University of Huddersfield Repository

Lamidi, Kafayat. K and Williams, Dina

Leading transformational change in Higher Education: Discussion of literature and conceptual framework

Original Citation

Leading transformational change in Higher Education: Discussion of literature and conceptual framework.

Kafayat Lamidi 1[1], Dina Williams 2[2]

[1] University of Huddersfield
[2] University of Huddersfield

Abstract

Universities are changing and require new leadership approach. The aim of this paper is to review conceptual and empirical literature on the leadership of entrepreneurial university and propose a conceptual framework to evaluate role of leadership at university level. It is grounded in supporting frameworks on entrepreneurial university; the transformational role theory (TRT) a novel framework to explore how entrepreneurial university leaders influence the universities' performance with emphasis on leadership contribution to the transformational process.

The meta-analysis of existing literature sources provides an insight into the varying roles of leadership between organizations. Leadership in the public sector particularly the higher education institution (HEI) was examined with reference to reports, articles and books published on this research topic between the periods from 19th century to date. These sources were selected based on the issues of the content, context, outcomes of change, process, leadership, organizational and sectorial change (governance arrangements and funding systems). Based on this review, the paper develops a conceptual framework which can be later applied to empirical data.

The originality of the study is in its conceptualizations of transformational role theory underpinning transformational entrepreneurial leadership (TEL). TEL has distinctive features which help create appropriate leadership style in the public sector particularly in considering the unique nature of universities (it governance systems).

Keywords: Entrepreneurial University, Leadership, Transformational Entrepreneurial Leadership, Higher Education Institution, Change and Organisational Change.

Introduction

Most recently University's functions undergone significant transformation; they are expected to excel in education and research but also promote innovation and entrepreneurship. Universities are experiencing exceptional challenges in reflecting who they are, what they do, how they do it and why they do it. Increasingly, the emergence of the knowledge economy, the development of the information and communication technology, the economic instability, and decrease in state funding have brought new demands on higher education systems worldwide.

The existing literature covers a broad range of areas relation to the configuration and model of entrepreneurial university from re-formulating university mission and strategy and re-aligning

university with external challenges and demands to embedding entrepreneurship education throughout university curricular and developing infrastructure to support graduate entrepreneurship. Yet little attention has been given to HOW entrepreneurial transformation happens and what is a role of university leaders in implementing of this change.

Spillane et al (2004) acknowledge that there is little contribution on how education leaders enact changes. Stensaker et al. (2013) and Neary et al. (2011) studies reveal that the academics are restrained in demonstrating their creative and innovative skills to the core functions and restructuring of the university due to the decision-making structures (see also Tierney, 2004; Whitley, 2008; Lamont, 2009). Leadership in public sector differs from the one in private sector. Public sector leadership is characterised by transactional rather than transformational. This paper proposed a notion of transformational entrepreneurial leadership (TEL) that suitable for tackling the changes in HEIs. The paper also identifies the roles of TEL and highlights the key qualities required by academic leaders to lead the university entrepreneurially. Thus, this paper seeks to fill the growing gap in understanding of the role of leadership in entrepreneurial performance of the UK universities.

Background

The universities across the world are in transition. The traditional idea of the university as a semi-autonomous institution charged with transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next and creating knowledge for future generations doesn't address the modern challenges of globalisation, further political and societal pressure. Increasingly universities are being required to operate more entrepreneurially, commercialising the results of their research and spinning out new, knowledge-based enterprises and play an active role in knowledge economy.

In recent years, the concept of entrepreneurial university draw attention of academic scholars and policy makers who are trying to define or/and delineate the phenomenon. There is a growing literature on university and academic entrepreneurship offering extensive meta-analysis of existing literature (Rothaermel et al., 2007) as well as individual models of entrepreneurial university (Guerrero et al., 2012; Kim, 2011; Nelles et al., 2010). Nelles et al. (2010) provided an emergent framework for studying entrepreneurial universities, taking advantage of entrepreneurial architecture. They categorized the elements of an entrepreneurial university in five groups: structures, systems, strategies, leadership, and culture. Guerrero et al (2010) also have shown that using institutional economics and resource based view (RBV) can help comprehend the relations between environmental factors (formal and informal) and internal factors (Resources and capabilities) involved in the transition processes of universities.

The Commission of the European Communities (CEC, 2003) emphasis that universities are key contributors to lifelong learning and in many respects holds the key to the knowledge economy and society (as well as Etzkowitz, 2003). The "obsession of the public sector practice on a dominant managerial principle can be shaped through shared meaning" (Zanetti et al., 2013:128). The European Commission (2013a) in its Modernization Agenda highlights the need for universities to renew their governance systems and develop more flexible financial systems. Shattock (2013) suggests that there is the need to shrink the role of governance and reinforce that of leadership and

management. As supported by Washington et al. (2013) who put forward that it is important to reconceptualise the institutional leaders' role in maintaining the legitimacy of the institutions. Stensaker et al (2013) in their study of five Nordic region universities confirm that there is need for new types of academic leadership in the higher education and what skills are required. Middlehurst (2013) points out that university need to update their structures and systems in order to meet up with the changes in the sector. We could assert that re-modernizing the governance structure and responding effectively to the demands of the knowledge society is central to leadership function in HEIs and therefore there is the need for new leadership style.

With all up-to-date research, a notable fact is that the quests for new leadership who will reshape the governance systems of the universities and simultaneously responding to environmental requirements need greater attention in the HEIs. Transformational entrepreneurial leadership has distinctive features which help create appropriate leadership style in the public sector particularly in considering the unique nature of universities; it governance systems, "production of scholarship, new ideas and training of elites" (Shattock, 2009:1). This topic is important because universities are playing a fundamental role in reducing the social-economic pressures in the society.

Role of university is changing, this therefore dictate a new format for the universities and the demands for universities to do more. To achieve this, universities from inside out have to change the way they operate. To enact this change we need a transformational leadership in the higher education systems that will respond effectively to the requirements of the knowledge economy. However, if there is no need for change transactional rather than transformational leadership will be effective

This study will be used to develop on King et al. (2005:88) notion that transforming the institution requires "doing your own work". The analysis is grounded in two conceptions of transactional and transformational leadership. On the basis of organisational theory, the results may support the notion that transformational leadership has a more positive effect on organisational performance and minimise the effects of change and uncertainty (Lowe et al., 1996; Conger, 1999; Judge et al., 2004). This paper will therefore suggest the appropriate leadership style, its contributions and roles to the changes in the HEIs.

The paper uses a framework developed by Pettigrew (1985) and Pettigrew et al. (2001) involving change management drivers supported by Kuipers et al. (2013) to investigate leadership roles and contribution in transforming change within the HE context.

Review Approach

The timeframe and research context are selected on the following criteria: firstly, this paper uses the seven change management factors suggested by Pettigrew (1985), Pettigrew et al (2001) and Kuipers et al (2013) to understand the changes within the HEI system and provide solutions to effectively handling the changes, so it searches for literature from the 19th century to date to see input from the perspective of other writers. Secondly, "entrepreneurial university emerges in the late 19th century in the US University" (Etzkotwitz, 2003:109). Thirdly, some authors (e.g King et al, 2005) believe that authors of leadership and management take their study at mythical level therefore selection of literature within this timeframe avoid this distortion and in-depth historical aspects. In addition, transformational leadership begins to gain consensus in the 19th century and

predominantly becoming interest area within the education systems in the 20th century. In this regard, it is observed that leadership in the 19th century is more characterised by situational approaches; transactional and transformational leadership (see Table 1 below). It can be deduced that both entrepreneurial university and transformational leadership emerge between the periods of 19th and 20th century and more progressively within the educational system.

Authors	Definition	Approach
Stogdill (1950: 3)	Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement.	General
Hemphill & Coons (1957: 7)	Leadership is considered as the behavior of an individual in directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal.	Situational-Transformational
Prentice (1961: 143)	Leadership involves the accomplishment of a goal through the direction of people and a leader is one who successfully marshals his/her human collaborators towards the achievement of certain goals	Situation-transformational
Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik (1961: 24)	Leadership is interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a particular end	Situational-transactional & transformational
Stogdill (1974: 411)	Leadership is the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction.	Situational-transactional & transformational
Hollander (1978: 1)	Leadership is the influential process between a leader and the followers.	General
Katz & Kahn (1978: 528)	Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization.	Situational-Transactional
Cribbin (1981)	Leadership is an influential process through which managers influence employees to comply with what is required and do well what ought to be done.	Situational-Transactional
Rauch & Behling (1984: 46)	Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement.	General
Donelly, Ivancevich & Gibson (1985: 362)	Leadership is an attempt at influencing the activities of followers through the communication process and toward the attainment of some goal or goals	General
Hersey & Blanchard (1988: 86)	Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation	General

Authors	Definition	Approach
Hosking (1988: 153)	Leaders are those who consistently make effective contributions to social order, and who are expected and perceived to do so	General
Batten (1989: 35)	Leadership is a development of a clear and complete system of expectations from the followers	General
Bass (1990: 19-20)	Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the people. It occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Any member of the group can exhibit some amount of leadership	Situational-Transformational
Cohen (1990: 9)	Leadership is the art of influencing others to their maximum performance to accomplish any task, objective or project	Situational-Transformational
Jacobs & Jaques (1990: 281)	Leadership is a process of giving meaningful direction to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose	Situational-Transformational
Conger (1992: 18)	Leaders are individuals who establish direction for a working group of individuals who gain commitment from this group of members to this direction and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction's outcomes	Situational-Transformational
Zalenik (1992)	Leadership requires using power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people.	Situational-Transactional
Jaques & Clement (1994: 4)	Leadership is the process in which an individual sets the purpose or direction for others and gets them to move along together with him or her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment	Situational-Transformational
Kouzes & Posner (1995: 30)	Leadership is the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for the shared aspirations	Situational-Transformational

Authors	Definition	Approach
Yukl (2006:8)	defines leadership as the process of influencing others to understand and agree what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish common goals	General
Mullins (2008)	Leadership is a relationship through which one person influences the behaviour and actions of the other	General
Rollinson (2008)	Leadership further as a process in which leaders and follows interact in a way that enables the leader to influence the actions of the followers without coercion in order to achieve certain objectives	General
Northouse (2010:3)	Leadership is defined as a process whereby someone influences others to achieve a common goal	General
Northouse (2013)	Leadership is a process to direct and manage the actions of subordinates in order to achieve certain goal and innovativeness	Situational-transformational
Kuipers, Higgs, Kickert, Tummers, Grandia & Van Der Voet (2013)	Leadership is driver of change	Situational-transformational

Table 1: Summary of Leadership Definition

Finally, the field of organization study is extensive, and a comprehensive review would reach beyond this journal's requested page number. The field entails a variety of specialist subjects such as entrepreneurship, leadership, entrepreneurial university as well as contributions from management study, organization, activity, systems and change management theories. In addition, entrepreneurial studies (e.g Wang et al., 2014) draw on a wide range of theoretical frames (see appendix 1). More so, majority of the literatures were selected from the public sector because the research context require assessing and understanding changes in public services, few from the private, a combination of public and private sectors, and majority of the literature are drawn from the educational perspective in order to ensure that the transformation issues were related to the education context.

This review is necessarily selective focusing on key words used to find articles including: 'transformational leadership', 'school leadership', 'leadership in education', 'entrepreneurial leadership', and 'entrepreneurial university'. These key words were used in combination with: 'public sector', 'public service', 'public administration', 'Higher Education Institutions', 'managing change', 'change management', 'organizational change', 'change leadership', 'leadership of change', 'transformation', 'Entrepreneurship' and knowledge economy.

Having gathered the list of articles, they were scrutinised in accordance to the requirements (timeframe, change issues), 98 articles meet these requirements and were thoroughly reviewed. Each article reviewed was labelled with one or more of the seven themes (context, content, process, outcome, leadership, organisation or sectorial). The contextual and content issues take into consideration country (referred to a certain country such as the US, UK or a comparative study) and the sector. After the completion of this process, theoretical frame was identified then a summary was devised for each article with emphasis on relevance and insights for the review. At this point, some articles were excluded because they are not related to the research topic and 2 others were included, and leave us with final list of 82 articles (see appendix 2). It was discovered that more than 25 theoretical perspectives were adopted in the articles of which leadership theories was the most frequently used. Other theoretical frames employed include innovation approach, activity theory, action theory, change, cognitive approach, institutional theory, stakeholder theory, economic theory, collectivist approach, policy paradigm, social constructionist, classical theory, bureaucratization and others (see appendix 1).

