results suggested a positive relationship between intellectual capital and corporate governance. Arslan (2013) explored the

effectiveness of board of trustees in Turkish foundation universities. The research indicated that the members of board of trustees do not fulfill effectively their responsibilities and they need to improve their ability to provide better governance. Giovanna (2013) studied the changing governance form of Italian universities in response to financial and economic difficulties due to the reduced government funding. The result of the study showed that the emerging model of governance in Italian public universities is one that can be called amalgam of models. It represents the set of choices on governance after the reform and encloses elements of academic, corporate, stakeholder and trustee governance.

Maruyama (2013) studied the applied universities' governance models in many countries. Study concluded that there are three university governance models: The first one is called the state centered model, which is roughly applied to France, Spain, and Portugal. The mission of university in this model is an implementation of national objectives such as training in special areas, research and development. The second model is the academic self-governance model, whose characteristic is collegial control by the professoriate with financial dependency on the state. This model can be applied to Germany, the Nordic countries and probably Japan. The third is the market-oriented model, which is close to the UK and the state universities in the US, where the universities compete for students and financial resources. They are managed by the corporate governance idea, which often includes a board of trustees.

Robinah (2014) examined the relationship between corporate governance and financial performance in Public Universities in Uganda. The findings revealed that corporate governance had a negative effect on financial performance, while policy and decision-making had a positive relationship with financial performance. Muljo, et. al. (2014) investigated the factors influencing optimization of the implementation of good governance principles on the academic field in Bina Nusantara University. The results indicated that there were many factors that affect the optimization of the implementation of good governance principles most of them are related to operational centralization and academic decentralization. Ghamari and Baharzadeh (2014) investigated how governance principles (transparency, governance of law, equity, efficiency and capability) increase efficiency and ability of governance system leading to a comprehensive development and democracy.

Setiyawati and Nengzih (2014) explored the effect of integration of environmental accounting concepts in establishing good corporate governance on institutional performance in the public sector. The results showed that the implementation of the principles of good corporate governance affects the disclosure of environmental accounting; the effectiveness of the internal control system affects the disclosure of environmental accounting, while the disclosure of environmental accounting does not have an effect on the institutional performance.

Shattock, (2014) analyzed governance change in nine major higher education systems: Australia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, the UK and the USA. Study concluded that the convergence of governance structures has been mediated by the historical, cultural, political and social characteristics of the different systems. Usman (2014) investigated the differences in the role of boards of governors in maintaining quality of education in both the public and the private sector universities in Pakistan. The result showed that the private sector boards portray have more efficient system compared to the public sector boards that lack autonomy and are under strong political influence.

Abdulraheem and Muammed (2014) examined issues and challenges relating to corporate governance in Nigerian higher education. It was found that four factors are responsible for the challenges in achieving effective corporate governance. These factors include funding, political interference, law and leadership. Wagfi (2014) investigated to which degree the governance concept is actually applied in the Jordanian Private Universities. Results showed that there is a medium degree of satisfaction for governance application in the private universities, and participation in decision-making was low.

Monyoncho (2015) explored how corporate governance practices of public universities impact the decision-making and leadership processes of University of Nairobi. The study showed that poor governance structure resulted in bad leadership and bureaucratic decision-making. This in turn negatively affected the quality of services in the university. Yelin and Wenting (2015) explored the good governance practices of the public sector. Study concluded that the context of good governance holds justice and efficiency as its value choice, and indicated that legitimacy; rule of law; transparency and other practical features will help to promote running a university fairly, while, accountability, responsiveness and inclusiveness are important to ensure the efficiency. Kwiek (2015) investigated how the collegial model reflects on actual governance patterns in the Polish university sector. The study concluded that Polish universities are operating according to the traditional collegial model of the university as a community of scholars, which is unparalleled with Western Europe. Results indicated that the influence of collegial bodies on academic decision-making in Poland is the highest in Europe; and, in contrast, the power of the government and external stakeholders is the lowest.

Yudianti and Suryandari (2015) evaluated the implementation of internal control and risk management in ensuring good university governance. Result showed that internal control and risk management positively influence the implementation of good university governance. Ntim, et. al. (2016) investigated the extent of voluntary disclosures in UK higher education institutions' annual reports and examine whether internal governance structures influence disclosure. Results showed that the interaction between executive team characteristics and governance variables enhances the level of voluntary disclosures, thereby providing support for the continued relevance of a shared leadership in the higher education institutions' sector towards enhancing accountability and transparency.

In summary, governance includes four entities: governance board (leaders), governance principles (context), followers who are guided and directed by the board within the governance principles and finally the culture (environment). Also, we can add other stakeholders.

Methodology

This research paper uses a qualitative method to describe which leadership style is suitable to manage universities in the light of governance principles. It is based on literature review, it started by screening and searching for previous studies related to both universities' leadership styles and universities' governance principles. After screening about 2000 previous studies, only about 200 studies where directly related to both topics. Therefore, about 200 literatures were used to develop the conclusion.

