A Study of Academic Leaders' Percieved Leardership Effectiveness: Evidence from Ethiopian Public Universities

Kefyalew Waktole Abetu,

PhD Scholar,
Wollega University, University School of
Organizational Leadership, Ethiopia.

Dr. Ritu Lehal,

Professor,
Punjabi University, University School of
Applied Management, Patiala, India.

ABSTRACT

An effective leadership account for the majority of organizational success. While, ineffective leadership contributes to an organizational problems and failures. In today's more complex and dynamic nature of organizations including higher learning institutions setting, effective leadership is perceived as a vital issue in provision of high quality human capital formation that the nations demands to achieve its desired development goals. Hence, the purpose of this quantitative research was designed to study the level of perceived leadership effectiveness of academic leaders within the context of Ethiopian public universities. To achieve the objective, the study sought to investigate the three leadership outcomes: effectiveness, satisfaction and extra effort. The study employed descriptive survey design with quantitative research approach. By using proportionate random sampling technique (n=118) academic leaders and (n=354) academic staff of public universities were approached for data collection by using both leaders' self and followers' rater reported version of MLQ-5x to assess the perceived leadership outcomes. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics by using IBM -SPSS version 24.The findings of the study revealed that, academic leaders' are found to be moderately effective in their leadership in higher learning institutions. The results of study has also an implication on social change that it expands leadership development programs that influences and improves a leadership effectiveness to address the demand for quality leaders in higher learning institutions for the benefit of Ethiopian universities as well as the society. Practically, the results of this study would rise an effective leaders who are proactive align with an institution's vision with the societal expectations, thus improves the higher educations' public perceptions as well.

Keywords: Leadership, Leadership Outcome, Leadership Effectiveness, Public University.

INTRODUCTION:

Organizations across the nations regardless of their type are at high competitive edge entangled with the economic, social, political and regulatory mandates, and environmental forces. Such changing work environments of high competition requires a productive work force with an effective leadership (Northouse, P. G. 2016). In line with this, in such situation, an organizations and leaders in order to achieve their desired goals, they need to be creative and put more effort into better understanding, influence, managing, and leading their employees' behaviors effectively. Bass and Bass (2008) believed effective leaders possess the ability to motivate, encourage, develop, and empower followers in order to fulfill organizational goals and objectives. An effective leadership is at the heart of organizations including higher learning institutions for not only competition rather for their survival and existence as well (Northouse, P. G. 2016 and Bryman, 2009). It is an effective leadership that make a difference on individuals, groups and organizational success (Hogan, Curphy and Hogan 1994). Conversely, the literature evidenced that ineffective and poor leadership leads organizations

to problems and failures (Bass, B. M. 1985; Gilley, Gilley, Ambort-Clark, & Marion, 2014; Hatten, 2011; Leverty 2012). The author argued that, an inability of a leader to provide effective leadership is detrimental to any organization. Hence, there is no debate among the scholars, practitioners and educators on the importance and necessity of an effective leadership in today's organizations including public organizations (education). However, the questions remain is around what makes an effective leadership and who should lead an organizations effectively in dealing with organizational demand for change and transformations to fit in the changing world is paramount important. Therefore, studying determinants that contribute to the understanding and application of effective leadership performance is a vital to organizational effectiveness in developing country where a dearth study exist like Ethiopian, particularly leadership effectiveness in higher learning organizations. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to investigate the level of academic leaders' leadership effectiveness in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions. Even though the abundance of studies on leadership exist in business context with in western developed world, studies on leadership outcomes in higher education context in developing country like Ethiopia is relatively thin. To the best of the investigator's knowledge, there is a dearth of empirical studies on leadership effectiveness in Ethiopian higher education context. Particularly, studies that focuses on effectiveness of leadership in higher education context is limited. Whereas, as a general notion for organizations to achieve it desired goal and objectives, an effective leadership is considered as most important and critically required. Consequently, this research study purposed to address this gap by investigating qualities of effective leadership that are most important for academic leadership in the eyes of faculty members as well as their leaders self- assessment of their effective leadership outcomes that should be developed for an existing and future academic leaders for higher learning institutions. Hence, the study aimed to answer the research question: what is the perceived level of leadership effectiveness of Ethiopian public universities' academic leaders engaging and performing leadership behaviors as self-reported by academic leaders and raters' reported by academic staff?