In addition, majority of related articles on the topics are from Higher Education Quarterly Journal (7), International Journal of Management Studies (7), The Leadership Quarterly (5), Academy of Management Journal (5), Harvard Business Review (5), Journal of Technology Transfer (5), Journal of Applied Psychology (4), Journal of Small Business Management (2), Journal of Business Ethics (2), Journal of Public Administration (2), Leadership and Organisation Development Journal (2), Political Science Series (2), Research Policy (2), The Political Quarterly and others (see appendix 2).

The summary of the review is depicted in Figure 1 below using the systematic literature review (SLR) process:

The SLR process was conducted to review literature because it provides a clear set of stages that can be trailed during reproduction of the study (Denyer et al., 2008; Thorpe et al. 2006), shows a systematic evidence that support the arguments of the research objectives (Pittaway et al., 2004), and gives a systematic analysis of knowledge generated (Wang et al., 2014). However, one of its shortcomings is that the use of strict key words may exclude relevant articles (Pittaway et al., 2004). On this basis, this paper considers SLR as a guiding technique that allows the researchers to structure and conduct the review in accordance to the research objectives.

Transformational Higher Education

To seek an understanding into the contribution of educational leadership in transforming the institution, this paper develop on Pettigrew (1985) and Pettigrew et al. (2001) notion that researchers should investigate how the four change management factors (context, content, process and outcomes) affect the change processes in the public sector. As supported by Kuipers et al. (2013) leadership is introduced as the fifth change management factor and suggests that a focus on values would be appropriate for examining change in the public organisations. Likewise, in the leadership literature, understanding effective leadership requires "analysis of contextual variables and processes" (Rickards et al., 2006:497). Therefore, these forces would be examined in this paper along with the inclusion of two additional themes- organisational and sectorial or institutional change as suggested by Kuipers et al. (2013).

Seven Change Management Factors in Higher Education

The contextual theme is considered as the 'where' factor that might involve internal and/or external influences. This include variables such as the entrepreneurship education or education reforms (e.g

DfE, 2013); culture, policies and technology (e.g Rothaermel et al., 2007); endorsement, recognition and reward (e.g Kirby, 2005); capitalization of knowledge and collaboration with industry, government and other institutional spheres (e.g Ezkowitz 2004); localization and commercialization (e.g O' Shea et al., 2005 and 2008); management structures, governance arrangement and leadership (e.g Sporn, 2001); a strengthened steering core, diversified fund-base and developmental periphery (e.g Clark, 1998). Pettigrew (1985) and Kuiper et al. (2013) refer to the content theme as the 'what' factor including initiatives, incentives and legislation. For example, contentual issue could be restructuring governance arrangement, leadership role and management structure (e.g Middlehurst, 2013). The process theme focuses on the 'how' and 'why' factors such as decision-making process, power and politics, an integrated entrepreneurial culture (Pettigrew, 1985; Clark, 1998). The outcome factor involves the "consequences of decisions" (Pettigrew, 1985:21) including "teaching, research and entrepreneurial activities" (Guerrero et al., 2012:47). For example, the HEI is changing in order to have social and economic impacts on the wider society such as university productivity and efficiency in both knowledge and technology transfer. In addition, outcome includes entrepreneurship education to improve students' skills, attributes and behaviour in order to be critical and creative oriented. Kuipers et al (2013) propose leadership in the change management literature as the vehicle that drives change. Also, some authors (e.g Kotter, 1996) in the organisational change study agree that leadership has great influence in the organisational change process. Kraatz et al. (2002:123) study also confirms that the role of leadership in the organisational change involves "knowledge transfer and inter-organisational learning, introduction of new ideas and assumptions, and replacement of the university values". This paper evolves round the leadership theme from the transformational view and therefore this will be extensively analysed further in other sections. One of the additional factors this paper introduces is the organisational theme which also describes the 'where' factor at organisational or institutional level of leadership roles (e.g Yokoyama, 2006); internal management structures and decision-making (e.g Middlehurst, 2004); managerial self-governance, seeking partnership with industry and government (Clark, 1998). For example, becoming entrepreneurial university requires changes to the organisational culture; to generate a shared vision entrepreneurial university requires an "entrepreneurial culture and entrepreneurial organizational structures" (e.g Guerrero et al., 2012:46). And finally introduce is the sectorial theme which focuses on the 'where' factor at the national level such as technology transfer oriented towards the creation of university spin-offs and stimulated academic heartland (Clark, 1998; Niosi, 2006). In this paper, this is conceptualise as institutional factors. For example, the introduction of various reforms in the public sector particularly within the higher education system has transformed the sector such as sourcing for fund and finances from other bodies rather than solely on the government. These variables are summarised in Table 2 below:

Change Management Factors	Defined as	Referenced in existing literature by
Context	Funding base diversification	Clark (1998)
	Networking and partnering with industries, government and other universities	Etzkowitz (2004)

Change Management Factors	Defined as	Referenced in existing literature by
	Communication, implementation and incorporation	Kirby (2005)
	Institutional strategies, purpose and goals	Yokoyama (2006)
	Culture, policies and technology	Rothaermel, Agung & Jiang (2007)
	Government policy and legislation	Brown (2010)
Content	Entrepreneurial activities and culture	Sporn (2001)
	Fees/funding/grants	Middlehurst (2012)
	Power-base and authourity levels	Stensaker & Vabø (2013)
Process	Human, physical and finacial capital	O'Shea, Allen, Chevalier & Roche (2005)
Outcome	Extensive research support, performance, efficiency and productivity of technology transfer	Kim (2011)
	Entrepreneurship program	Guerrero & Urbano (2012)
	Capabilities and quality	Middlehurst (2012)
Leadership	Leaders, managers and governors	Middlehurst (2004)
	Strategic planning committee, leading administrators, university presidents, departmental heads and senior levels faculty members	Yokoyama (2006)
	VCs, Pro and deputy VCs, registrars and senior executive officers, HR directors, Deans, HoD, faculty managers and leadership development managers	Bolden, Petrov & Gosling (2008)
Organisational/Institutional	Managerial self-governance, seeking partnership with industry and government	Clark (1998)
	Management structures and decision-making	Middlehurst (2004)
	Leadership roles	Yokoyama (2006)
Sectorial	Stimulated academic heartland	Clark (1998)

Change Management Factors	Defined as	Referenced in existing literature by
	The characterisation of higher education by preservation and dissemination of knowledge	Coaldrake (1999b)
	University spin-offs	Niosi (2006)
	Organisational actorhood	Bosetti & Walker (2010)
	Educational reforms	DfE (2013)

Table 2: A Summary of the Seven Change Management Factors

Leadership in the flexible-specialised economy

As noted earlier, this paper gives important consideration to the leadership issue. Leadership is a process to direct and manage the actions of subordinates in order to achieve certain goal and innovativeness (Yukl, 2002 and 2006; Northouse, 2013). Leadership can be considered as a transformational process where subordinates are motivated to do more than what is required of them (Shamir et al., 1993; Yukl, 1999; Davies, 2005). Scholars in the organisational change literature (e.g Kotter, 1996) astutely point out that leadership is a major force in the organisational change processes. Similarly, in the public administration literature, leadership is defined as the driver of change (Kuipers et al., 2013). From these pespectives, it is the process through which activities and people are co-ordinated to achieve a goal

Educational leadership is seen as a culture of combined attributes because there is opportunity for academics to learn from each other via seminar presentations and others. There is the need for collective intelligence to lead in a rapidly changing and highly demanding society (Brown et al., 2001). As supported by the UK government's White Paper, Our Competitive Future: Building the Knowledge-Driven Economy (DTI, 1998) knowledge-based economy is more about effective utilisation and exploitation of all types of knowledge in various activity approaches. Similarly, universities need to collaborate with business and industry to develop and apply knowledge for societal gain (Coaldrake, 1999). Bosetti et al (2010:7) study confirms that universities are autonomous institutions which are "exceptionally significant with the capacity to provide solutions where other bodies cannot". The knowledge triage of the university is challenged by a broad "value system" such as developing entrepreneurship skills, promoting research, enhancing university-government-industry relationships and embodying an enterprise culture (Peters, 2002; Bosetti et al., 2010:6). Knowing that the external context (such as advancement in knowledge, globalisation and others) is the key factor that threatens the higher institutions' role in the economy, the learning and strategies aspects of the University should be ultimately focus on the promotion of students learning and university from within and outside need changing to meet the demands of the society (Dearing Report, 1997). Likewise, it is a challenge on HE leadership in retaining and maintaining the university's mandate.

Transformational leadership in transforming the institution

In decades, there has been extensive growth in leadership from the trait and style theories to situational approaches all of which continue to be grounded on the leader considering that the subordinates are "passive in the leader-follower" relationship (Bolden et al., 2008:360). Between the 80s to date the transformational leadership (TL) emerged as one of the new leadership styles (charismatic, visionary and transformational) suggested by the English researcher, Bryman (1980) as leadership that recognises the need to engage subordinate in the process with focus on the charismatic attribute of the leader (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1999). Zanetti et al (2013) accept that that transformation in the public service requires leadership with the "ability to engage with and persuade others to have interest in the changes" (see also Holt, 2008; Zanetti, 1998:112; King et al., 2005). Therefore, leadership in the public sector is about coping with change (Kotter, 1990) and the leaders must be credible and have adequate knowledge in the process of transforming the University (Gabris et al., 2001; Kavanagh et al., 2006). The inference from this analysis is that as universities are going through a transition period, the transformational leadership style need to be explored.

In addition, Davies (2005) contends that there are various forms of leadership in the educational context. These include ethical, sustainable, invitational, constructivist, political, emotional, distributed, learning-centred or instructional, strategic, transformational and entrepreneurial leadership. From Davies' (2005) perspective, strategy is associated with wider components of the institution; it does not take into account daily operations. In contrast, Bolden et al. (2008:335) argues that while leadership styles in higher education "constitute various forms", their practicalities remain under simplified. Also, a review on school leadership by National College for School Leadership (2012) identifies transformational leadership as one of the two leadership approaches considered to be effective in schools. The report confirms that combining transformational with instructional leadership result in effective leadership in schools. In our view, strategic, entrepreneurial and transformational leadership have impact on change and constitute similar elements required for effective leadership performance however, transformational leadership has been proved more effective than other styles in different organizational settings of different countries in the knowledge-based society (Riggio et al., 2012).

Furthermore, employees' level of job satisfaction is maximised (Hatter et al., 1988; Koh et al., 1995). Transformational leaders have confidence in their employees and communicate high performance expectations of them (House, 1977). These leaders are persistence and demonstrate high level of initiative until the organisational goal is achieved (Eyal et al., 2004). In addition, transformational leaders enhance the "self-concept and sense of self-efficacy" of subordinates by aligning their individual and joint identification with the goals and objectives of both the leader and the organisation thereby stimulating them to work "beyond performance expectations" compare to that of the transactional leaders (Riggio et al., 2012:50; Shamir et al., 1993).

As confirmed in the study of Seltzer et al. (1990:694), transformational leader behaviour using the scale of initiation; provision of information and structure to tasks and the scale of consideration; being open and show concern about employees' welfare add to the variance of subordinates' satisfaction and leaders' effectiveness but a dyadic effect on subordinates' extra efforts. Principally, the behaviour is concerned with tasks accomplishment and maintenance of good relationship between the leader and the subordinates. Similarly, some empirical studies (e.g Engelbrecht et al.,

2004; Hood, 2003) confirm that the altruistic behaviour and ethically-centred values of transformational leaders produces significantly more positive impacts which in turn leads to a morally institutional atmosphere than other leadership styles. In a different study (e.g Riggio et al., 2012) the effectiveness of transformational leaders on performance has been investigated in various establishments including the educational system (e.g Harvey et al 2003; Tucker et al., 1990), Canadian hospitals (e.g LeBrasseur et al., 2002) and human service organisation in the United State (e.g Seltzer et al., 1990). The results confirm that the relationship between transformational leadership behavioural components (I's) and subjective indicators (perceptions of subordinates about the leader's performance) are much stronger than the objective indicators (outcome-based performance such as productivity or quality). Using the Bass et al (2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), the finding supports the notion that transformational leadership enhances positive performance and encourages subordinates to perform at higher levels than other leadership styles. Also, in a Chinese-Canadian cross-cultural study (Zheni et al., 2013:135), it is confirmed that there is a positive relations between transformational leaders and subordinates' autonomous motivation cross-culturally and higher "collectivistic values" were related to higher autonomous motivation however there is no significant moderation of collectivist values on motivational effect of transformational leaders.