Discussion and Conclusion

The relationship between governance and leadership is complex but crucial for any organization, because there is no governance without leadership. Governance board members have to adapt and adopt a leadership style, which is suitable to their organization, context, followers and culture. Governance board my use different styles based on the organization, context, followers and culture. For example, they may use shared leadership among them, but use transformational leadership style with those highly educated, having good experience and ready to cooperate with each other, such as academic staff, and may use transactional leadership style with followers who are new, less educated, less experience, and not ready to cooperate with each other.

Previous studies showed that the most suitable leadership style that should be used within the board is shared leadership. Shared leadership style consists of the leader sharing the decision-making with other members according to their interests and by practices social equality. Shared leadership is about collaborative, collective, cooperative, participative, distributive leadership in decision-making with clear and shared vision, mission, goals, power, resources, responsibilities and accountability.

Transformational leadership is the most suitable style to be used for academic staff members who are highly educated and having good experience and ready to work as a team. This style causes change in individuals and systems, focuses on changing and transforming followers to help each other, and inspires empowerment and motivation of the followers. Finally, transactional leadership style is most suitable style for new followers, inexperienced, low level of education and routine work. Transactional leadership style uses rewards and punishments. This style is also suitable in crisis and emergencies, it motivates followers through a system of rewards and punishments, and it is known as managerial leadership, which focuses on the role of supervision and controlling.

In conclusion, there is no governance leadership style which suites all organizations or all industries. Even in a single organization, there is no specific style, which can be used for all followers' levels. Governance leadership style depends on leader, context, followers and culture. For higher education particularly universities, it seems to be the most suitable style depend on the level of followers' education, experience, readiness to cooperate and to be a team member. Based on this criteria and previous studies, it seems that in universities there are three different styles, which can be used as follows: shared leadership style among the governance board members, transformational leadership style for academicians and mid-level management, and finally transactional leadership style for other workers who perform routine work.

Recommendations

The study recommends using different styles based on leader, context, follower and culture. The study also recommends using shared leadership style for upper management (governance board members), transformational style for academicians and middle management level, and finally transactional style for other employees. The study recommends carrying out quantitative researches to test how it can be generalized to universities.

References

Abdollahi, B.; Jamshidi, M.; Delavari, Y.; Menati, W.; and Yasini, A. (2013). The effect of servant leadership style on employees trust in Ilam University of Medical Sciences. *Reef Resources Assessment and Management Technical Paper (RRAMT),* 38(5):220-229.

Abdul Wahid, A.H.D.; Abu, W.A.L.; and Smith, M. (2013). Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital: Evidence from Public and Private Universities. *Higher Education Studies*, 3(1):63-78.

Abdulraheem, I.; and Muammed, A. (2014). Corporate governance in Nigerian Higher Education: Issues and challenges. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(2):221-228.

Acs, Z.J.; and Audretsch, D.B. (2012). Understanding Family Businesses: Undiscovered Approaches, Unique Perspectives, and Neglected Topics**.** International Studies in Entrepreneurship. Springer, New York.

Afridi, A. (2013). Performance & solo vs. shared leadership: A contingency theory perspective. *Journal of Strategy and Performance Management,* 1(2): 78-88.

Afsar, B. and Rehman, M. (2015). Investigating Relationships among Paternalistic Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Organization Citizenship Behavior, Psychological Contract and Turnover Intention: A Case of Pakistani SMEs. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 23(8):1699-1713.

Ahmad, A.S. (2012). Perceived Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Case Study of Administrative Staff of University of the Punjab. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(21):150-158.

Ahmed, F.S.A.; and Abdo, L.M.A. (2013). Identifying the Leadership Style of the Teaching Staff as Perceived by the Clinical Instructors of the Faculty of Nursing, Cairo University. *Medical Journal Cairo University*, 81(2):97-100.

Ait-Yassine, F.L. (2012). Suggested Adaptive Leadership Principles in Marketing Environment. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9):71-74.

Akhigbe, O.J.; Finelady, A.M.and Felix, O.O. (2014). Transactional Leadership Style and Employee Satisfaction in Nigerian Banking Sector. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(26):14-23.

Akomolafe, C.O.; and Ibijola E.Y. (2012). Rationale for students' participation in university governance and organizational effectiveness in Ekiti and Ondo States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies*, 4(1):14-18.

Al-Khasawneh, A.L.; and Futa, S.M. (2013). The Impact of Leadership Styles Used by the Academic Staff in the Jordanian Public Universities on Modifying Students' Behavior: A Field Study in the Northern Region of Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(1):1-10.

Al-Omari, A. (2005). Leadership Styles And Style Adaptability Of Deans And Department Chairs At Three Public Research Universities. *Doctorate Dissertation*. College of Education, Washington State University, USA.

Amah, O.E. (2015). Servant leadership relationship with leader-member exchange: The moderating role of motivation-to-serve and motivation-to-lead, *International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences (IJMESS)*, 4(3):108-127.

Amin, M.; Shah, S.; and Tatlah, I.A. (2013). Impact of Principals/Directors' Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction of the Faculty Members: Perceptions of the Faculty Members in a Public University of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 7(2)97-112.