REVIEW ON LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS:

Leadership Effectiveness has been defined by numerous scholars in the field and various literatures shows that there is no universally accepted one agreed up-on definition or theory of leadership emerged (Yukl, 2012, 2013). However, various researchers like Cooper & Nirenberg, (2004) defined and assessed effectiveness of leadership in terms of the consequences of leader's influence on individuals, groups, or organizations. The authors defined leadership effectiveness as "the ability of an individual leader to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organizations" (Bass and Bass, 2008, & Yukl, 1998). It is paramount important here to mansion that according to the authors, the level of leaders, leadership effectiveness highly affect their subordinates' commitment to work effectively which in turn influence them to contribute to organizational goal achievement too. Such leaders motivates followers in an exceptionally engaging manner. Kotter, (2012) argued that, inspiring and satisfying subordinates is vital to leadership effectiveness. Effective leaders are those who represent and being accepted by their followers able to transform their organizations. In the same vein Weinberger, L. A. (2009) argued that, an effectively performing leadership influence an entire organizational success. Study by Jacobsen and Andersen (2015) also revealed that, followers are actively engaged in achieving organizational goals rather than solely an agents that blindly follow their leaders. Leaders who conduct themselves in an exemplary manner tend to have a significantly beneficial outcome in their employees' dedication and execution of work (Walter, Humphrey, & Cole, 2012). The central prerequisite for an effective organization leadership is the ability of a leader to influence workers to exert extra effort, inspire, motivate, satisfy and lead them productively (Yukl, 1998 & Northouse, P. G. 2016). It has been also argued that, such leaders have an impact on their followers those who follow them. According to Jain, A., Srivastava, S., & Sullivan, S. (2013); Flumerfelt, S., & Banachowski, M. (2011) Study, a leader influences how followers perform activities on behalf of their leaders. Moreover, Bass and Avolio (1994, 1995, 1999, 2004,2008) contended that, an art of an effective leadership is where by a leader knows their subordinates' satisfaction on them, able to influence the willingness of the followers' to exert extra effort, ability to work productively and lead an effective team, and ability to valuing their employees' contributions. As the authors, leaders using these leadership arts as an instrument to support employees grow in to contributing members of an organization. This could ultimately improve organizational goal achievement productively.

Therefore, in this research study leadership effectiveness conceived as "the ability of an individual leader to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organizations (Bass and Avolio 2004). This implied that, effectiveness of a leader is determined by how well leaders meet the needs and expectation of the employees such as the supervisors, followers, and peers, and how much they like,

respect, and admire their leaders, or how strongly they are committed to carrying out their leaders' visions and directions (Bass and Avolio 2004). Hence, the purpose of this study was to investigate an academic leaders' level of leadership effectivness of Ethiopian public higher learning institutions based leaders' self-perceptions and on how academic staff perceive of their leaders' managerial effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY:

The study was conducted using a descriptive survey research design (Creswell, J. W. 2012). The target population for this study was consists of an academic leaders and their followers of government higher learning Institutions of Ethiopia. At the time this study was conducted there were 41 government higher education Institutions found operational under the aspics of Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MOE, 2018). Of the 41 higher education Institutions, five universities were randomly selected as sample for this study. In five higher education Institutions, approximately 5820 faculty members and 446 academic leaders those who are working in different positions across universities from top universities management level to department head level. By using Yemanes' (1967) sample sized determination formulae, of 5820 academic staff and 446 academic leaders 375 faculty members those direct report to 125 immediate academic leaders were identified. As the study used both leaders' self- report and employees' perception of their leaders on their managerial effectiveness, from each sample university each leader across all functions to be evaluated themselves and evaluated by three direct report of their own followers regardless of the level of management. Accordingly, 125 positioned academic leaders across all functions identified to be evaluated by self and raters' of 375 faculty members to (3:1). Of the 375 faculty members only majority of them are male 86 % (321) and 14 %(54) of them are their female counter part. In similar manner, out of 125 academic leaders across all management functions of the sample universities majority of them are also male 78% (98) and the rest 22% (27) of them are female leaders.

INSTRUMENT:

To measure academic leaders' leadership effectiveness, both self-report and the rater's report version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x) developed and validated by Bass & Avolio, 2004) was administered to 125 academic leaders and their subordinates of those 125 academic leaders or managers, which means 375 faculty members of which three direct report were evaluated. This means that each respective academic leader to be evaluated by self and three followers (academic staff). The instrument measures the full range leadership behaviors with their leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness). This study has nothing to do with measures of leadership behaviors rather used measures of leadership out comes (Effectiveness of leader, employee satisfaction with the leaders, and employees willingness to put in extra effort). This mean that, the MLQ5x reports results in the areas of extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and the perceived leader's effectiveness. The three dimensions of leadership outcomes: satisfaction of employees' with the leader, employees' extra effort, and perceived leadership effectiveness from the aggregate mean scores of both leaders' and employees' perspectives were used to assess leaders' managerial effectiveness. A few sample survey questions asked in the MLQ 5x from viewpoint of faculty members as well as those of leaders are: my leaders gets extra effort out of me, I am satisfied with my leader, and my leaders is effective in meeting my job-related needs from followers' side and I gets employees to put in extra effort than expected, I use method of leadership that are satisfying, and I am effective in meeting employees' job-related needs (Bass and avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004). These constructs were measured sing scale range from "0"= not at all, "2"=some times, "3"=frequently to "4"= frequently, if not always. In this study, only the three dimensions of leadership outcomes with 9 questions were utilized to assess leaders' perceived managerial effectiveness from both side (leader and followers). More specifically, 4 question items are measures perceived leadership effectiveness (productivity), 2 question items to be evaluated leaders and employees' perception satisfaction with leader's leadership, and 3 questions assess employees' and leader's perception of willingness to exert extra effort and the leader's ability in influencing extra effort in staff.

The MLQ-5x is a standardized reliable and validated survey instrument in measuring both full range leadership styles and leadership effectiveness (outcomes). As per the Peterson, (1994) guide line that the reliability of the instrument estimated to be .70 and above is acceptably for research. According to the authors the more the coefficient of alpha reliability approached to 1 the more the survey instrument will be reliable in measuring what it intended to measure consistently. Accordingly, the reliability of the instrument has been checked and reported as an effective in measuring leadership and its effectiveness in various studies (Bass and Avolio, 2004). The reliability was reportedly range from .74 to .94 in different studies which is consistent with the original

reliability established by authors for the three leadership outcome dimensions .91, 94, and .91 for Effectivness, Satisfaction and Extra Effort respectively by conducting study on 6,848 respondents Bass and Avolio (2004). The reliability of the instrument for this study also conducted which range from .78 to .86 with .81 reliability in total, which is consistent with original reliability established by the authors as summarized in the table below.

Table 1: Summary of Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient for each study construct

Sr No	The study Constructs	No of Items	Mean	SD	Previous Reliability	Current Study Reliability
1	Effectiveness	4	2.79	.909	.91	.86
2	Satisfaction	2	2.74	.958	.94	.78
3	Extra Effort	3	2.67	.907	.91	.80
	Total LO	**9**	**2.74**	**.844**	**.92**	**.81**

Source: SPSS Result (2019) * Leadership Outcomes (Effectiveness)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The study was purposed to investigate academic leader's managerial effectiveness in Ethiopian public universities. To achieve this objective, as mentioned above 125 academic leaders and 375 faculty members of five public universities were approached for the administration of data collection through direct contact to leaders as well as their followers. Each of the one hundred twenty five Leaders were asked their agreement to participate and to be evaluated by their direct report academic staff. Accordingly, each academic leaders in five sample universities across all managerial levels and functions were identified and agreed. Accordingly, each leaders provided the researcher with list of academic staff reporting to them. Hence, for each of the leader, three direct reporting staff in total of three hundred seventy five employees were randomly selected and approached for data collection. In the same manner, a total of 125 academic leaders and 375 subordinates were asked to participate in completing the self- report and rater's version of MLQ-5x form by leaders and their followers respectively to assess their own perception of leadership effectiveness and followers' perceptions of their immediate leaders' managerial effectiveness as they perceive it. After ensuring the willingness of both group, the data collection were performed. Any leader which was not evaluated with three subordinates were not included in the study. Accordingly, 125 copies of leader's questionnaire and of 375 copies of the raters' questionnaires distributed. Of the distributed copies 354 respondents were completed and returned the survey questionnaire which was a total response rate of 94% on the side of followers. Whereas 118 leaders were completed and returned the questionnaires. Which means, leaders' managerial effectiveness was assessed by 118 leaders assessed themselves and 354 respondents. After data collection completed, every questionnaires were checked for completeness and usability, then after entering in to IBM-SPSS version 24 the data cleaning was performed. Consequently, after usability of the data has been identified, using SPSS version 24 the descriptive statistics has been analyzed.

Demographic Characteristics:

As it has been shown in the table 2, there were 118 academic leaders voluntarily participate in the study to complete self-report MLQ and to be evaluated by three direct report academic staff of which 91(77%) of them are male leaders and 27(23%) of them are their female leaders counterpart. Regarding the academic staff, 354 of them were completed and retuned the MLQ-5x rater's report of which only 50(14%) of the them were female academic staff filled the questionnaires as subordinate of the line manager or leader and the rest 304 (86%) of them were their male academic staff counterpart considered as subordinate of their immediate leader regardless of the level of the management. It is clear from the table that university positions were occupied by male than their female leaders.