As described in Bass (1985) the behavioural components of transformational leaders involve inspirational motivation, idealised influence, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation (see below).

Inspirational Motivation (IM): this is associated with the ability of the leader to demonstrate enthusiasm and optimism. The leader converses an appealing vision thereby providing the workforce with sense of belongings and meaning in their job. This is consider as what Thompson et al. (2010) referred to as strategic vision; like strategic leaders, transformational leaders will ensures that the university has a clear direction and resources to achieve its goals. The Idealised Influence (II) constitutes idealised attributes and idealised behaviours (Bass et al., 2000). Leaders with these characteristics acknowledge the moral and ethical importance of key decisions and consider followers' most important values and beliefs. As accepted by Burns (2005:12) who put forward that leadership is a "moral and ethical territory" suitable for goal accomplishments. In this dimension, transformational leaders give clear "vision and a sense of mission" (Northouse, 2013:191). It is the ability of the leader to behave morally by being good example (role model). It entails that subordinates highly believe in their leader, tend to emulate him/her and strongly connected with his/her identity (Gerbert et al, 2012). Transformational leader transforms subordinates' beliefs, attitudes and values thereby motivating them to perform beyond expectations (Antonakis, 2003; Yukl, 1999). Thompson et al (2010) refer to this as embodying change; related to the strategic leaders, transformational leaders are symbolically highly significant in the change process to be a role model for future strategy. This focuses on the emotional component of the leader (Antonakis, 2012). The Individualised Consideration (IC) describes the leader's ability of being supportive and encouraging, providing appropriate materials and resources needed for subordinates to carry out their job effectively. This reflects the leader's coaching and mentoring behaviour (Gerbert et al, 2012). Finally, the Intellectual Stimulation (IS) refers to the ability of the leader to create awareness and challenge subordinates to handle problems in new dimensions (Bass 1985; Kark et al., 2003). Waldman et al (2008) suggest that this behavioural component may enhance the leader's ability to perform the visionary and change agent roles. It could be assert that this is the degree at which

transformational leaders energise employees to carry out activities in innovative ways. In essence, TLs use IS to encourage and challenge employees to try new ways of doing things, and think about work-related problems in different dimensions. This is known as pragmatism; similar to the strategic leader, transformational leader is able to make things happen and bring positive results (Thompson et al, 2010).

Inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration are associated with communication competence (Flauto, 1994). Most importantly, the ability to engage expertly in interpersonal communication is vital for transformational leadership (Barge, 1994; Lian et al 2012). However, the effectiveness of transformational leaders and performance level of subordinates lies on the integration of these four attributes (Barling et al., 1996; Dvir et al.; 2002; Lowe et al., 1996).

Based on the above analysis, the core principle of transformational leadership is value. Transformational leaders place value on their subordinates that instigate professional and personal development like self-direction, recognition and achievement (Sarros et al., 2001). Shamir et al. (1993) agrees that transformational leaders influence subordinate self-esteem. Transformational leaders empower employees to take responsibilities thereby improving their capacity to work on own initiative and encourage them to be more creative (Dvir et. al., 2002). However, these leaders are self-protective by ensuring that their own and their subordinates security and safety is guaranteed.

Of all the authors (e.g Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Avolio et al., 1999; Bass et al., 2000; Groves et al., 2011) who have attempted to distinguish between transformational and transactional leadership styles have detailed the differences in the change-oriented leadership literature. Transformational leadership is a values-laden influential process in which values messages are convey between the leaders and subordinates while the latter is a transaction-based leadership that reward subordinates for compliance (Burns, 1978). For Bass (1985) transformational leadership transforms subordinates' individual values to collective values which support the organisational vision whereas transactional leadership involves exchange process in which the leader rewards the subordinates in ex-change of their performance. In the event of enhancing socio-economic changes trans-formation leadership style is considered most suitable while that of transactional is appropriate for creating substantial organisational change (Avolio et al., 1999). Bass et al. (2000) add that transformational leadership is characterised as idealised attributes, idealised behaviours, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration while transactional leadership is based on "contingent reward and management by exception" (as well as Onorato, 2013:42). Some authors (e.g Avolio et al., 1988; Barling et al., 1996) add that the skills and behaviours of transformational leadership can be developed. In addition, Rickards et al (2006:86) argue that transactional leadership is considered as exhibiting more transformational behaviours and not showing "pure transformational style". In comparing the two styles, transformational shows some elements of transactional style while the later does not have any element of the former. De Luque et al. (2008:633) point out that stakeholder values of the transformational leadership stimulate "long-term" vision and ethical values while the economic values of the transactional leadership emphasis short-tern vision. Groves et al. (2011) study confirm that transformational leadership is associated with leader stakeholder values while that of transactional is leader economic values. Transformational leadership is becoming grounded in ethical and moral aspiration as it enhances the level of the individual conduct of both the leader and employees (Burns, 1978) while Transactional leadership entails the "exchange" relationship between leader and subordinates to tolerate each other self-interest (Rickards et al., 2006:84).

Despites these difference, both leadership styles are "value-centred" leadership that reflect best leaders' style (Grove et al., 2011:1; Rickard et al., 2006) but in different ways. The British researchers, Rickards et al. (2006: 86) point out that transformational add to the effectiveness of transactional leadership and does not "replace" it therefore both are best leadership styles. These differences are summarised and presented in Table 2 below:

Characteristics	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Literature
Values Base	Leader-stakeholder values	Leader-economic values	Grove et al., (2011)
Change Type	Enhance socio-economic change	Facilitates substantial change	Avolio et al. (1999)
Behavioural Components	Individualised Consideration, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Idealised attributes and idealised behaiour.	Contingent reward and management by exception	Onorato (2013:42); Bass (1985); Bass et al (1994); Avolio et al (1999)
Empowerment	Provides an empowering atmosphere where autonomy, commitment and job satisfaction flourish under challenging and motivating work enviroment	Exchanges rooted in self-interests	Avoili et al (1999)
Motivation	Uplifting morale, motivation and standards of subordinates	Respond to subordinates' immediate self-interests	Avoili et al (1999)

Table 3: Distinguishing Attributes of Transformational & Transactional Leadership

The inference from the above Table is to establish factual claim to support the proposed framework. It can be deduced that transformational leadership style is well suited to respond to the on-going change in the public sector specifically within the higher education system.

Public vs. Private Sector Leadership

Leadership in public sector is significantly different from leadership in private sector. "Contextual complexity" has greater influence on the significant differences between leadership in different organisations (Brunner, 1997:219). Baliga et al (1988:130) contend that organisational and environmental contexts; "culture, structures, levels of discretion, types of opportunities, types of problems and missions" are contributing factors that distinguish one organization from the other. In addition, researchers of administration and management studies (e.g Kuipers et al., 2013; Hooijberg et al., 2001; Leithwood, 2003; Orazi et al., 2013) identify the differences to include environmental forces, nature, structures and processes of organisations which in turn affect how leaders lead. With this, leadership in the public sector is gaining major contribution in the public administration leadership literatures (Orazi et al., 2013). It can be asserted that leadership in private and public sector is influence by their nature of businesses. Contrary to private sector leadership, leadership in the public sector is characterised as bureaucratic leadership; more responsibilities and high level of autonomy (Van Wart, 2003). From the same perspective, Pedersen et al (2008:327) describe leadership in the public sector as "centralisation of authority" which counter-balances the management opportunities.

Considering the environmental characteristics, in the United State (Northern American), leaders in public sector such as educational organisation (such as the university) are characterised by self-transcendence value and higher importance to openness to change than leaders in private sector (Johnson, 1998). Also, leaders in public sector are altruistic and service oriented (Kempton et al 1995; Westley, 1997).

Besides, public sector leaders are more adaptive and innovative oriented because the organisation's goals and objectives are more vague and intellectual than their counterpart (DiMaggio et al., 1990; Howard et al., 1995). These leaders are characterised by having overarching goal towards social and economic developments (Devall, 1991; Mitchell et al., 1991; Sale, 1993). In addition, developing external relationships and influencing stakes is the main focus for public organisations particularly the American universities. More recently, these organisations are developing working relationship with businesses and government agencies while in private organisations there is equal balance between activities (Dunlap et al., 1991; Howard et al, 1995). In essence, leadership in public sector is more about creating the greatest good for the greatest number of subordinates while firmly committed to the organisation's goal.

Form the above analysis, leaders in the public sector must behave as transformational leaders (Orazi et al., 2013). These leaders are characterised as being charismatic in their individual and active style of influencing subordinates (Bryman, 1992). These leaders are not directive in order not to affect their disposition. In essence, they generate enthusiasms, open problems to new options and approach issues in new ways. Where there is great opportunity and rewards, these leaders work from high risk positions (Egri et al., 2000). These leaders use intuition and empathetic to relate with their workforce (Zaleznik, 1977). In the course to achieve organisational success, transformational leaders articulate an appealing vision (Portugal et al., 1994). Moreover, Pawar et al. (1997) point out that transformational leaders use simple and adhocracy structures. With these structures organisational vision emerges from the leader and subordinates identification of the leader's vision facilitate its acceptance. That is these organisational structures aid innovation and receptivity to organisational change thereby staff cohesively work as a team (Egri et al., 2000).

Current Higher Institution Issues and Solutions

Scholars of leadership literature (e..g Bass, 1985; Henton et al., 1997) acknowledge that the complexity of leadership is due to the emergent of shared-vision in the twentieth century, increasingly working in a knowledge environment and the growth in the range of leadership skills required within public firms including the education systems. The education system is currently undergoing significant change, with a lot of institutions looking closely at how they can strengthen their partnerships with industry, government and other schools. A major emerging area is that many universities are recognising that they could do more and work better by establishing relationships with others. For example, drawing on the experiences and expertise of people from different or similar areas is a collection of ideas and knowledge that could enrich effective working practices which are mutually respected and supported. This section therefore addresses the central issues facing the HE and academic leaders.

The issues about university sustaining in the knowledge-based economy include: Choice and organisational identity, reforms and change, transforming management structures, new

leadership/management responsibilities, power and authority, redesigning governance and leadership, control and strategic autonomy. This section of the paper provides an overview of these issues and implications for leadership practice in the higher institutions. It should be noted that some of these subjects are not completely separate; some mediate into the other. For example, control of strategic autonomy and changes to the governance arrangement are central to leadership function. Therefore leadership in higher institutions must to be stronger.

Outcome of Fees and Funding in Higher Education (HE)

The major consequence of the economic recession on higher education is on tuitions and funding. Globally, there is increase in educational cost which "affordability become challenge" for both students and their parents (Educause, 2010). As a means of financial support most institutions in England are providing scholarships in various form ranging from 25%, 50% to full fee-waiver (100%) but the inability of the opportune students to progress successful become a cost to the university then a challenge for both academic leaders and the education system. This is used as a mechanism to challenge competition among universities. However, investments in education have a long-term benefit for both students and for the economy, and need to be more efficient in order to improve outcome and increase productivity (OECD, 2008). With this support, UK HE provides "direct in-out benefits to the economy through the production of additional skilled labor force" (Esson et al., 2013:406). Despite the increase in tuition and fees, the number of graduates continues to outgrow. For example, statistics from OECD (2013:2) reveals that over the past decade the post-secondary UK graduation rate rise from 42% in 2000 to 47% in 2005 and 51% in 2010 to 55% in 2011, the second highest after Poland and above the OECD average of 39%. Also age between 15-29years are facing tough transition into higher education and the labour market, and between the periods of 1999 to 2008 there has been 25% rise in the number of undergraduate students in the UK HE institution (OECD, 2008 & 2013). The message from the figure is that the demand for education will continue to rise due to high demand of skilled work. Also, the data prove the expectation that the rise in tuition will lead to a decline in number of student and rate of graduation wrong. The challenge for university and leaders is the capacity to meet student expectations and satisfy their experiences. To satisfy the demand for more educational need, institutions are sorting for new funding sources in order to respond to the rapid growth in student numbers and utilise the resources available the educational system must be re-invented to reflect flexibility in the quality of schooling (OECD, 2008).