Antonowicz, D.; and Jongbloed, B. (2015). University Governance Reform In The Netherlands, Austria, And Portugal: Lessons For Poland. Better Government Programme Media patron: EY Poland, Warsaw. www.bettergovernment.

Arbabi, A.; and Mehdinezhad, V. (2016). School principals' collaborative leadership style and relation it to teachers' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*. 5(3):3-12.

Arslan, H. (2013). Effectiveness of Board of Trustees in University Governance. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 13(9):1165-1171.

Attri, A.K.; and Devi, N. (2014). Leadership: Characteristics And Theories. *GALAXY International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, GIIRJ*, 2(3):30-34.

Ayinde, F.F.; Akintayo, M.O.; and Kayode, F.J. (2015). Analysis of Leadership Theories in Health Organization. *Journal of Research in Humanities & Social Sciences*, 3(5):31-33.

Bakioglu, A.; and Dalgic, G. (2012). Academics' Perceptions of the Effects of Globalization on Turkish Foundation University Policies. *Education and Science*, 37(165):34-47.

Baschung, L.; Bellon, B.; Goastellec, G.; Musselin, C.; Sanchez, P.; and Theves, J. (2006). *Strategic management of University research activities*. PRIME – OEUGUIDE. http://www.prime-noe.org.

Bass, B. (2008). Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications (4th ed.). The Free Press, New York, NY.

Benson, A.M.; and Blackman, D. (2011). To distribute leadership or not? A lesson from the islands. *Tourism Management*, 32(5):1141–1149.

Bergman, J.Z., Rentsch, J.R., Small, E.E., Davenport, S.W., & Bergman, S.M. (2012). The shared leadership process in decision-making teams. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 152(1):17-42.

Bevir, M. (2013). Governance: A very short introduction. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Blackmore, J.; Brennan, M.; and Zipin, L. (2011). Re-Positioning University Governance and Academic Work. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 11(1):54-56.

Bo, Y. (2013). The Influence Study of Transformational Leadership in University on Teachers' Organizational Commitment: The Construction and Verification of a Theoretical Model. *Canadian Social Science*, 9(4):126-137.

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3):251-269.

Botha, R.J. (2014). The Place and Role of Distributed Leadership in Functional and Effective South African Schools: Towards School Improvement. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(20):1225-1232.

Bremer, I. (2009). Common Factors Between Swedish And Chinese Entrepreneurial Leadership Styles. *Business Intelligence Journal, 2(1):9-41.*

Business Dictionary (2016). Transformational Leadership**.** http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/transformational-leadership.html

Cai, Y. (2009). Global Isomorphism And Governance Reform In Chinese Higher Education. 31st Annual EAIR Forum in Vilnius, Lithuania, 23 to 26 August 2009 Higher Education Group/ Department of Management Studies. University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland.

Carson, J.B; Tesluk, P.E.; and Marrone, J.A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5):1217-1234.

Cawthorne, J.E. (2010). Leading from the Middle of the Organization: An Examination of Shared Leadership in Academic Libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(2):151–157.

Chaudhry, A.Q.; and Javed, H. (2012). Impact of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7):258-264.

Cherry, K. (2016). Lewin's Leadership Styles. Cited on 19, march 2016. http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/

Chukwu, B.I. and Eluka, J. (2013). Applications of Leadership Theories in Nigerian Business Organizations. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 59170:166-171.

Cirstea, C.; and Constantinescu, D. (2012). Debating About Situational Leadership. Management & Marketing, X(1):53-58.

Ciucanu, I. (2013). Governance of Higher Education: Funding Reforms in CEE countries. Perspectives, Challenges and Trends. *Quality Assurance Review for Higher Education*, 5(1-2):31-45.

Claassen, R. and Duwell, M. (2015). The Triple Democratic Deficit In University Governance: Perspectives for the New University. *Krisis Journal for contemporary philosophy*, Issue 2:43-48.

Clarke, N. (2012). Shared leadership in projects: a matter of substance over style. *Team Performance Management*, 18(3/4):196-209.

Cojocar, W.J. (2011). Adaptive Leadership in the Military Decision Making Process. *Military Review, Mission Command*, 23-28.

Corazzini, K.N.; and Anderson, R.A. (2014). Adaptive Leadership and Person-Centered Care: A New Approach to Solving Problems. *North Carolina Institute of Medicine Journal,* 75(5):352-354.

Cullen, K.; and Yammarino, F.J. (2014). Special issue on collective and network approaches to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25:180–181.

Damirch, Q.V.; Rahimi, G.; and Mir Seyyedi, H. (2011). Ransformational Leadership Style And Innovative Behavior On Innovative Climate At Smes In Iran. Kuwait Chapter. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 1(4):119-127.

Daniela, Z.; Lucia, K.; and Liliana, D. (2010). Applyng The Principles Of Corporate Governance In Central And Eastern European Countries, The National Characteristics And Particularities Of Corporate Governing In The Romanian Economy. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, 12(1):347-354.

DeBoy, J.L. (2015). Shared Governance At Lincoln University: An Elusive Quarry. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 8(4):235-240.