In table 2, the age categories of both positioned academic leaders as well as their followers was clearly stated. Accordingly, as it is clear from the table, the majority of the respondents found to be in a young age category. Which is considered as among productive age categories, 5(4.2%) of the leaders are in the range of 20-29 years, 59(50%) of them were in the 30-39 age category, 45(38.1%) of them where in the 40-49 age category and only 9(7.6%) of the leaders were revealed in age category of 50 years and above. In the similar manner, the majority of the academic staff categorized under productive young age group of which 80(22.6%) them are reported to be 20-29 years, 118 (43.2%) of them are between 30-39, 70(25.4%) of them are from age category from 40-49, and 44 (8.8%) of the respondents were in aged categories of the respondents.

From study sample data it is clear that, more than the half of the universities' academic jobs including a leaderships positions are occupied by male leaders and workers, only 14% of the sample staff and 23% of academic positions are occupied by female employees. The rest high percent 86% teaching positions and 77% academic positions are covered by their male counterpart. Similarly, as it is clearly stated in the table, nearly 80%(68%) of the academic leaders are experienced, of which their year of experiences range from 5- 15years, whereas only few of them about 8 (6.7%) are less than 5 years of work experience. In the case of academic staff experience

Table 2: Demographic characteristics of the participants

No	Demographic Variables	Category	Leader Participants		Follower Participants	
			Frequency	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
1	Gender	Male	91	77	304	86
		Female	27	23	14	14
		Total	**118**	**100**	**354**	**100**
2	Age	20-29 years	5	4.2	80	22.6
		30-39 years	50	50	153	43.2
		40-49 years	45	38.1	90	25.4
		$\geq$ 50 years	9	7.6	31	8.8
		Total	**118**	**100**	**354**	**100**
3	Work Experiences	2-5 years	8	6.7	122	34.4
		6-10 years	50	42.4	118	33.3
		11-15 years	30	25.4	70	19.8
		$\geq$ 16 years	30	25.4	44	12.4
		Total	**118**	**100**	**354**	**100**
4	Education level	BA/BSc	2	1.6	48	13.6
		MA/MSc	74	62.7	226	63.8
		PhD	42	35.6	80	22.6
		Total	**118**	**100**	**354**	**100**
5	Position in the University	HOD*	65	55	63	17.8
		Dean	33	28	14	4
		Executive**	20	17	15	4.2
		Teachers	-	-	262	74
		Total	**118**	**100**	**354**	**100**
		Total	**118**	**100%**	**354**	**100%**

Source: SPSS Output (2019)   *Head of Department   **Directors, University Vice presidents and Presidents

categories, similar with their leaders, more than half of the sample academic staff respondents 188 (53.1%) are from moderate highly experienced with 5-15 years of services in teaching and different academic positions across the sample universities. The rest, very small number of the academic staff 44 (12.4%) of are senior teachers with high years of services, whereas about 122(34.4%) of the respondents reported less experienced with less than 5years but more than 2years of experiences with in universities. Regarding the educational achievement of the respondents, the majority of both academic leaders and their raters (followers) samples had a second degree holders 74 (62.7%), respondents with doctorate degree holders are 42(35.6%), and very small number of them 2(1.6%) had first degree holders hold a leadership position in the universities. The majority of the sample leaders found to be head of the departments 65(55.1%), 33(28%) college deans , and 20(17%) of the leaders are from top executive level entitled with Directors, University's vice presidents and presidents in the sample universities. In the similar manner, educational achievement of the academic staff found nearly similar with their leaders. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents had 226(63.8%) MA/MSc degree holders. Whereas, as it has been clearly stated in the table 2, only 48 (13.6%) of them had BA/BSc degree. Furthermore, approximately 15 (4.2%) of the sample were university level directors and vice presidents participated as followers for their line immediate leaders, 14 (4%) of them were middle level leaders who are direct report to top level leaders as wells as immediate supervisors for their subordinate department heads, and the majority of the respondents were instructors direct report to department heads 262 (74%) as it has been briefly stated in the table above (see table 2).