Efficiency and Productivity Challenges

Students from across the globe are attracting to study and live in the UK with a number of factors contributing to this including, globalisation, growing population, national policy and many more (EC, 2012). Significantly, international students contribute to this output in Britain with an increase from 10.8% in 2000 to 13% in 2011 of the UK non-European students (OECD, 2013). Universities are taking various measures such as finance and human resources to maximise efficiency and reduce costs. Increasingly, as the number of students rises, universities are considering which key services are to be supplied and delivered on campus and which are to be efficiently resourced through "contractual dealings" with other institutions or corporations within or outside the country (Educause, 2010:4). For example, the continuous increase in the number of international students particularly from Hong Kong lead University of Huddersfield to outsource teaching services in Hong Kong making use of the same staff rather than recruiting all new staff to work over there. This save

the University the service costs while maximising its productivity and responding to demand in an efficient way. University of Huddersfield and its education leaders have been able to handle the situation because of their ability to respond to change and uncertainty. It is therefore requires that effective leadership in education must be flexible and adaptable to changes, drive for efficiency and alternative revenue. In this approach, higher education will be more productive to serve more students by utilizing capacity.

Reforms and change: implications for leadership and management responsibilities

Drawing on the postmodernism school, government is taking the lead in the transformation of public service especially the University with its various educational reforms; funding, curriculum and governance reforms. There are three reforms of paradigms identified by (Benington, 2007:328) namely: the "old public administration, new public management and networked governance". These paradigms are interconnected and form the basis for leaders' behavioural aspects and decision-making which in turn influence the operating system of the sector. These reform paradigms have significant implication on leadership. For example, with the funding reform, university must support government to ensure that students have wider access to education.

Governance and leadership: Implication on Collaboration

Governance is an approach to governing (Stimson et al., 2006). In this context, it is the way by which universities are controlled and managed with a structure that outlined the actions, rules, policies and procedures of decision-making. The growth in "economies complexity" at various levels has given rise to the importance of governance in today's world (Karlsson, 2012:9). Increasingly, organisations are building working relationships with one another specifically; with knowledge-intensive institutions like the University for ideas and contributions to strengthen their capacity in order to overcome the challenges and become more creative and innovative. Having an efficient governance to support collaboration between university and industry become an issue for both educational leaders and their institutions. In essence, the governance systems need changing to provide suitability for continuous adaption and gain a long term change. The implementation of various reforms differs between countries so is the governance changes implementation differs between institutions (Whitley, 2012). Most importantly, public organisations are places for change and to successfully implement the changes it requires an incremental transformation (King et al., 2005:89). In essence, becoming an entrepreneurial institution requires time; "sets a frame of reference" for what the transformation entails and how it will be pursued therefore, University need to take things one step after the other (Pettigrew, 1985:1). For effective leadership practice in redesigning the governance structure, the concept of Theme-Centred Interaction (TCI) can be adopted to open space for a fairly tightly integrated system to facilitate resolution. TCI aid a cooperative working relationship regardless of environmental conditions severity. The concept is suggested because various educational reforms (curriculum, funding and governance) are currently being pursued in school establishments and decision is made within internal and external borders. The application of the TCI concept will facilitate changes from within and outside the University. It is to enable the achievement of a balance between intellectual and emotional involvement (Cohn, 1975). As profiled in King et al (2005:97-98) in the topic '*Transforming Institutions: Insider/Outsider'*, the effectiveness of the "TCI concept" is tested. It worth noting that transformation was successful from outside the organisation than from within because of the

bureaucratic process therefore educational leaders need to encourage active partnership with all stakeholders.

From the above analysis, it can be recommended that the five leadership practices proposed by Kouzes et al. (2002) are essential aspects of TEL. these include:

(1) Challenging the process: educational leaders must have the capability to work through the process, reason creatively and critically to process and utilize the knowledge economy.

(2) Motivating a shared vision

(3) Encouraging others to perform: must have the ability to make changes, be able to share ideas with others

(4) Building a supportive environment

(5) Leading by example by being a role model

Building on King et al. (2005:88) notion of "doing your own work" educational leaders are transformational in their approach to work. The novelty of King and colleague's work in the public administration literature is that they use critical theory to investigate and profile the experiences of public sector leaders to offer solutions to the problems in public organisations demonstrating the theory in practice. Though their work uncover the socially constructed practices in the public sector this project is distinct in its conceptualisation of the TEL; most appropriate style to lead transformational public institutions, a notable contribution in the leadership and management literature. Drawing on this notion, academic leaders' work involves a unique combination of both individual and organisational commitment. They are not only performing their academic purpose but also working towards the transformation of the University. In addition, every academics is an individual who sees him or herself as part of the system and would like to be part of the whole transformation process, having this awareness generate the feeling and thinking about having the capability, independence, autonomy and power to do their job. Also, considering that we are in the historical era, people's expectations, perceptions and assumptions about the university governance and administrative systems is commitment to high standards which is measured through efficient performance. This requires academic leaders to have the attitude of doing their own work and be part of the whole governance and bureaucracy process. From this view, to generate more "public value" leadership in HEIs should be tailored towards the fulfilment of both institutional and legitimate mandates by serving the public interest in a flexible-specialised society (Moore, 2000:).

Some authors (e.g Graham, 2007) contend that academic leaders can achieve a distinctive leadership practice by not only working towards the implicit values of others but also facilitating clarity about their own personal values. In this regard, value is important in educational community and educational leadership because it is central to decision-making. Agreeably, articulating value on the individual and organisational side is essential for effective educational leadership practice. In this sense, it is crucial to reinvent governance to adapt to the bureaucratic process this would allow the University goal to be aligned with stakeholders' interests and priorities. Ultimately, academic leaders must have the capability to govern in spite of various policies with the attitude of being open to new issue.

Power and authority influence on strategic autonomy

Power has different meaning in various disciplines. In a general analysis, Burns (2005:11) contends that from the economics perspective, it can be measure as control of prices or production, from the historical perspective it is the activities of the rulers, from political point of view it is electoral votes and for psychologist, it is the impact of leaders on followers driven by their own motives rather than by quantities (such as monetary values). Kanter (1979:66) define power as "efficacy and capacity" that enables organisation to achieve its goals and a device for effective managerial behaviour. Increasingly, there can be the acquisition of functional productive power through empowerment towards the achievement of organisational goals by the leaders. Pfeffer (1992:14) points out that power is a "potential force" and one of the concepts in understanding the behaviours in organisations which could be rules, procedures and behaviours that are clearly set out as standards of the institutions that gives an individual the capability to achieve established goals and influence others (as well as Allen et al, 1983; Pfeffer, 1981; Salancik et al, 1977). As supported by Mintzberg (1983) control of organisational decisions and activities are influenced by various "organisational actors" with their different individual expectations (see also Pfeffer 1992:340). Therefore, understanding the stakeholders' interests (impacts and influences) on the University is fundamental. In this context, there is the need to consider the external coalition; comprises of the government, parents, students, partner institutions, suppliers, and general public and the internal coalition which constitute the staff. On a common ground the degree at which each individual exercises their power revels in the university identity. For example, the government finance majority of fund in the UK HEI and have high expectations in the quality standard of teaching and research activities of the university.

Generally, the government interventions such as policy and legislation of the governing body have impact on the control of universities. Similarly, control and strategic autonomy have influence on leadership practice; the leaders' power and authority. The extent to which academic leaders carry out their responsibilities is greatly influence by the decision of the project leaders (Neary et al., 2011; Whitley, 2008). The autonomy level of the university need to be encouraged; universities must be more independent, flexible and transparent to the societal needs and these would allow educational leaders to act within their authority and exercise their legitimate power.

The modern structural theories view power to be the same as authority and define power as the use of formal authority to accomplish organisational goals (Peter et al., 1962). In contrast, other writers (e.g Graham, 2007) distinguish between the two concepts by pointing to the value issues. Educational leaders lead because they are able to exercise some legitimate power (exercising leadership on role and position basis) which is "value-neutral" and is clearly recognised by subordinates as having the authority over them (p.46). The power and politics theories argue that power include control over scarce resources, ability to work the organisational rules, credibility, access to others perceived to be powerful, a centre place in a potent coalition (Shafritz et al., 1996:353). From the theory of organisational power and politics perspective, organisations are complex systems that consist of people and coalitions with their various beliefs, values, interests, perceptions, preferences and views (p.352). The value concept will be examined later. Contrary to power and politics organisation theory, the modern structural, organisational economics and systems theories view organisation as establishments whose organisational behaviour and decisions are directed towards achieving recognized organisational goals. From this end, power is the ability to influence other while authority gives leaders the power to exercise control over their subordinates.

The power and politics school (e.g Kotter, 1985) asserts that in the current business domain there is gap between the power require for a job and the power ascribed (authority) to the job. Similarly, power for an accomplishment is contingent upon what is to be achieved (Cohen et al., 1974). Cohen et al (1974) study reveals that universities have unrealistic goals and little knowledge about the responsibilities of the people involved. In essence, the study of leadership styles and traits will not determine the effectiveness of the leaders but rather understanding the power based (Kanter, 1979:66). We could conclude that apart from the expert power ascribe to the educational leaders' roles, there is the need to entrust on them the productive power to accomplish tasks to boost their creative and innovative skills. With this we could draw on the TEL sources of power which will be examined in detail in the next section.

TEL Power Source: integrating the work of Kanter (1979) and Holt (2008) there is two major sources of TEL power; the productive and integrative power respectively. The productive power: Kanter (1979) highlights that productive power is the functional ability of the leader to inform, supply, and support employees by providing them the required resources to get things done. This power allows leader and subordinates to have the capacity to act and embark on productive activities (Kanter 1997). From this definition the bases of productive power as noted in (Kanter 1979; 1997) are (i) supply power- the ability of the leaders to establish commitment to agreed goals and organize resources including materials and people (ii) informative power: the ability to communicate a clear vision and equip subordinates with latest information (iii) supportive power- the capability of the leader to create a supportive environment that would encourage and motivate the staff to innovate and try new ideas without fear of reprisal. This is the ability to reinforce and encourage high expectations. The productive power enables the leader to achieve positive and high performance.

The integrative power: as noted in Holt (2008) study, TEL must have the functional ability to work effectively with people inside and outside the University. These leaders must have the ability to negotiate and persuade stakeholders to show interest in the change. Sources of integrative power include (i) alignment power: the ability to align the University with other progressive organisations including profit and non-profit firms. This is the power to establish partnership (ii) co-operative power: the ability to employ the collaborative effort of the people involved. These leaders must be able to build strong and positive working relationship with staff and students (Brundrett 1999, Kotter 1999:124) (iii) collective power: the ability to influence and transform individual interest into a joint perspective. (Kanter 1997:131) add that the leader must have the ability to convert individual competence into organisational competence. This power allows the leader to exchange knowledge which transform into shared value and shared knowledge for the University and organisational power grows when shared (Kanter 1997).

Like organisational power, it could be suggested that the two power bases identified above is transformational power which would enables transformational entrepreneurial leaders drive the organisation forward in the period of change. As exemplified in King et al. (2005:117) transforming organisation requires the leaders to be extremely "relational and productive". It is suggested that educational leaders need this power along other sort of authority to lead in a knowledge-based society.

Choice in Education and organisational identity

Unlike the classical school that view organisations as static structures, the organisations and environments school contend that organisations continuously move from one state of dynamic

equilibrium to another rather than being stagnant (Shafritz et al., 1996). Universities have choice of becoming entrepreneurial in different ways; University gain its own direction and independence even though the government fund it, it set its own priority. In the 18th century hardly can university be independent but now university is gaining freedom by moving out from a traditional teaching institution to play a prominent role; they are now gaining some independence. Also, university becomes the knowledge circle as it begins to establish the transfer process joining with organisation in its region thereby creating interaction with its environment. Drawing on this, university has choice to transform the bureaucracy of its structure and do things differently; however, it requires strategic thought and actions (King et al., 2005). Similarly, universities need to enhance student experience by providing options on what to study and where to study. In this context, student ownership is argued for in order to allow student take responsibilities of their own learning.