Dehkordi, A.G.; and Sheykhshabani, S.H. (2012). The relationships between Managers' Leadership Styles of Physical Education of Islamic Azad Universities (sixth district) with Employees Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *International Conference on Management, Behavioral Sciences and Economic Issues (ICMBSE 2012) Penang, Malaysia*, 191-194.

Edwards, G.; and Smit, B. (2008). Collaborative leadership as a necessary condition for successful curriculum implementation. *Journal of Education*, 44:110-122.

El Said, H.H. (2014). Faculty Governance: Opportunities and Challenges after the Egyptian Revolution – The case of the FEPS, Cairo University. *JHEA/RESA*, 12(1):53-68.

Erben, S.G.; and Guneser, A.B. (2008). "The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Commitement:Investigating the Role of Climate Regarding ethics". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4):955–968.

Erkutlu, H. (2012). The impact of organizational culture on the relationship between shared leadership and team proactivity. *Team Performance Management*, 18(1/2):102-119.

Faniran, J.O.; and Akintayo, D.I. (2012). Moral Authority, Leadership Integrity And Management Of Conflicts In The Nigerian University System. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 2(1):01-06.

Felix, C.O.; Ahmad, A.H.; and Arshad, R.B. (2012). Individualism and Collectivism as Moderators of Moral Reasoning and Transformational Leadership Style in the Nigerian Public Sector. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 12(7):568-577.

Ford, R. (2010). Complex adaptive leading-ship and open-processional change processes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 31(5):420.

Foster, D.E. (2002). A Method of Comparing Follower Satisfaction with the Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire Styles of Leadership. *Communication Teacher*, 16(2):4-6.

Gardner, W.L., Cogliser, C.C., Davis, K.M., & Dickens, M.P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22:1120-1145.

Gastil, J. (1994). A Definition and Illustration of Democratic Leadership. *Human Relorions*. 47(8):953-975.

Ghamari, H.; and Baharzadeh, F. (2014). A Comparative Study of Civil Services Management Law with the Principles of Desirable Governance through the Perspective of International Law. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(14):49-57.

Giovanna, L. (2013). University Governance at the Crossroads: The Italian Case. *International Journal of Business Research and Development*, 2(2):20-34.

Glass, A. (2014). The State of Higher Education 2014. The OECD Higher Education Programme (IMHE). www.oecd.org/edu/imhe.

Gliddon, D.G. (2006). Forecasting a competency model for innovation leaders using a modified Delphi technique. ProQuest.

Goransson, B.; and Brundenius, C. (2011). Universities in Transition: The Changing Role and Challenges for Academic Institutions. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada. Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London.

Grasic, T.; Radosavljevic, A.; Mutabdzija, S.; Brajic, A.; and Avdibegovic, M. (2011). Recognizing forest governance principles in state forest service's tasks prescribed by national forest legislation – case study Serbia**.** Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium, Lithuania 2011, May 18-20, 2011, 149-157. Kaunas, Lithuania.

Greenleaf Center (2016). The Servant As Leader**.** https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/

Griffin, R.J.; and Ebert, R.W. (2010). *Business essentials* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. pp. 135-136.

Gulcan, M.G. (2015). Complexity Theory and New Leadership Paradigm. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 10(2):1-12.

Gummerson, W.M. (2015). Augmenting Sustainable Leadership Practices with Complexity Theory. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ)*, 6(1):1247-1255.

Gupta, R. (2015). Servant Leadership is an imperious tool for Global Organizational Elegance. *Journal of Business Management and Economics,* 3:29-31.

Guyot, S. (2011). The Instrumentalization Of Participatory Management In Protected Areas: The Ethnicization Of Participation In The Kolla-Atacameña Region Of The Central Andes Of Argentina And Chile. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 10(2):9–36.

Hackman, M.Z.; and Johnson, C.E. (2013). *Leadership, a communication perspective* (6 ed.). Waveland Press. USA.

Hagen, Y. (2011). Introduction. New opportunities for co-operatives: new opportunities for people proceedings of the 2011 ica global research conference, 24-27 august, 2011, mikkeli, finland, 11-13.

Haghighat, R.; and Esmaily, M. (2014). Studying the Relationship between Educational Managers' Thinking Style and Transformational Leadership Style Sari Islamic Azad University as Case Study. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(23):11-18.

Hamidifar, F.; Vinitwatanakhun, W.; and Roodposhti, F. (2013). Developing an Effective Academic Leadership Model at Islamic Azad University. *Int. J. Manag. Bus. Res*., 3(2):161-174.

Heifetz, R.; Grashow, A.; and Lensky, M. (2009). *The Practice Of Adaptive Leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*. Harvard Business Press.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1977). *Management of Organizational Behavior 3rd Edition– Utilizing Human Resources*. New Jersey/Prentice Hall.

Hoch, J.E; and Dulebohn, J.H. (2013). Shared leadership in enterprise resource planning and human resource management system implementation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23:114–125.

Hosseinzadeh, A.; Nazem, F.; and Eimani, M.N. (2014). A structural model for transformational leadership style based on job alienation in District 2 of Islamic Azad University. *Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences*, 3(I):01-05.