Academic Leaders' Perceived Leadership Effectivness:

The primary objective of the research study was to investigate perceived leadership effectiveness of Ethiopian Public Universities. The study intended to answer the research question: what is the perceived level of leadership effectiveness of Ethiopian public universities' academic leaders engaging and performing leadership behaviors as self-reported by academic leaders and raters' reported by academic staff? The quantitative data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics to address this research questions to achieve the research objective aforementioned above. Accordingly, to answer the research questions quantitative data were collected from both faculty members and their leaders as mentioned in the methodology part, using both self-reported and raters reported version of MLQ5x survey instrument on the three dimensions of perceived leadership Outcomes (effectiveness): Perceived leader's effectiveness employee's extra effort, and employee's satisfaction, performed as summarized in the next section.

As per the operationalized by Bass and Aolio's (2004), perceived leadership effectiveness deal with the ability of the respective leader in meeting employees' job related needs. This implied that to what extent the leader attempt to try harder in representing his/her followers in representing them in addressing their job related necessities in the work place. An ability of a leader in influencing the followers to gets them work hard and do more than expected of them. Furthermore, a leader to deserve as effective and productive in self- evaluation and in the eyes of his/her followers, required to meet the requirements in achieving the desired an organizational goals. Consequently, a leaders to be determined to be effective, he/she has exhibit high quality leadership behaviors, establishing and leading a group which is an effective as perceived by the followers as well as by themselves. Based on an effective leadership behaviors and qualities established to evaluate respective leaders framed in the MLQ which ranges from "0"= not at all to "4"=frequently, if not always, used to determine the perceived level of effectiveness of leaders as both perceived by leader self-assessment and their followers as summarized in the table below. To be more precise, in each of the listed tables, the last row of calculated total frequencies - the "totals row" would help to obtain the impression of whether the respondents perceived a particular dimension of leadership outcome to occur "more frequently" if the majority of responses resorted under positive '3' and '4' rating levels and "once in a while" if the majority of responses appeared under negative '0' and '1' ratings levels.

Table 3: Composite one-way frequency tables for the four questionnaire items that probe the Leadership outcome sub-dimension of: Perceived leadership Effectiveness

No	Question Items	Frequency of Occurrences					
		Not At all	Once in a while	Some times	Fairly Often	Frequently	Total
**LEADERS' SCORES (118)**						
1	I am Effective in meeting employees' job-related needs	3 2.5	7 5.9	32 27.1	46 39.0	30 25.4	118
2	I am Effective in representing me to higher authority	2 1.7	8 6.8	32 27.1	51 43.2	25 21. 2	118
3	I am Effective in meeting organizational requirements	1 .8	4 3.4	35 29.7	46 39.0	32 27.1	118
4	I leads a group that is effective	-	2 1.7	21 17.8	58 49.2	37 31.4	118
	Total	**6**	**21**	**120**	**201**	**124**	**472**
	EMPLOYEES' SCORES (354)						
1	He/she is effective in meeting my job-related needs	11 3.1	28 7.9	76 21.5	132 37.3	107 30.2	354
2	He/she effective in representing me to higher authority	22 6.2	34 9.6	75 21.2	121 34.2	102 28.8	354
3	He/she effective in meeting organizational requirements	13 3.7	24 6.8	78 22.0	140 39.5	99 28.0	354
4	He/she Leads a group that is Effective	15 4.2	30 8.5	67 18.9	138 39.0	104 29.4	354
	Total	**62**	**116**	**296**	**531**	**412**	**1416**

Source: SPSS Output (2019)

From the table 3 above is clear shown that both leaders and their followers' scores of the four items dimension of leadership outcome that measure: how the respective leader is effective in meeting employees job-related needs, effective in representing employees to higher authority, effective in meeting organizational requirements, and how the leaders leads a group that is effective. Accordingly, the leaders' self-evaluation and evaluation by their followers result show 1.27% of the respondents responded not at all effective, 4.45% effective once in a while, 25.42% Sometimes effective, 42.58% Fairly Often effective and 26.27% rated frequently effective respectively. In the similar manner, the academic staff responded 4.38% of the respondents responded not at all effective, 8.19% say effective once in a while, 20.90% say sometimes effective, 37.5% say fairly often effective and 29.1% say frequently effective respectively. Hence, as per the frame work above, the majority of the responses that reflect the self-perception that the perceived effectivness of a leader (leadership outcome) is fairly often to frequently effective, in academic leaders leadership effective performance with 68.86%. In the same fashion, the rater's reported perceived leadership effectiveness of academic leaders also reported fairly often to frequently effective with 66.59%.