Local and Regional Relationship

Universities are integral part of their environment that must adapt and adjust to environmental demands for survival and in turn their decisions and actions influence their environments. As such universities need to operate an open system and establish foundations to strengthen their external relationships (Katz et al., 1966). There is the need for universities to be more flexible closely integrated and coordinated to maintain a constant relationship with their external environments. In addition, HEIs must respond in a non-bureaucratic mode to societal needs. University need to embed in its system the voices, beliefs, and experiences of others by engaging the community. Also, university leaders need to strive for national leadership recognition and awards to create awareness of their contributions and impacts on universities which in turn could lead to recognition for the institution. This will motivate all university leaders to be entrepreneurial in their leadership approach. It worth noting that the need for individual recognition can never be satisfied but it is fundamental for everyone to work towards the organisational goal and as such would like to feel proud about their institutions, be recognised with such establishment thereby having impact in its identity.

Though various literatures acknowledge the need for collaboration, the education system is one of the complex organisations which survival is the goal and relationships (Shafritz et al., 1996). Considering the concept of organisational identity, Universities are not independent institutions as they are conditioned by other organisations and publics. From the institutional theory perspective, beliefs about institutions emerged from and influenced by various actors and forces such as professionals, parents, government and general public. It could be seen that there is still some elements of power as influential variable within this context. As exemplified, universally, university differs in relations to their funding source, governance reforms implementation, strategy and capability which in turn characterises their identity. For instance, the so called "Hollow" type universities have limited control over resources not to mention being decisive (Whitley, 2012:498). Therefore, effective leadership practices need to be centred on the notion of driving change in the sector and building relationships on the basis of trust. Increasingly, coping with the changes at both organisational and sectorial level of the educational system require effective leadership (Yukl, 2010:508). We could assert that leadership is effective mechanism for these achievements however it requires planned and controlled actions. Likewise, the activities that keep the system stronger regardless of any environmental pressure must conform to the norms and social expectations of the institutional environments.

In addition, as universities compete for students, parents and students have variety of choices. Increasingly, institutions are experiencing a lot of pressure from their customers. Shafritz et al. (1996) study shows that competition is a powerful motivation that drives institution to become the University of Choice thereby increases their level of performance. It could be assert that to attract adequate number of student, universities must run program or course the students wish to study and/or encourage students to dictate the teaching method they prefer.

It can be deduced that successfulness of entrepreneurial university is greatly influenced by established goal, effective collaboration and cooperation of internal (staff, students) and external (government and cooperate business) stakeholders. In essence, these people's attitude, behaviour and perception must be shaped and modified towards the goals to become entrepreneurial.

Bureaucratic structures and transformational entrepreneurial leadership

Public organisations are characterised as a mechanistic management system with hierarchical structure of control, authority and communication in which activities and behaviours are regulated by the decisions of those with greater expertise (Burns et al., 1961; (King et al., 2005). In addition, public sector leadership and management are administrative and bureaucratic respectively (Van Wart, 2003). Similarly, University management structure is bureaucratic with administrative leadership which authority is "rational-legal"; a position of authority acquire through qualification (Graham, 2007:47; Hodgkinson, 1991). For decades, the fixation of this structure remains the same while there are changes to its environment. Such system would not enhance creativity and innovation within the educational systems. (Kanter 1997) points out that bureaucratic hierarchical system hinder interaction and relationship between people and activities. In essence, bureaucracy would not facilitate the implementation of entrepreneurial activities and transformation. Generally, most public organisations are experiencing this similar issue because they have the same structure. For example, Shaftritz et al. (1996) study revealed that the novel thing University can do is to give students the opportunity to exercise influence over key decisions that affect their learning activities and not to see them as customers with little input in the bureaucratic process. In this regard, provision and access to modern learning technologies should be available for student to facilitate and enhance their enterprise and entrepreneurial skill and development.

A key attribute that distinguish public organisations from that of private is their approach to work, they are committed to work in the interest of the public in "consistency to democratic values" (Denhardt et al., 2002:6). Though public organisations have different customer-based, they still take the same working approach. Drawing on the structural contingency theory, university should be a place where attitudes can be developed and modified which give people sense of responsibilities and accountabilities (King et al., 2005). With this, the university system needs to be structure to work for the will of the people. This requires that it is essential for the leaders to lead by example showing commitments to transparency and communication in order for transformational activities to have the potential for occurrence in the normal way. In essence, these leaders must make themselves available to people, listen to others and accept criticisms. In the same sense, the University system also need to operates and functions at the choice and desire of the societal need.

Furthermore, it can be suggested that to achieve a favourable performance in an entrepreneurial university, every individual must be able to feel and have the belief of what is called 'we all are in' rather than an isolated 'I'; a system where people opinion is respected and incorporated supported with a reward system on the basis of value derived from performance (King et al., 2005). As noted

earlier, bureaucracy is a constraint to creativity, innovation and successful implementation of change. It implication on effective leadership is the fact that it is the first point of resisting change. People become resentful to change because they are accustomed to certain ways of doing things and creativity is essential for the development of knowledge and change (King et al., 2005). To reduce the tensions of bureaucracy, as suggested in previous section, the Theme-centred interaction (TCI) idea may be employed into educational leadership. The practical application of the concept of TCI is aimed at providing support to the leaders by empowering the subordinates to have the feeling of more autonomous power within them (Cohn, 1975). Ruth Cohn in her German book titled 'Psychoanalysis Theme-Centred Interaction' published in 1975 introduced the concept to contextualise the relationship between the individual, organisation, activities and their environment. The balance between these variables is a potential for innovation and creativity which makes it a useful tool in the educational settings and leadership practice. Though the concept is widely used in the Humanistic Psychology and Education disciplines, it can be redesigned in social sciences as art of leading. It can be considered as a device to structure organisation for innovative purpose. With this, a collaborative working environment is encouraged leading to the creative use of resources (such as people and materials) then there is potential for more creativity.

The modern structural organisation theory concludes that at least a most suitable arrangement in light of the societal forces that will enable more involvement of and dependence on employees to define and redefine their positions and relationships (Shafritz et al., 1996). Theories of organisational culture and change assert that flexibility is constrained by organisational culture which basis of power is authority, hierarchical form, and dependence on rules that can obstruct lasting change. From this perspective, running the institution on a bureaucratic structure can deter the University from embarking on changes required to respond to the knowledge society. Bureaucracy system is suitable in a relatively stable environments therefore considering that institutions are continuously changing we could argue that there is the need to alter or modify this structural pattern. However, it should be noted that the organic structure is not argued for but the need for collective intelligence and decision-making at all level within the university is crucial.

Drawing on the contingency theory of organisations, university need to be open to environmental influences and similarly leadership effectiveness depends upon setting or situations (Thompson, 1967). Since no organisation exists in isolation therefore to survive HEIs must be structure to ease the acquisition of resources (Salancik et al., 1977). The resource dependence theory asserts that universities exchange resources with their environment as a prerequisite for survival. For example from the view of the institutional theory, majority of the environmental factors are subjective to socio-cultural challenges rather than efficiency and effectiveness of values to a prescribed structural form. Effectiveness of a leader is contingent on the match of leader's style to the situations. Some scholars (e.g Galbraith, 1973) agree that it is important to organise the structure of an organisation in relation to its environment when considering organisational performance.

Other researchers (e.g Hersey et al., 1977) argue that more attention should be given to the employees' willingness towards the accomplishment of the leader's visions. In essence, for the staff to be transformed into innovators and entrepreneurs as the University is becoming entrepreneurial, the system must be flexible and adaptive. In addition, to maintain strong relationship with business and government, the university must continuously support and exchange ideas. Therefore, operating in highly bureaucratic and hierarchical structure stifles collaboration and engagement with these bodies. It could be draw upon that leadership effectiveness is contingent upon both the activities and

environment of the organisation (Stogdill, 1974). Spillane et al (2004) study reveals that organisational arrangements are designed and re-designed on the basis of leadership activities. Therefore, considering the new demand on HEIs as key actor in the society coupled with the intense competition among universities in becoming entrepreneurial, the TEL is proposed. On this basis, the TEL is introduced as effective practice that will enable universities to respond effectively to the changes.

Based on the empirical and theoretical study reviewed above, it could be suggested that the followings are key qualities of TELs for leading an HEI:

(1)   Ability to influence and actively engaged

(2)   Ability to coach and mentor

(3)   Ability to adapt to unpredictable situations and take on challenges

(4)   The leader must be supportive

(5)   Such leader must be self-confidence and belief in his/her people

(6)   The leader must have sense of humour

(7)   This leader must be expose to new things and be able to do things in new ways by having the power to innovate in order to perform better

(8)   The leader must be tolerance and value-oriented (appreciate others)

(9)   H/She must be able to communicate a shared vision and shared value

(10)   H/She must be decisive

(11)   H/She must be highly committed to the organisation by not only fulfilling their professional roles but having intense consideration for the university.

In addition, TEL could perhaps consider the four core skills proposed by Bennis et al (2002:45) which are:

(1)   The ability to adapt to changing context

(2)   Ability to influence and engage other people in shared vision

(3)   Ability to negotiate and persuade and

(4)   Having a moral and ethical behaviour (trust and honesty).

Conceptual framework

In the conceptualisation of our framework, transformational and entrepreneurial leadership components are integrated. Having analyzed in detail the transformational leadership concept, the entrepreneurial leadership (EL) concept will now be review. Van Wart (2003:217) asserts that entrepreneurial leadership is a process that enables leaders to execute "practical process and cultural changes" which increase production and enhance quality. Entrepreneurs drive innovation and exploit opportunities by employing the "aspirational" style (Greenberger et al., 1988; Thompson, 2003:415). The behavioural component of EL include organisational innovativeness, pro-activeness and risk-taking (Covin et al., 1988; Eyal et al., 2004; Gupta et al., 2004; Sharma et al., 2011). In

addition, entrepreneurial institutions facilitate collective activity through social interaction between the people in order to encourage a shared understanding of the activity (Easterby-Smith et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2006). Thompson (2001:418) contends that entrepreneurs, entrepreneurial leaders and enterprising staff have "ability to balance" the charismatic and architectural roles in order to effectively manage opportunities and risks. Since entrepreneurial skills and attributes are becoming essential for tackling challenges and uncertainty, entrepreneurial leaders must therefore be self-confidence, prepared for change, creative and be able to see things differently (Egri et al., 2000). In this sense, entrepreneurial leadership shares the same attributes with transformational leadership by performing the charismatic role as depicted in figure 2.

From the above diagram, by transforming subordinates' interests, the leader is transforming the behaviour, attitude and orientation of the people. The above framework integrates the core skills, attributes and behavioural components of the two concepts to establish a fit for transformational change. Before writing about a concept there is the need for a criteria and definitions therefore TEL is a concept use to describe leadership of change, creativity and innovation (see figure 3 below). On this basis, such leaders are role models through their commitment by modifying own and others'

behaviours, providing the whole institutions detailed rationale about the change, able to handle uncertainty and sensitive to others.

Figure 1: Selection Criteria of TEL Concept

The diagram is represented in a pyramid to show the significant of change. The transformation of the HEI involves an enormous process of various activities such as drawing on the creative skills, ideas, knowledge, expertise and experiences of people to produce exceptional results. It is therefore conclude that this paper argues for leadership of change, creativity and innovation.

Conclusions and recommendations

Leadership in entrepreneurial university is becoming an important research area at the interface of entrepreneurial and leadership studies. This paper has suggest a new leadership style that tends to be 'most appropriate' in leading a transformational change. However, it can be applied in different context. From the above analyses, one could assert that for university leaders to become entrepreneurs they need to demonstrate two competencies: Firstly, innovation and adaptability- they need to be extremely innovative in order to keep pace with changes. As well as be very comfortable with rapid changes and competent in adapting to these changes. Secondly, productivity and profitability- this require that university leaders must have a leadership approach that generates superior performance, continuity and efficiency. Notwithstanding, University leaders' contributions towards the university success is to sustain the university's current performance and guarantee it future performance. In this sense, University leaders encourage others to work cohesively and effectively to reflect the entrepreneurial culture of the University.

The paper concludes by suggesting areas for further research on the configuration of university, thus:

Further research on entrepreneurial university could be extended in the impact of entrepreneurial university on economic growth and development. Also, there is no clarity in the definition of entrepreneurial university. Another interesting area for further research is to set criteria on evaluating universities' key performance indicators (KPI) and a study on the assessment of the criteria used to measure entrepreneurial university is required.

Reference

Allen, R. W. & Porter, L. W. (1983) Organisational influence processes. Glenview IL: Scott, Foresman.