Hufty, M. (2011). Investigating Policy Processes: The Governance Analytical Framework (GAF). Research for Sustainable Development: Foundations, Experiences, and Perspectives. *Bern: Geographica Bernensia*: 403-424.

Islam, T.; Aamir, M.; Ahmed, I.; and Muhammad, S.K. (2012). The Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on the Motivation and Academic Performance of Students at University Level. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(2):237-244.

Iyer, R.D. (2013). Servant Leadership: The Leadership Style for Teachers. *International Journal of Computational Engineering & Management (IJCEM)*, 16(2):39-42.

James, K.T.; Mann, J.; and Creasy, J (2007). Leaders as Lead Learners: A Case Example of Facilitating Collaborative Leadership Learning for School Leaders. *Management Learning*, 38(1):79–94

Johnson, C.E. (2015). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of leadership (5th Ed). Normative Leadership Theories*. Sage Publishing. U.K.

Johnson, T.; Martin, A.J.; Palmer, F.R.; Watson, G.; and Ramsey, P.L. (2012). Collective Leadership A Case Study of the All Blacks. *Asia-Pacific Management and Business Application*, 1(1):53-67.

Jones, D.W.; and Rudd, R.D. (2007). Transactional, Transformational, or Laissez-Faire Leadership: An assessment of College of Agriculture Academic Program Leaders (Deans) Leadership Styles. *Proceedings of the 2007 AAAE Research Conference*, 34:520-530.

Kanter, R.M. (2003). Rosabeth Moss Kanter on the Frontiers of Management. *Harvard Business Review (Harvard Business School Press)*.

Karn, A.L.; Jianxin, S.; and Mujtaba, G. (2012).The Consequences of the Hegemony of the Leadership Styles and Employee Job Satisfaction among University Teachers in China. *International Conference on Education, Applied Sciences and Management* (ICEASM'2012) December 26-27, 2012 Dubai (UAE): 94-97.

Kavasakalis, A. (2013). Are Common Beliefs Present among Greek Academics during the Implementation of a Controversial University Policy? *International Research in Education*, 1(1):15-28.

Kemp, W.; and Paulauskas, R. (2013). Adapt or Die: "Smart Power", Adaptive Leadership, the Lithuanian Chairmanship, and the Evolution of the OSCE. IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook* 2012:25-41.

Kezar, A. (2004). What Is More Important to Effective Governance: Relationships, Trust, and Leadership, or Structures and Formal Processes? Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education. 127:35-46. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Krucken, G. (2011). A European Perspective On New Modes Of University Governance And Actorhood. Center for Higher Education Studies. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.17.11. University Of California, Berkeley. http://cshe.berkeley.edu/.

Kwiek, M. (2015). The unfading power of collegiality? University governance in Poland in a European comparative and quantitative perspective. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 43:77-89.

Landis, E.A. (2011). 21st Century Leadership Issues as They Pertain to a Small Private Liberal Arts University. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 12(3):108-111.

Landman, T (2006). *Studying Human Rights* (1st ed). Routledge, NY.

Lewin, K.; Lippitt, R.; and White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10:271-301.

Li, Y. (2014). *Study on Transformation of University Governance*. International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication (ICELAIC 2014), 187-190.

Lin, T.C. (2011). Corporate Governance of Iconic Executives. *The Notre Dame L. Rev.*, 87:351.

Lopez, C.G.; Alonso, F.M.; Morales, M.M.; and Leon, J.A. (2015). Authentic leadership, group cohesion and group identification in security and emergency teams. *Psicothema*, 27(1):59-64.

Lovegrove, N.; and Thomas, M. (2013). Why the World Needs Tri-Sector Leaders. http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2013/02/why_the_world_needs_tri-sector.html

Ma, X. (2013). Exploration of and Research into Implementation of Modern University Governance Model in Universities and Colleges of China. International Conference on the Modern Development of Humanities and Social Science (MDHSS 2013): 212-214. Published by Atlantis Press.

Majoni, C. (2016). Exploring the relevance of distributed leadership in odl in zimbabwe. A case of the zou mashonaland central region. *International Journal of Information Research and Review*, 3(1):1666-1668.

Malik, P.; Singh, H.; Mittal, A.; and Tomar, R. (2015). An Analytical Study Of Leadership Theories. *International Journal Of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, 4(1):1-17.

Malos, R. (2012). Annals of Eftimie Murgu University Resita, *Economic Studies, Fascicle* II:421-426.

Manktelow, J. (2012). Leadership Style. Mind Tools. Retrieved 2 November 2012.

Mapunda, G. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership and indigenous enterprise development. Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability, *Refereed Material*, III(3):1-28.

Martindale, N. (2011). Leadership Styles: How to handle the different personas. *Strategic Communication Management*, 15(8):32–35.

Maruyama, F. (2013). Comparison Of University Governance Usa, Uk, France And Japan. Report of the International Seminar on University Governance, 2012. Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University RIHE International Seminar Reports, No.19:99-104.

Melo, A.I.; Sarrico, C.S.; and Radnor, Z. (2008). Research design for analysing the relationship between governance structures and performance management systems in universities. *Reflecting Education*, 4(2):68-81.