Table 4: Composite one-way frequency tables for the three questionnaire items that probe the Leadership outcome sub-dimension of: Perceived willingness to put Extra Effort

No	Question Items	Frequency of Occurrences					Total
		Not at all	Once in a while	Some times	Fairly Often	Frequently	
LEADERS' SCORES (118)							
1	I gets employees' to do more than I expected them to do	-	12 10.2	39 33.1	49 41.5	18 15.3	118
2	I Heightens employees' desire to succeed	2 1.7	7 5.9	30 25.	42 35.64	37 31.4	118
3	I increases employees' willingness to try harder	2 1.7	4 3.4	19 16.1	51 43.2	42 35.6	118
	Total	4	23	88	142	97	354
EMPLOYEES' SCORES (354)							
1	He/she gets me to do more than I expected to do	25 7.1	31 8.8	105 29.7	114 32.2	79 22.3	354
2	He/she heightens my desire to succeed	12 3.4	27 7.6	97 27.4	130 36.7	88 24.9	354
3	He/she increases my willingness to try harder	13 3.7	26 7.3	89 25.1	133 37.6	93 26.3	354
	Total	50	84	291	377	260	1,062

Source: SPSS Output (2019)

From table 4, it is clearly shown that, both leaders and their followers' perception of employees willingness to put in extra effort scores of the three items on the dimension of leadership outcome that measure: how the respective leader is able to gets employees' to do more than what they are expected them to do, heightens employees' desire to succeed, and able to increases employees willingness to try harder. Based on this, the leaders' self-evaluation of his/ her ability in influencing the aforementioned qualities that initiates workers to put in to extra effort without reservation to work hard in achieving organizational goal. Hence, a leader self-evaluation scores and employees evaluation of the leaders presented respectively. Accordingly, the self- rated scores on the three items, the result show only 1.13% of the leader respondents responded not at all an able to influence employees' extra effort, 6.49% once in a while in influencing employees' extra effort, 24.86% sometimes influencing employees' extra effort effective, 40.11% Fairly Often in influencing employees' extra effort and 27.40% Frequently respectively. In the similar manner, the academic staff responded to leaders' ability in influencing them to be willing to put extra effort, 4.71% of the respondents responded not at all, 7.91% say once in a while, 27.40% say sometimes, 35.5% say fairly often and 24.48% say frequently in influencing them to exert extra effort respectively.

To sum up, the majority of the responses that reflect the self-perception that the perceived extra effort of a leader (leadership outcome) is fairly often to frequently, in academic leaders' leadership effective performance with 67.51%. In the same manner, the rater's reported perceived leadership effectiveness of academic leaders

also reported fairly often to frequently effective with 59.98%.

Moreover, the perceived employees' Satisfaction discussed below from table 5, it is clear that, both leaders and their followers' perception of employees' satisfaction with leader scores of the two items on the dimension of leadership outcome that measure: the respective leaders uses methods of leadership that are satisfying, and how the leader work with employees in a satisfactory way. The leaders' self-evaluation of his/ her capability in influencing the aforementioned qualities that initiates workers satisfaction to work on the realization of leader's vision in an organization. Hence, a leader self- evaluation scores and employees evaluation of the leaders has been presented accordingly. The self- rated scores on the two items, the result show that only 4.23% of the leader respondents responded as leaders are not at all an able to influence employees' satisfaction, 6.78% once in a while in influencing employees' satisfaction, 21.61% sometimes influencing employees' satisfaction, 43.22% fairly often in influencing employees' satisfaction and 27.97% frequently respectively.

Table 5: Composite one-way frequency tables for the two questionnaire items that probe the Leadership outcome sub-dimension of: Perceived employees' Satisfaction

| No | Question Items | Frequency of Occurrences | | | | | Total |
		Not at all	Once in a while	Some times	Fairly Often	Frequently not always	
	LEADERS' SCORES (118)						
1	I uses methods of leadership that are satisfying	-	11 9.3	24 20.3	52 44.1	31 26.3	118
2	I work with employees in a satisfactory way	1 .8	5 4.2	27 22.9	50 42.4	35 29.7	118
	Total	1	16	51	102	66	236
	EMPLOYEES' SCORES (354)						
1	He/she uses methods of leadership that are satisfying	14 4.0	25 7.1	100 28.2	127 35.9	88 24.9	354
2	He/she works with me in a satisfactory way	12 3.4	32 9.0	81 22.9	126 35.6	103 29.1	354
	Total	**26**	**57**	**181**	**253**	**191**	**708**

Source: SPSS Output (2019)

In similar vein, the academic staff responded to leaders' ability in influencing them to be satisfied with leaders' managerial leadership. Accordingly, 3.57% of the respondents responded not at all, 8.10% say once in a while, 25.56% say sometimes, 35.73% say fairly often and 26.97% say frequently in influencing them to exert extra effort respectively.