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

Antonakis, J. & Day, V. D. (2012) The Nature of Leadership 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Avolio, B., & Gibbons, T. C. (1988) 'Developing transformational leaders: A lifespan approach.' In: Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness, ed. by Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999) 'Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.' Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72 (4), 441-463.

Baliga, B. R. & James G. H. (1988) 'An Organizational Life Cycle Approach to Leadership.' In Emerging Leadership Vistas, ed. by James G. Hunt, Rajaram Baliga B., Peter Dachler H., and Chester A. S. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Barge, J.K. (1994) Leadership: communication skills for organizations and groups, St. Martin's Press, New York.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, K. E. (1996) 'Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment.' Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(6), 827–832.

Bass, B.M. (1985) Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990) Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2000) Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Batten, J. D. (1989) Tough-minded leadership. New York: AMACOM.

Benington, J. (2007) 'The Reform of Public Services.' Stationery Office and National School of Government, London.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G. and Gosling, J. (2008) 'Tensions in Higher Education Leadership: Towards a Multi-Level Model of Practice.' Higher Education Quarterly, 62 (4), 358-376.

Bosetti, L. & Walker, K. (2010) 'Perspectives of UK Vice-Chancellors on Leading Universities in a Knowledge-Based Economy.' Higher Education Quarterly, 64 (1), 4-21.

Brown, J. (2010) 'Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education.' An Independent Review of HE Funding and Student Finance, 1-60.

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2001) Capitalism and social progress: The future of society in a global economy. Palgrave: Macmillan Ltd.

Bryman, A. (1980) Transformational Leadership. Book

Bryman, A. (1992) Charisma and leadership in organisations. London: Sage.

Burns, J.M. (1978) Leadership. New York: Harper Row.

Burns, J. M. (2005) Leadership. Leadership, 1(1), 11-12.

Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1961) The management of innovation. London: Tavistock Publications

Brunner, R. D. (1997) 'Teaching the Policy Sciences: Reflections on a Graduate Seminar.' Policy Sciences, 39 (2), 217- 31

Clark, B. R. (1998) Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation. Pergamon.

Coaldrake, P. (1999a) 'The Changing Climate of Australian Higher Education: An International Perspective.' Higher Education Management, March, 11 (1), 117-244.

Coaldrake, P. (1999b) 'Rethinking university work.' Paper presented at HERSDA Annual International Conference in Melbourne, July.

Cohen, W. A. (1990) The art of a leader. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass

Commission of the European Communities (CEC) (2003) 'The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge.' Communication from the Commission, COM 2003:58. Brussels: CEC

Conger, J. A. (1992) Learning to lead. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Conger, J. A. (1999) 'Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on developing streams of research.' The Leadership Quarterly, 10 (2), 145-179.

Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. (1988) 'The Influence of Organization Structure on the Utility of an Entrepreneurial Top Management Style.' Journal of Management Studies, 25, 217–259

Cribbin, J. J. (1981) Leadership: strategies for organizational effectiveness. New York: AMACOM

Davies, B. (2005) The essential of school leadership. London: Sage

Dearing (1997) 'Higher Education in the Learning Society.' The Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (The Dearing Report) [online] available from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/ncihe/ accessed [25 February 2014].

Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V. & Aristigueta, M. P. (2002) Managing human behavior in public & non-profit organizations. London: Sage Publications.

Denyer, D. and Tranfield, D. (2008) 'Producing a systematic review.' In: The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods, ed. by Buchanan, D. London: Sage, pp. 671–689.

Department for Education (2013) 'School funding reform: Next steps towards a fairer system & School funding reform: Arrangements for 2013-14' [online] available from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20131216163513/http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/s/school%20funding%20equia.pdf accessed [27 February 2014].

De Luque, M., Washburn, N., Waldman, D., & House, R. (2008) 'Unrequited profit: How stakeholder and economic values relate to subordinates' perceptions of leadership and firm performance.' Administrative Science Quarterly, 53(4), 626–654.

Devall, W., & Sessions, G. (1985) Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith.

DiMaggio, P. J. & Anheier, H. K. (1990) 'The sociology of non-profit organizations and sectors.' In Scott, W. R. & Blake, J, ed., Annual review of sociology, 16, 137-159. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Donelly, J. H., Ivancevich, J. M. & Gibson, J. L. (1985) Organizations: behavior, structure, processes 5th edition. Plano, Texas: Business Publications Inc.

DTI (1998) 'Our Competitive Future: Building the Knowledge Driven Economy'. The Government's 1998 Competitiveness White Paper, December.

Dunlap, R. E., & Mertig, A. C. (1991) 'The evolution of the U.S. environmental movement from 1970 to 1990: An overview.' Society and Natural Resources, 4, 209-218.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B., & Shamir, B. (2002) 'Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment.' Academy of Management Journal, 45(4), 735–744.

Easterby-Smith, M., Crossan, M. & Nicolini, D. (2000) 'Organizational learning: debates past, present and future.' Journal of Management Studies, 37, 783–796.

EDUCAUSE (2010) 'The Future of Higher Education: Beyond the Campus.' January, 1-20 [online] available from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/PUB9008.pdf [15 January 2014].

Egri, C. P., & Herman, S. (2000) 'Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations.' The Academy of Management Journal, 43(4), 571-604.

Engelbrecht, A., Van Aswegen, A., & Theron, C. (2004) 'The effect of ethical values on transformational leadership and ethical climate in organizations.' South African Journal of Business Management, 36 (2), 19–26.

Esson, J., & Ertl, H. (2013) 'Securing the future of higher education in England.' The Political Quarterly, 84 (3), 404-409 [online] available from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2013.12031.x/pdf [20 February 2013].

Etzkowitz, H. (2003) 'Research groups as 'quasi-firms': The invention of the entrepreneurial university.' Research Policy, 32 (1), 109-121.

Etzkowitz, H. (2004) 'The evolution of the entrepreneurial university.' International Journal of Technology and Globalization, 1 (1), 64–77.

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2001) Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations Continuum. London: Pinter

European Commission (2012) Immigration of International Students to the EU. Europe Migration Network Study [online] Available from http://www.infoeuropa.md/files/imigratia-studentilor-internationali-in-ue.pdf [16 January 2014].

Eyal, O. & Kark, R. (2004) 'How do transformational leaders transform organisations? A study of the relationship between leadership and entrepreneurship.' Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3(3), 209-233.

Flauto, F.J. (1994) The relationships among transactional leadership, transformational leadership, quality of leader-member exchange, and communicative competence: An integrated model, Dissertation. UMI Dissertation Services Ohio University: Ann Arbor, MI

Gabris, G.T., Golembiewski, R.T. & Ihrke, D.M. (2001) 'Leadership Credibility, Board Relations, and Administrative Innovation at the Local Government Level.' Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 11 (1), 89–108.

Galbraith, J. R. (1973) Designing Complex Organizations. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Gebert, D. & Boerner, S (2012) 'Fostering Artistic Ensemble Performance: Exploring the Role of Transformational Leadership.' Non-profit Management and Leadership, 22 (3).

Graham, H. (2007) Values for educational leadership. London: SAGE Publications Inc.

Greenberger, D.B. & Sexton, D.L. (1988) 'An Interactive Model of New Venture Initiation.' Journal of Small Business Management, July, 1–7

Groves, S. K. & LaRocca, A. M. (2011) 'Responsible Leadership Outcomes via Stakeholder CSR Values: Testing a values-centred model of transformational leadership.' Journal of Business Ethic, 98, 37-55.

Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2012) 'The development of an entrepreneurial university.' The Journal of Technology Transfer, 37 (1), 43–74.

Gupta, V., MacMillan, I. C. & Surie, G. (2004) 'Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct.' Journal of Business Venturing, 19, 241–60

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988) 'Superiors' Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership.' Journal of Applied Psychology, 73: 695-702.

Harvey, S., Royal, M., & Stout, D. (2003) 'Instructor's Transformational Leadership: University Student Attitudes and Ratings.' Psychological Reports, 92: 395-402.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957) Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stodgill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, pp. 6-38.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1988) Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Henton, D., John M., & Kimberly W. (1997) Grassroots Leaders for a New Economy: How Civic Entrepreneurs Are Building Prosperous Communities. San Fran- cisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991) Educational Leadership: The Moral Art. New York: State University of New York.

Hollander, E. P. (1978) Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships. New York: Free Press.

Holt, R. (2008) 'Using Activity Theory to Understand Entrepreneurial Opportunity'. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 15 (1), 52-70.

Hood, J. (2003) 'The relationship of leadership style and CEO values to ethical practices in organizations.' Journal of Business Ethics, 43, 263–273.

Hooijberg, R. & Choi, J. (2001) 'The Impact of Organizational Characteristics on Leadership Effectiveness Models: An Examination of Leadership in a Private and a Public Sector Organization.' Administration and Society, 33-40.

Hosking, D. M. (1988) 'Organizing, leadership, and skilful process.' Journal of Management Studies, 25, 147-166.

House, R.J. (1977) 'A 1976 Theory of charismatic leadership.' In Hunt, J.G. & Larson, L.L. (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Howard, A. & Magretta, J. (1995) 'Surviving success: An interview with the Nature Conservancy's John Sawhill.' Harvard Business Review, 73(5), 108-118.

Jacobs, T. O., & Jaques, E. (1990) 'Military executive leadership.' In Clark, K. E. and Clark, M. B. (Eds.), Measures of leadership. West Orange, New Jersey: Leadership Library of America, pp 281-295.

Jaques, E., & Clement, S. D. (1994). Executive leadership: a practical guide to managing complexity. Cambridge, MA: Carson-Hall.

Jones, O., Macpherson, A. & Thorpe, R. (2010) 'Learning in owner-managed small firms: mediating artefacts and strategic space.' Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 22, 649–673.

Johnson. D. B. (1998) 'Green businesses: Perspectives from management and business ethics.' Society and Natural Resources, 11, 259-266.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. (2004) 'Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity.' Journal of Applied Psychology, 89 (5), 755–768.

Kanter, R. M. (1979) 'Power failure in management circuits.' Harvard Business Review 57 (65), 75.

Kanter, R. M. (1997) Frontiers of Management. United State of America, Harvard Business Review Book.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978) Social psychology of organizations, 2nd edition. New York: John Wiley.

Kark, R., Shamir, B. & Chen, G. (2003) 'The Two Faces of Transformational Leadership: Empowerment and Dependency.' Journal of Applied Psychology, 88 (2), 246–255.

Karlsson, C. (2012) 'Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, Governance and Regional Economic Development.' Center for Strategic Innovation Research, 6, 2-17.

Kavanagh, M. H. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006) 'The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organizational Culture and Individual Acceptance of Change during a Merger.' British Journal of Management, 17, (1), 81–103.

Kempton, W., Boster. J. S. & Hartley. J. A. (1995) Environmental values in American culture. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kim, Y. (2011) 'The ivory tower approach to entrepreneurial linkage: productivity changes in university technology transfer.' The Journal of Technology Transfer. doi:10.1007/s10961-011-9217-8

King, C. S. & Zanetti, L. A. (2005) Transformational Public Service: Portraits of Theory in Practice. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Kirby, D. A. (2005) 'Creating entrepreneurial universities in the UK: Applying entrepreneurship theory to practice.' Journal of Technology Transfer, 31 (5), 599–603.

Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995) 'The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore.' Journal of Organizational Development, 16, 319-333.

Kotter, J. P. (1996) Leading Change. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995) The leadership challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kraatz, M.S. & Moore, J.H. (2002) 'Executive migration and institutional change.' Academy of Management Journal, 45(1), 120-143.

Kuipers, S. B., Higgs, M., Kickert, W., Tummers, L., Grandia, J. & Voet Van Der, J. (2013) 'the management of change in public organisations: A literature review.' Journal of Public Administration, 2-19.

Lamont, M. (2009) How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment. Harvard University Press.

LeBrasseur, R., Whissell, R. & Ojha, A. (2002) 'Organisational learning, transformational leadership and implementation of continuous quality improvement in Canadian hospitals.' Australian Journal of Management, 27, 141-162.

Leithwood, K. & Riehl, C. (2003) What do we already know about successful school leadership? AERA Division A Task Force, Washington, DC: AERA.

Lian, L.K., & Tui, L.G. (2012) 'Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics.' The Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13 (2), 59-96.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996) 'Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature.' The Leadership Quarterly, 7 (3), 385-425.

Middlehurst, R. (2004) 'Changing internal governance: A discussion of leadership roles and management structures in UK universities.' Higher Education Quarterly, 58(4), 258–279.