Merendino, A. (2013). International Theories of Corporate Governance: Critical Analysis and Evidence of the Italian Model. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 1(1):140-145.

Mokhber, M.; Tan, G.G.; and Vakilbashi, A. (2015). Enhancing Organization Demand for Innovation through Entrepreneurial Leadership and Social Networks. *Journal of Advanced Research Design*, 12(1):1-12.

Mokhtarpour, H.; Mohammadi, F.; and Mokhtarpour, S. (2014). The Relationship between Leadership Style (Transformational Leadership and Interactive) of Principals and Job Satisfaction of Shiraz University Staff Employee. *Journal Health Management & Information*, 1(4):92-95.

Monyoncho, R.M. (2015). Perception of Corporate Governance Practices at the University Of Nairobi. *DBA Africa Management Review*, 5(1):94-112.

Morales, S.S.; and Santaolalla, V.H. (2013). Identity, Politics and Authentic Leadership.Spanish Youngsters' Perceptions of J. L. Rodriguez Zapatero and M. Rajoy. *Estudos em Comunicacao*, 13:107-134.

Morton, L.W.; and Brown, S.S. (2011). *Pathways for Getting to Better Water Quality: The Citizen Effect*. Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg, London New York.

Mottoh, S.N. (2015). The Influence Of Transformational And Transactional Leadership Style On Employee Performance (Case Study: Dinas Kesehatan Manado). *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 15(4):436-446.

Muljo, H.H.; Wicaksono, A.; and Riantono, I.E. (2014). Ptimalisasi Penerapan Prinsip Good Governance Bidang Akademik Dalam Upaya Mewujudkan Good University Governance. *Binus Business Review*, 5(1): 91-100.

Nasereddin, Y.A. (2012). A proposed theoretical framework for universities governance and indicators for applying it in light of the comprehensive quality requirements. *The University Performance Development Magazine.*

Nazem, F.; and Mozaiini, M. (2014). Investigating the relationship between leadership style (transformational and pragmatic) and employees' job involvement at Islamic Azad University of Roudehen, Damavand, Pardis, Boomehen and Firuzkuh to provide an appropriate model. *Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences*, 3 (IV):82-88.

Negussie, N.; and Demissie, A. (2013). Relationship Between Leadership Styles Of Nurese Managers And Nurses' Job Satisfaction In Jimma University Specialized Hospital. *Ethiop Journal Health Science*, 23(1):49-58.

Neider, L.L.; and Schriesheim, C.A. (2010). The Dark Side of Management. Information Age Publishing. USA.

Ngo, J.; De Boer, H.; and Enders, J. (2015). Managerial Leadership Styles of Deans in Indonesian Universities.World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 9(5):1506-15013.

Niu, C.P.; Wang, A.C.; and Cheng, B.S. (2009). Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader: Probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12:32-3.

Ntim, C.G.; Soobaroyen, T;. and Broad, M.J. (2016). Governance Structures, Voluntary Disclosures and Public Accountability: The Case of UK Higher Education Institutions. *Accounting, auditing & accountability journal.*

Nwafor, S.O. (2012). The Essential Leadership Styles For Effective Administration Of Universities In Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1(3):173-179.

Nwagbara, U. (2011). Rethinking Labour Turnover: Prospecting For Shared Leadership. Petroleum-Gas *University of Ploiesti Bulletin*, LXIII(4):1-10.

Odumeru, J.A; and Ogbonna, I.G. (2013). Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(2):355-361.

OECD (2004). OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, 2004. OECD Publications Service, France. http://www.oecd.org/corporate/ca/corporategovernanceprinciples/31557724.pdf.

Othman, A.; and Abd Rahman, H. (2013). Innovative Leadership: Learning from Change Management among Malaysian Secondary School Principals. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 23(2):167-177.

Othman, J.; Mohammed, K.A.; and D'Silva, J.L. (2013). Does a Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style Predict Organizational Commitment among Public University Lecturers in Nigeria? *Asian Social Science*, 9(1):165-170.

Ozkan, S.; and Ceylan, A. (2016). Collective Efficacy as a Mediator of the Relationship between Authentic Leadership and Well-being at Work. *International Business Research*, 9(6):17-30.

Paracha, M.U.; Qamar, A.; Mirza, A.; Hassan, I.; and Waqas, H. (2012). "Impact of Leadership Style (Transformational & Transactional Leadership) On Employee Performance & Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction" Study of Private School (Educator) In Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(4Ver.1.0):55-64.

Parveen, S.; and Tariq, A. (2014). Leadership Style, Gender and Job Satisfaction: A Situational Leadership Approach. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3(12):1-6.

Pennock, L.; Jones, G.A.; Leclerc, J.M.; and Li, S.X. (2012). Academic Senates and University Governance in Canada: Changes in Structure and Perceptions of Senate Members. Annual meeting of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, Belgrade, Serbia, September 10-12, 2012.

Perales, E.; Chorro, E.; Viqueira, V.; and Martinez-Verdu, F.M. (2012). Knowledge spirals, situational leadership and informal learning applied on b-learning methodology. *Proceedings of EDULEARN 12 Conference*, 2nd-4th July 2012:3408-3415. Barcelona, Spain.