To sum up, the majority of the responses that reflect the self-perception that a leader's perceived to be exhibiting satisfactory leadership (leadership outcome) is fairly often -to- frequently, in academic leaders' leadership effective performance with 71.19%. In the same manner, the rater's reported perceived leadership effectiveness of academic leaders also reported fairly often to frequently effective with percentage of 62.71.98%.

Furthermore, from both leader's self-reported and followers rater's reported, the response patterns on the perceptions of academic leaders managerial effectiveness seem to suggest that on all the three dimensions of leadership outcomes: effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction about more than half of the responses observed as a fairly often in engaging and performing effective leadership behaviors.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics on the Perception means scores, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for the Leadership effectiveness dimensions of extra-effort; effectiveness and satisfaction

Dimensions of Leadership Outcomes	N	M	SD	Mini.	Maximum	Range
Larder's Self-Report						
Effectiveness	118	2.88	.549	1	4	4
Extra Effort	118	2.86	.617	0	4	4
Satisfaction	118	2.92	.680	1	4	4
Total Scores leaders'	118	2.89	.615	0	4	4

Dimensions of Leadership Outcomes	N	M	SD	Mini.	Maximum	Range
Academic Employees' report						
Effectiveness	354	2.79	.909	0	4	4
Extra Effort	354	2.67	.907	0	4	4
Satisfaction	354	2.74	.958	0	4	4
Total Scores followers'	354	2.73	.925	0	4	4

Source: SPSS Output (2019)

Similar to the previous discussion that explored the leaders' effectivness leadership behaviors as assessed by the MLQ-5x using questions that measure each construct, this part intended to discuss the central tendency of the responses on the perceptions of leaders' self and their followers as summarized in the table 6 using descriptive statistics such as mean score, standard deviation, minimum, maximum and range for the 118 leaders and 354 followers participants that answered the MLQ-5x. Accordingly, leaders' self-report on their leadership outcomes were (M = 2.89, SD = 0.62) and followers' report on the perception of their leaders' leadership outcomes (M=2.73, SD=.93) given that the MLQ was on a 0 to 4 scale ranging from leaders' managerial effectiveness "not at all" effective -to-"frequently effective". The sub scores for the individual Leadership outcome dimensions were again clustering near this mean, with leaders' self-perception of satisfactory leadership is being the highest (M = 2.92, SD = 0.68), followed by effectiveness (M = 2.88, SD = .55), and Extra effort (M = 2.86, SD = .62). Whereas, the followers' perceptions of leaders' effective leadership outcomes observed, perceived leadership effectiveness is being the highest relative to other dimensions (M = 2.79, SD = .91), followed by perceived satisfaction on the leader (M = 2.74, SD = .96) and Extra effort (M = 2.67, SD = .91).

CONCLUSION:

As it is revealed on the summarized descriptive statistics displayed in table 4, 5 and 6 above, the academic leaders' self-reported and raters' reported level of managerial effectiveness observed very similar on all the three dimensions of leadership effectivness with slight differences. An overall, analysis of the data supports the idea that these public universities' leaders have exhibited moderately high level of effective leadership behaviors. This is validated by the mean scores of the three dimensions of effective performing leadership outcomes (2.92, 2.88, and 2.86) of leaders' self-evaluation as well as 2.79, 2.74, and 2.67 of followers' evaluation of their leaders. Relatively, the mean scores of both on the leaders' self-evaluation and those of the followers, the employees' extra effort is lower relative to the other two constructs, 2.86 and 2.67 respectively as measured by each group. This imply that relative to the rest two constructs of leadership out comes, employees' extra effort in Ethiopian higher learning institutions perceived to be less positive. Therefore, this is specifically more important that employees' willingness to put in extra effort is pivotal in higher learning institutions as employees are motivated to work more that expected to work wholeheartedly. Such employees are effective in what they do and satisfied with their jobs and most likely to stay with organization, contribute and enhance the high productivity of higher education. Moreover, an overall mean scores for all the three constructs together (2.84, 2.77, and 2.83) reported for all respondents-leaders together with their followers. These means that scores of all together estimated to be nearly the frequency of occurrences rating level minimum 2.67 –to-2.92 maimum which rounded to '3' implied that, academic leaders perceived to be fairly often effective (moderately high effective), this also mean that the perceptions of respondents can be taken as positive perception of all the thee leadership outcomes in engaging and performing in effective leadership in the eyes of both their own and their subordinates.