Middlehurst, R. (2013) 'Changing internal governance: Are leadership roles and management structures in united kingdom universities fit for the future?' Higher Education Quarterly, 67 (3), 275-294.

Mintzberg, H. (1983) Power in and around organisations. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mitchell, R. C, Mertig, A. G. & Dunlap, R. E. (1991) 'Twenty years of environmental mobilization: Trends among national environmental organizations.' Society and Natural Resources, 4, 219-234.

Moore, M. (2000) Creating Public Value: Strategic Mansagement in Government. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Mullins, L. J. (2008) Essentials of Organisational Behaviour. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

National College for School Leadership (2012) Inspiring leaders to improve children's lives: Good Governance [online] available from http://www.ioe.ac.uk/Review_of_School_Leadership_landscape_2012_Dec.pdf accessed [28 February 2014].

Neary, M. & Saunders, G. (2011) 'Leadership and Learning Landscapes: The Struggle for the Idea of the University.' Higher Education Quarterly 65 (4), 333-352.

Nelles, J., & Vorley, T. (2010) 'Constructing an Entrepreneurial Architecture: An Emergent Framework for Studying the Contemporary University beyond the Entrepreneurial Turn.' Innovative Higher Education, 35 (3), 161–176.

Niosi, J. (2006) 'Success factors in Canadian academic spin-offs.' The Journal of Technology Transfer, 31 (4), 451–457.

Northouse, P.G (2010) Leadership theory and practice 5th edition. London: Sage

Northouse, P.G (2013) Leadership theory and practice 6th edition. London: Sage

OECD (2008) Education at a Glance 2008: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing [online] available from http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/41278761.pdf accessed [15 January 2014]

OECD (2013) Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing [online] available from http://www.oecd.org/edu/United%20Kingdom_EAG2013%20Country%20Note.pdf> accessed [15 January 2014]

Onorato, M. (2013) 'Transformational Leadership Style in the Educational Sector: an empirical study of corporate managers and educational leaders.' Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 17 (1), 33-47.

Orazi, C. D., Turrini, A. & Valotti, G. (2013) 'Public Sector leadership: New perspective for research and practice.' International Review of Administrative Sciences, 79-486.

O'Shea, R., Allen, T. J., Chevalier, A., & Roche, F. (2005) 'Entrepreneurial orientation, technology transfer and spin-off performance of US universities.' Research Policy, 34 (7), 994–1009.

O'Shea, R., Chugh, H., & Allen, T. J. (2008) 'Determinants and consequences of university spin-off activity: A conceptual framework.' Journal of Technology Transfer, 33 (6), 653–666.

Pawar, B. S. & Eastman, K. K. (1997) 'The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual Examination.' Academy of Management Review, 22, 80-109.

Pedersen, D. & Hartley, J. (2008) the changing context of public leadership and management: implications for roles and dynamics. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 21 (4), 327-339.

Pfeffer, J. (1981) Power in Organisations. Boston: Pitman

Pfeffer, J. (1992). Managing with power: politics and influence in organisations. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Peters, G. B. (2002) 'Governance: A Garbage Can Perspective.' Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna: Political Science Series, 84, 5-32.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1985) The Awakening Giant. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W. & Cameron, K. S. (2001) 'Studying Organizational Change and Development: Challenges for Future Research'. Academy of Management Journal, 44 (4), 697–713.

Pittaway, L., Robertson, M., Munir, K., Denyer, D. & Neely, A. (2004) 'Networking and innovation: a systematic review of the evidence.' International Journal of Management Reviews, 5, 137–169.

Portugal, E. & Yuki, G. (1994) 'Perspectives on environmental leadership.' Leadership Quarterly, 5, 271-276.

Prentice, W. C. H. (1961) 'Understanding leadership.' Harvard Business Review, September/October, 39 (5), 143.

Rauch, C. F., & Behling, O. (1984) 'Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership.' In: Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership. ed. By Hunt, J. G., Hosking, D. M., Schriesheim, C. A. and Stewart, R. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 45-62.

Rickards, T. & Clark, M. (2006) Dilemmas of Leadership. NY: Routledge

Riggio, R., E. & Bass, B. M. (2012) Transformational Leadership 2nd edition. London: Taylor and Francis.

Rollinson, D. (2008) Organisation Behaviour and Analysis: An integrated approach. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Rothaermel, F. T., Agung, S. D., & Jiang, L. (2007) University entrepreneurship: a taxonomy of the literature. Industrial and Corporate Change, 16 (4), 691-791.

Sale, K. (1993) The green revolution: The American environmental movement 1962-1992. New York: Hill and Wang.

Sarros, J. C. & Santora, J. C. (2001) 'The transformational-transactional leadership model in practice.' Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22 (8), 383 – 394.

Seltzer, J. & Bass, B. M. (1990) 'Transformational Leadership: Beyond Initiation and Consideration.' Journal of Management, 16 (4), 693-703.

Shaftritz, J. M. & Ott, J. S. (1996) Classics of Organisation Theory 4th Edition. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Shattock, M. (2009) Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy: Diversification and Organisational Change in European Higher Education. London: McGraw-Hill Education

Shattock, M. (2013) University Governance, Leadership and Management in a decade of Diversification and Uncertainty. Higher Education Quarterly, 67 (3), 217-233

Sharma, A. & Dave, S. (2011) 'Entrepreneurial Orientation: Performance Level.' Journal of Indian Management, 43-52

Sharmir, B., House, R. J. & Arthur, M. B. (1993) 'The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: a self-concept based theory.' Organisation Science, 4, 577-594.

Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004). 'Towards a theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective.' Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36 (1), 3-34.

Sporn, B. (2001) Building adaptive universities: Emerging organisational forms based on experiences of European and US universities. Tertiary Education and Management, 7(2), 121–134.

Stensaker, B. & Vabø, A. (2013) 'Re-inventing Shared Governance: Implications for Organisational Culture and Institutional Leadership.' Higher Education Quarterly, 67 (3), 256-274.

Stimson, R. J., Stough, R. R. & Roberts, B. H. (2006) Regional Economic Development: Analysis and Planning Strategy 2nd Edition. Berlin: Springer.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950) 'Leadership, membership and organization.' Psychological bulletin, 47, 1-14.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974) Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature. New York: Free Press.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., & Massarik, F. (1961) Leadership and organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tierney, W. G. (2004) 'Improving Academic Governance: Utilizing a Cultural Framework to Improve Organizational Performance.' In: Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance. Ed. By Tierney, W. G. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, pp. 205–215.

Tucker, M. L., Bass, B. M., and Daniel, L. G. (1990) 'Transformational Leadership's Impact on Higher Education: Satisfaction, Effectiveness an Extra Effort.' In: Measures of Leadership. Ed. by Clark, K. E. and Clark, M. R. (pp.169-176). Greensboro, NC: Centre for Creative Leadership.

Thompson, J. D. (1967) Organisation in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill

Thompson, J. L. (2001) Strategic management 4th edition. Thompson Learning.

Thompson, J. L., & Martin, F. (2010) Strategic management: Awareness & change. South-Western: Cengage Learning.

Thorpe, R., Gold, J., Holt, R. & Clarke, J. (2006) 'Immaturity: the constraining of entrepreneurship.' International Small Business Journal, 24, 232–252.

Van Wart, M. (2003) 'Public Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment.' Public Administration Review, 63 (2), 214-228.

Waldman, D., & Galvin, B. (2008) 'Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership.' Organizational Dynamics, 37 (4), 327–341.

Wang, C. L. & Chugh, H. (2014) 'Entrepreneurial Learning: Past Research and Future Challenges.' International Journal of Management Reviews, 16, 24-61

Washington, M., Patterson, W. D. K & Van Buren III, J. H (2013) 'How institutions constrain or enable leadership: Denominational influences on mega church pastors (or "who does what? Predicting pastor's probability of publishing").' Harvard Business School Conference, 1-41.

Westley, F. (1997) 'Not on our watch: The biodiversity crisis and global collaboration response.' Organization & Environment, 10, 342-360.

Whitley, R. (2008) 'Constructing Universities as Strategic Actors: Limitations and Variations.' In Engwall, L. and Weaire, D. (eds.) the University in the Market. Colchester: Portland Press, pp. 23–37.

Whitley, R. (2012) 'Transforming Universities: National Conditions of their varied Organisational Actorhood.' Minerva 50, 493:510.

Yokoyama, K. (2006) 'Entrepreneurialism in Japanese and UK Universities: Governance, management, leadership and funding.' Higher Education, 52(3), 523–555.

Yukl, G. A. (1999) 'An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership.' The Leadership Quarterly, 10 (2), 285-305

Yukl, G. A. (2002) Leadership in Organizations. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. A. (2006) Leadership in Organizations. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall

Zalenik, A. (1977) 'Managers and leaders: Are they different?' Harvard Business Review, 55, 67–80.

Zalenik, A. (1992) Managers and leaders: are they different? Harvard Business Review, March/April, p. 126

Zanetti, L. A. (1998) 'at the nexus of state and civil society: The Transformative Practice of Public Ad-ministartion.' In King, C. S. and Stivers, C. M. (Eds.), Government is us: Public Administration in an anti-government era (pp 102-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Zanetti, L. A. & King, C. S. (2013) 'Reflections on Theory in Action Transformational Public Service Revisited: Possibilities for Changing the Discipline?' Administrative Theory & Praxis, 5 (1), 128-143

Zhein, W. & Marylène, G. (2013) 'A Chinese-Canadian cross-cultural investigation of transformational leadership, autonomous motivation, and collectivistic value.' Journal of leadership & organizational studies, 20 (1), 134-142.

Appendix 1

Not all the publications included in the review are in this Table. For complete list of all publications please see the list of references

Authors

Year

Theoretical Persapectives

Journal

Methods

Sector

Country

Databases

Time Horizons

Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam

2003

Leadership theories

Leadership Quarterly

Quantitative

Pblic & Private

US & UK

ScienceDirect

Not given

Avolio, Bass & Jung

1999

Leadership theories

43

Occupational and Organizational Psychology

Quantitative

Private

US and Others

Wiley

Not given

Barling, Weber & Kelloway

1996

Leadership theories, attitudinal changes

Applied Psychology

Quantitative

Private

Canada

EBSCO HOST

Cross-sectional

Bolden, Petrov & Gosling

2008

Leadership theories

Higher Education Quarterly

Qualitative

Public

UK

44

Wiley

Cross-sectional

Bosetti & Walker

2010

Activity theory

Higher Education Quarterly

Qualitative

Public

UK

Wiley

Cross-sectional

Brunner

1997

Central theory

Policy Sciences

Reflective approach

Public

US

Springer

Not given

Coaldrake

1999

45

Policy paradigm, Educational & Economic change,

Higher Education Management

n/a

Public

Australia

ERIC

Not given

Conger

1999

Leadership theories, Institutional theory

The Leadership Quarterly

n/a

n/a

US

ScienceDirect

Not given

Covin & Slevin

1988

A relational perspective of organisational structure & entrepreneurial orientaion

Journal of Management Studies

Quantitative

Private

46

US

Wiley

Cross-sectional

De Luque, Washburn, Waldman & House

2008

Stakeholder theory, Economic theory, Social Science theory, leadership theories

Administrative Science Quarterly

Quantitative study based on 40 firms
in each country

approximately 20 Private firms in each country & 20 firms owned by either
public or private shareholders

Austria, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Taiwan, and Turkey

Wiley

Longitidinal (2000–2003)

DiMaggio & Anheier

1990

Ecological perspective, Sociological perspective

Annual review of sociology

n/a

Public

US

n/a

47

Dunlap & Mertig

1991

Social constructionist

Society and Natural Resources

n/a

Public

US

Taylor & Francis

Longitidinal

Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir

2002

Experiential learning & development, Leadership theories

Academy of Management Journal

Quantitative: 54 military
leaders, 90 direct followers, and 724 indirect followers.