Pinnington, A.H. (2011). Leadership development: Applying the same leadership theories and development practices to different contexts? *Leadership*, 7(3)335-365.

Rabindarang, S.; Bing, K.W.; and Yin, K.Y. (2014). The Influence of Distributed Leadership on Job Stress in Technical and Vocational Education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 4(1):490-499.

Ramalu, S.S.; and Darus, A.B.H. (2013).Transformational Leadership Style And Knowledge Management Among University Administrators In Malaysia: Examining The Moderating Effect Of Organizational Structure*. Proceedings of the 2nd Applied International Business Conference (AIBC2013),* 7-8 December 2013:617-6033.

Ramanthan, C.S.; and Dutta, S. (2014). *Governance, Development and Social Work***.** Routledge, New York, USA. Taylor and Francis.

Rau, T.V.; Saerang, D.P.E.; and Pangemanan, S.S. (2015). Analysis Of Servant And Transformational Leadership On Corporate Social Reponsibility At Gereja Kalvari Pentakosta Missi Di Indonesia. *Journal EMBA*, 3(1):760-768.

Ray, S.A.; and Ray, I.A. (2012). Understanding Democratic Leadership: Some Key Issues And Perception With Reference To India's Freedom Movement. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3.1):1-26.

Ritchie, S.M.; Tobin, K.; Roth, W.M.; and Carambo, C. (2007) Transforming an academy through the enactment of collective curriculum leadership. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(2):151-175.

Robinah, A. (2014). Corporate governance and financial performance of public Universities in Uganda. *Acme Journal of Educational Administration and Management*, 1(1):1-17.

Roebuck, C. (2011). Critical need for entrepreneurial leaders during turbulent times. Chris Roebuck: Transforming Organisational & Individual Performance via Entrepreneurial Leadership. http://chrisroebuck.co/blog/critical-need-for-entrepreneurial-leaders-during-turbulent-times/

Roger, C. (2015). Examining teamwork and leadership in the fields of public administration, leadership, and management. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 21(3/4):199-216.

Rosenthal, S.A.; and Pittinsky, T.L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17:617–633.

Saeed, A.; and Ahmad, S. (2012). Perceived Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Case Study of Administrative Staff of University of the Punjab. *European Journal of Business and Management,* 4(21):150-158.

Sakiru, O.K.; Othman, J.; Silong, A.D.; Kareem, S.D.; Oluwafemi, A.O.; and Yusuf, G.O. (2014). Relationship between Head of Department Leadership Styles and Lecturers Job Satisfactions in Nigerian Public Universities. *Asian Social Science*, 10(6):138-144.

Salahuddin, A.M. (2011). Distributed Leadership in Secondary Schools: Possibilities and Impediments in Bangladesh. *The Arts Faculty Journal,* 19-32.

Salin, D.; and Hoel, H. (2011). Organizational Causes of Workplace Bullying. Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice. 227-243. London: Bullying and harassment in the workplace Taylor & Francis.

Sanati, S.S.; and Nikbakhsh, R. (2014). The Relationship between Transformational Leadership Style and Organization Citizenship Behavior in Physical Education Experts in University of Applied Science and Technology in Iran. *International Journal of Sport Studies*. 4(11):1436-1441.

Sanchez, M.P.; and Elena, S. (2010). Changing Patterns of Governance and Management in European Universities: Emerging Paradoxes in Spanish Universities. UAM-Accenture Working Papers: Working Paper # 2010/02. http://www.uam.es/docencia/degin/catedra/

Sart, G. (2014). The New Leadership Model of University Management for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, I57:73-90.

Schultz, D.; and Schultz, S.E. (2016). *Psychology and work today*. Routledge, New York, USA.

Setiawan, R.; Sumantri, S.; and Sulastiana, M. (2014). Description of Servant Leadership on Public Official in Bekasi Government. *International Conference on Economics, Education and Humanities (ICEEH'14)***,** Dec. 10-11, 2014 Bali (Indonesia), 56-60.

Setiyawati, H.; and Nengzih, M. (2014). The Effect of the Implementation of Good Corporate Governance Principles and the Effectiveness of Internal Control System Disclosure of Environmental accounting and Its Implications On the Company Performance (Studies in State-Owned and Private Hospitals in Jakarta). *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 5(24):172-177.

Shah, S.R. (2014). Empowering EFL Teachers through Distributed Leadership: A Critical Perspective on Leadership Practices in an Educational Institution. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5, 10(1):9-25.

Shailer, G.E. (2004). *Introduction to Corporate Governance in Australia*. Pearson Education Australia.

Sharma, L.J.K.; and Singh, S.K. (2013). Characteristics Of Laissez-Faire Leadership Style: A Case Study. *International Journal Of Research In Commerce & Management*, 4 (3):29-31.

Shattock, M. (2010). K University Governance Under Stress. International Higher Education. European Trends, 21-23.

Shattock, M. (2014). International Trends in University Governance: Autonomy, self-government and the distribution of authority. Routledge, New York, USA.