Hence, based on the finding above, it is fair to conclude that, Ethiopian public universities academic leaders' are moderately effective in leading the three primary pillars of higher learning institutions mission which are production of high quality human resources, provision of quality research and provision of quality service to the community, to address the nation's development demands. Therefore, sustainable leaders' capacity building through established training and development programs has to be the priority of government and universities if desired goals are to be achieved successful.

IMPLICATION:

The study result has an implication on social change that, in expanding leadership development programs that influences and improves leaders' managerial effectiveness to address the higher learning institutions' demand for quality leaders for the benefit of Ethiopian public universities as well as the society at large. Practically, the results of this study would rise an awareness of the need for the leaders' capacity building through establishing

training and development programs to produce an effective leaders who are proactive align with an institution's vision with communities' expectations, thus improving an organization's public perceptions as well.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH:

This research was conducted to study the level of academic leaders' managerial effectiveness in some selected Ethiopian public universities. The data were collected from both academic leaders and their followers using structured multifactorial leadership questionnaires that focused on leadership out comes. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Therefore, this study is not free of limitations as measuring leadership effectiveness by itself is not an easy, it requires a more compressive and robust studies to come up with clear understanding and practices of effective leadership. Accordingly, as this study only focused on public universities, more study that may include private higher learning institutions are recommended. In the same manner, in this study, leadership effectiveness was measured by using subjective (criteria) aspects of leadership effectivness (behavior) using employees perceptions to assess as they perceive the behavior of an effective leadership outcomes, whereas, the objective or result based (criteria) measure of effectiveness of leadership is another way to leadership effectiveness, whereby the leaders are measured by objective criteria that is goal achievements based on performance evaluation results. Therefore, empirical study that focuses on both the subjective criteria together with objective measure of leadership effectiveness is highly recommended. Furthermore, as this study was descriptive survey used to analyze the data collected using descriptive statistics, therefore, a robust research that focuses on identifying variables that influences these effectivness of leadership using high level correlation and regression analysis in Ethiopian higher education context is highly recommended.

REFERENCES:

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th Ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1995). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire leader 5x-short form.* Palo Alto: Mind Garden.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (2000). *Manual for multi-factor leadership questionnaire: Sampler set*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.

Bryman, (2009). *Effective Leadership in higher education*. Final Report, research and development serious: Leadership Foundation for higher education, London.

Cooper, J. F., & Nirenberg, J. (2004). *Leadership effectiveness*. In G. R. Goethals, G. J. Soreson, & J. M. Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (pp. 845-854). http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412952392

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Flumerfelt, S., & Banachowski, M. (2011). Understanding leadership paradigms for improvement in higher education, *Quality Assurance in Education, 19*(3), 224- 247. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/s09684881111158045

Gilley, A., Gilley, J. W., Ambort-Clark, K. A., & Marion, D. (2014). *Evidence of managerial malpractice:* An empirical study, *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 19(4), 24-42.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality, *American psychologist*, *49*(6), 493.

Jacobsen, C. B., & Bøgh Andersen, L. (2015). Is leadership in the eye of the beholder? A study of intended and perceived leadership practices and organizational performance, *Public Administration Review, 75*(6), 829-841.

Jain, A., Srivastava, S., & Sullivan, S. (2013). Leader effectiveness in emerging markets: an empirical study of the managers in India, *Journal of Technology Management in China*, *8*(2), 105-119.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*, Harvard business press.

Leverty, J. T., & Grace, M. F. (2012). Dupes or incompetents? An examination of management's impact on firm distress, *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, *79*(3), 751-783.

MOE, (2018). *Ethiopian Ministry of Education Annual report*, Obtained from Information communication documentation Center.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership theory and practice, (7th ed),* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's alpha, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 381–391.

Walter, F., Humphrey, R. H., & Cole, M. S. (2012). Unleashing leadership potential: Toward an evidence-based management of emotional intelligence, *Organizational Dynamics*, *41*(3), 212-219.

Weinberger, L. A. (2009). Emotional intelligence, leadership style, and perceived leadership effectiveness, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *11*(6), 747-772.

Yamane, Taro. (1967). *Statistics, an Introductory Analysis*, (2nd Ed.), New York: Harper and Row.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations,* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Sagor, R. (1992). Three principals who make a difference. Educational Leadership, 49(3), 13- 18.

Yukl, G. (2011). *Contingency theories of effective leadership*, In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 286-298). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behaviors: What we know and what questions need more attention? *Academy of Management*, 26(4), 66–85. doi: 10.5465/amp.2012.0088

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.