Public

Not given

Emerald Management

 longitudinal

Easterby-Smith, Crossan & Nicolini

2000

Organizational learning, Social cognitive theory

48

Journal of Management Studies

n/a

n/a

n/a

JSTOR Archive

n/a

Egri & Herman

2000

Change management, Complement environmental paradigm with management paradigm & Leadership theories

Academy of Management Journal

A mixed method study based on 73 leaders

Both nonprofit & for-profit

Canada/US

Emerald Management

Not given

Engelbrecht, Van Aswegen & Theron

2004

Leadership Theories, structural relationships

South African Journal of Business Management

Quantitative

Private: Non-probability

South African

49

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Esson & Ertl

2013

Dynamic perspective of strategy capabilities, Decision theory, Policy implementation paradigm

The Political Quarterly

n/a

Public

Wiley

n/a

Etzkowitz

2003

Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial University, Innovation theory, Change management

Research Policy

Qualitative: interview & case studies

Public

US, European
and Latin American universitiesand archival research
at Stanford University

ScienceDirect

Longitidunal: 80s & 90s

50

Eyal & Kark

2004

Complexity theory used to devised 4 entrepreneurial strategies, Organisation theory

Leadership and Policy in Schools

Quantitative:140 Israeli elementary
schools

Public

Israel

Taylor & Francis

Longitidunal

Gabris, Golembiewski & Ihrke

2001

Public leadership theory, Classical management theory

Administration Research and Theory

Quantitative

Public

Not given

Wiley

Not given

Gebert & Boerner

2012

Communication theory, Innovation theory, Leadership theory, Diversity management

51

Non-profit Management and Leadership

n/a

Nonprofit performing arts companies

Not given

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Greenberger & Sexton

1988

Change management, Leadership theory, Innovation theory,entrepreneurship, Psychology

Journal of Small Business Management

n/a

n/a

Not given

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Groves & LaRocca

2011

Transformational process, Leadership theories, Institutional theory, Organisational theory, Stakholder theory

Journal of Business Ethic

Quantitative: split-sample, Qualitative: CEO interviews

72 for-profit & 50 nonprofit organisations

US

52

Springer

Longitidunal: 2-year period
(2008–2010)

Guerrero & Urbano

2012

Institutional Economics, Resource-Based View

Journal of Technology Transfer

Secondary data

fifty Spanish public universities

Spain

JSTOR

Not given

Gupta, MacMillan & Surie

2004

Discovery-driven approach, entrepreneurial leadership,Leadership theory, Social constructionist

Journal of Business Venturing

Quantitative

Firms across cultures

Clusterwise: Anglo, Nordic Europe, Germanic Europe, Latin Europe, Eastern Europe

ScienceDirect

Longitidunal

Hater & Bass

53

1988

Organisational change, Leadership theories, attitude-change phenomena, Performance

Journal of Applied Psychology

Quantitative

Private

US

Emerald Management

Not given

Harvey, Royal & Stout

2003

Leadership theory

Psychological Reports

Quantitative

Public

Not given

Ammons Scientific

Not given

Holt

2008

Activity Theory used to understand entrepreneurial opportunity, Entrepreneurial learning, Cognitive approach, Transformation

Mind, Culture, and Activity

Qualitative: 90 entrepreneurs

54

Private

UK

Taylor & Francis

Longitudinal: entrepreneurs were interviewed three times at six monthly intervals

Hood

2003

Leadership theory, Social construct

Journal of Business Ethics

Quantitative

Private

US

JSTOR Archive

Not given

Hooijberg & Choi

2001

Generic leadership theory

Administration and Society

Quantiattive

Private & Public

JSTOR Archive

55

Not given

Hosking

1988

Social psychological approach, Leadership theory

Journal of Management Studies

n/a

n/a

n/a

JSTOR Archive

Not given

Howard & Magretta

1995

Action theory, Startegic change & management

Harvard Business Review

Qualitative

Private

Not given

Not given

Jones, Macpherson & Thorpe

2010

Strategic entrepreneurship, action learning, collective critical reflection (organizational reflexivity)

56

Entrepreneurship & Regional Development

n/a

Private

Not given

Not given

Johnson

1998

Ecological paradigm

Society and Natural Resources

Quantitative

Not given

Not given

Taylor & Francis

Not given

Judge & Piccolo

2004

Leadership theory

Journal of Applied Psychology

Quantitative

n/a

n/a

57

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Kark, Shamir & Chen

2003

Leadership theory

Journal of Applied Psychology

Quanitative: 888 bank employees

Private

Israel

Not given

Karlsson

2012

Entrepreneurship, Governance & Policy paradigm

Center for Strategic Innovation Research

n/a

Public

Not given

n/a

Kavanagh & Ashkanasy

2006

58

Leadership Theory, Change management approaches, Communication theory, Incremental approach, Indifference approach, Immediate approach

British Journal of Management

Qualitative and Quantitative

Public

Not given

Emerald Management

Longitudinal study: two-year intervals over six years

Kim

2011

Academic entrepreneurship, Productivity change, Innovative approaches

Journal of Technology Transfer

Quantiative

Public

US

JSTOR

Longitidunal

Kirby

2005

Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship development theories

Journal of Technology Transfer

Qualitative (Case-based)

Public

59

UK

Springer

Cross-sectional

Koh, Steers & Terborg

1995

Leadership theory, Theory of collectivist culture

Journal of Organizational Development

Quantiative

Public

Singapore

Not given

Kraatz & Moore

2002

Organisation theory, Institutional change,

Academy of Management Journal

Quantitative

631 private independent colleges

US

JSTOR Archive

Longitidunal

Kuipers, Higgs, Kickert, Tummers, Grandia & Voet Van Der

60

2013

Change management, Leadership theory, complexity theory, Policy paradigm

Journal of Public Administration

n/a

n/a

n/a

EBSCO HOST

n/a

LeBrasseur

2002

Structural Change, Strategic change, Cultural change, Leadership theory

Australian Journal of Management

Quantitative & Case studies

Health sector: Canadian Hospitals

Canada

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Lian & Tui

2012

Theory-based model, Leadership theory,

The Journal of Applied Business and Economics

Quantitative: 2000 firms

61

Private

Klang Valley

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam

1996

Organisation theory, Leadership theory

The Leadership Quarterly

Quantitative

public & private

Not given

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Middlehurst

2004

Historical perspective, Educational change

Higher Education Quarterly

n/a

n/a

n/a

JSTOR

n/a

62

Middlehurst

2013

Policy paradigm, Change management, Strategic capacity

Higher Education Quarterly

n/a

Public

UK

JSTOR Archive

Not given

Mitchell, Mertig & Dunlap

1983

Bureaucratization

Society and Natural Resources

public & private

Not given

Taylor & Francis

Not given

Neary & Saunders

2011

Critical reflexivity approach, Innovation theory, leadership & Leraning theory

Higher Education Quarterly

63

Qualitative: Case studies of 12 universities; 60 individual face-to-face interviews

Public

UK

JSTOR Archive

Not given

Nelles & Vorley

2010

Pragmatic & Holistic approach, Education policy, Organisation paradigm

Innovative Higher Education

n/a

n/a

n/a

n/a

Niosi

2006

Spin-offs creation

The Journal of Technology Transfer

Quantitative

Public

Canada-US

Springer

64

Not given

Onorato

2013

Strategic changes, Leadership theory, Management approach

Academy of Educational Leadership Journal

Quantitative: 45 principals

public & private

New York State

Taylor & Francis

Not given

Orazi, Turrini & Valotti

2013

Public administration, Public management, Public sector leadership

International Review of Administrative Sciences

n/a

Public

Not given

SAGE

Not given

O'Shea, Allen, Chevalier & Roche

2005

Resource-based perspective

65

Research Policy

Quantitaive

Public

US

ScienceDirect

Longitidunal

O'Shea, Chugh & Allen

2008

Systems approach, University spinoffs, University entrepreneurship

Journal of Technology Transfer

n/a

Public

n/a

Springer

Not given

Pawar & Eastman

1997

Leadership theory, Organisation & Management theories

Academy of Management Review

n/a

n/a

Not given

66

Emerald Management

n/a

Pedersen & Hartley

2008

Social constructionist, Policy & Reform paradigm

International Journal of Public Sector Management

n/a

public

UK and Denmark

JSTOR

n/a

Peters

2002

Policy paradigm, Governance

Political Science Series

n/a

Public

Not given

SAGE

n/a

Pettigrew, Woodman & Cameron

2001

67

Theories of change, organizational change & development

Academy of Management Journal

n/a

n/a

Not given

JSTOR

n/a

Pittaway, Robertson, Munir, Denyer & Neely

2004

Innovation theory used to study business dynamics & configuration

International Journal of Management Reviews

n/a

n/a

Not given

n/a

Portugal & Yuki

1994

Leadership theory, Social & Environmental change

Leadership Quarterly

n/a

n/a

68

n/a

ScienceDirect

Not given

Prentice

1961

Leadership theories

Harvard Business Review

n/a

n/a

n/a

n/a

Sarros & Santora

2001

Leadership theory, Strategic management

Leadership & Organization Development Journal

Quantitative: Survey & Qualitative: Interview

Private & Public

Australia

Emerald Management

Not given

Seltzer & Bass

69

1990

Leadership theory

Journal of Management

Quantitative

Private

Not given

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Shattock

2013

Governance & Management, Transformation, Institutional theory

Higher Education Quarterly

Quantitative: Survey

Public

UK

Wiley

Not given

Sharma & Dave

2011

Entrepreneurial orientation, Entrepreneurship

Journal of Indian Management

Quantitative

70

Private

Not given

Emerald Management

Not given

Sharmir, House & Arthur

1993

Leadership theory, Self-concept based motivational theory

Organisation Science

Quantitative

Not given

Not given

Not given

Spillane, Halverson & Diamond

2004

Activity theory and theories of distributed cognition (human cognition)

Journal of Curriculum Studies

n/a

Public

n/a

JSTOR

n/a

71

Stensaker & Vabø

2013

Governance, Policy paradigm, reform and change, Strategy cognition

Higher Education Quarterly

Quantitative

Public

US and in Europe

Wiley

Not given

Thorpe, Gold, Holt & Clarke

2006

Social constructionist perspectives

International Small Business Journal

Qualitative: email interviews

cross-section of industry sectors

Not given

Sage

Not given

Van Wart

2003

Leadership theory

Public Administration Review

72

n/a

n/a

n/a

JSTOR

n/a

Waldman & Galvin

2008

Economic Perspective & Stakeholder Perspective used to understand responsible leadership

Organizational Dynamics

n/a

n/a

n/a

ScienceDirect

n/a

Wang & Chugh

2014

Individual & collective learning, exploratory and exploitative learning, and intuitive and sensing learning

International Journal of Management Reviews

n/a

n/a

n/a

Wiley

73

n/a

Washington, Patterson & Van Buren III

2013

Institutional leadership & theory

Harvard Business School Conference

Quantitative

Private: 1400 megachurches

US

Not given

Westley

1997

Classical theory, Social change

Organization & Environment

Qualitative: Interview

Public & Private

Not given

Sage

Not given

Whitley

2012

Governance change, Organisational actohood, Collectivist

74

Minerva

n/a

Public

Not given

Springer

n/a

Yokoyama

2006

Organisational change

Higher Education

Qualitative: case studies + documentation

Public & Private universities

Japan & UK

JSTOR

Not given

Yukl

1999

Leadership theories

The Leadership Quarterly

n/a

n/a

n/a

75

EBSCO HOST

n/a

Zalenik

1977

Leadership theories, Organisation & Management approach

Harvard Business Review

n/a

n/a

n/a

n/a

Zalenik

1992

Leadership theories, Organisation & Management approach

Harvard Business Review

n/a

n/a

n/a

n/a

Zanetti & King

2013

Action theory (Psychology), Collective effervescence, Transformation

Administrative Theory & Praxis

Qualitative: Interview

Public

Not given

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Zhein & Marylène

2013

Leadership theory, Motivation theory, Collectivist

Journal of leadership & organizational studies

Quantitative

public & private

China & Canada

EBSCO HOST

Not given

Table 4: A summary of publications

Appendix 2

Journals	Count	Percentage
Higher Education Quarterly	8	9.8
International Journal of Management Reviews	7	8.5
The Leadership Quarterly	5	6.1
Academy of Management Journal	5	6.1
Harvard Business Review	5	6.1
Journal of Technology Transfer	5	6.1
Journal of Applied Psychology	4	4.9
Society and Natural Resources	3	3.7
Journal of Small Business Management	2	2.4
Journal of Business Ethic	2	2.4
Journal of leadership & organizational studies	2	2.4
Researh Policy	2	2.4
Journal of Public Administration	2	2.4
Others	30	36.6
Total	**82**	**100**

Table 5: A summary of journal count