Shorten, R. (2012). Modernism and Totalitarianism: Rethinking the Intellectual Sources of Nazism and Stalinism. *Palgrave Macmillan, U.K,* p. 256. eBook.

Silva, A. (2015). An Integrated Leadership Theory. *Journal of Perspectives in Organizational Behavior, Management, & Leadership*, 1(1):5-9.

Soltani, I.: and Esmaelian, M. (2015). Analysis of the Relationship between Spiritual Intelligence with Multi-Factor Leadership Styles of Directors of Educational Departments of the Isfahan University. *Journal of Social Issues & Humanities*, 3(4):44-50.

Stefenhagena, D. (2012). Problems of University Institutional Governance In Changing Environment. *Economics and Management*, 17(4):1594-19-599.

Stincelli, E.; and Baghurst, T. (2014). A Grounded Theory Exploration of Informal Leadership Qualities as Perceived by Employees and Managers in Small Organizations. International *Journal of Business Management and Economic Research (IJBMER)*, 5(1):1-8.

Sultana, N.; and Rahman, M.A. (2012). Innovative Leadership (People). *The Jahangirnaga Journal of Business Studies*, 2(l):37-51.

Sundaram, N. (2015). Governance of Indian Central Universities in 21st Century – Need for a Model Act. *International Conference on Technology and Business Management*, March 23-25, 2015:206-217.

The University of Sheffield (2013). *Mission Vision & Identity*. www.sheffield.ac.uk/ourplan.

Tomigolung, H.N. (2015). The Effects of Servant Leadership on Employee Performance At Regional Government Office Southeast Minahasa. *Journal EMBA*, 3(1):163-172.

Tricker, B. (2009). Essentials for Board Directors: An A–Z Guide (2nd Ed.). Bloomberg Press, New York, USA.

Tsheola, J.; and Nembambula, P. (2014). Governance of the South African University under Democracy and the Triumphalism of Managerialism over Transformational Leadership. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy, 5(27):1655-1666.

Usman, S. (2014). Governance and Higher Education in Pakistan: What Roles do Boards of Governors Play in Ensuring the Academic Quality Maintenance in Public Universities versus Private Universities in Pakistan? *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(2):38-51.

van Winden, F. (2012). Affective Social Ties—Missing Link in Governance Theory. *RMM*, 3:108-122.

Vlachad, M.; and Ferla, M. (2013). Differentiation of Teachers' and Principals' Engagement in Distributed Leadership according to Their Demographic Characteristics. *Journal of Education and Learning,* 2(4):19-30.

Vugt, M.; and Ronay, R. (2013). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: Theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1–22.

Vumilia, P.L. (2015). How Leadership Styles in Academia Align to Achieve Success within the Tanzanian Catholic Universities System. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(4):53-63.

Wagfi, A.A. (2014). Corporate Governance: Actual and Aspirations, and Ethical Commitments-A field study-on Private Northern Jordanian Universities (The higher education sector – Jordan). *European Journal of Business and Management,* 6(10):71-86.

Watts, T.; Flanagan, J.; and Little, J. (2005). A model for corporate governance, decision-making, and accountability in today's universities. Accounting and Finance Association of Australia and New Zealand Conference (pp. 1-22). Australia (on CD ROM): John Wiley & Sons Australia Ltd.

Wiratmadja, I.I.; Govindaraju, R.; and Rahyuda, A.G. (2008). The Influence of Transformational Leadership Style and Compensation System on the Performance of University Lecturer: A Case at a State University in Indonesia. APIEMS 2008 Proceedings of the 9th Asia Pacific Industrial Engineering & Management Systems Conference Nusa Dua, Bali – Indonesia December 3rd – 5th, 2008:693-699.

Wooten, L.P.; Anderson, L.; Pinkerton, J.; Noll, T.; Lori, J.; and Ransom, S. (2006). Strategic Leadership in Healthcare: The Role of Collective Change Agents in Closing the Gap of Healthcare Disparities**.** Ross School of Business Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 1060. University of Michigan.

Xu, S. (2011). Paternalistic Leadership And Followers' Outcomes: An Attachment Theoretical Perspective**.** Workshop on Research Advances in Organizational Behavior and Human Resources Management Paris Dauphine, May 17-19, 2011, Conference Proceedings: 253-266.

Yelin, W.; and Wenting, X. (2015). An Exploration on the Value Appeal and Practice Path of University Governance Under the Context of Good Governance. *Canadian Social Science*, 11(3):286-291.

Yudianti, F.N.; and Suryandari, I.H. (2015). Internal Control and Risk Management in Ensuring Good University Governance. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 6(2):6-12.

Yukl, G.; and Mahsud, R. (2010). Why Flexible And Adaptive Leadership Is Essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2):81-93.

Zeng, Y. (2012). Analysis on the Generation Logic and Limitations of University Governance in China. Science and Engineering Publishing Company, Jiujiang, China, November 9-11, 2012, *Proceedings of International Conference on Social Science and Environmental Protection (SSEP)*, 226-229.

Zhang, X.; and Thiam, M. (2014). Assessing the Role of Stakeholders in the Implementation of SMEs Governance Principles in France. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 3(5):69-81.