

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

January 2014

Leadership Style, Culture and Commitment: An Analytical Study of University Libraries in Pakistan

Muhammad Rafiq Awan

University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan, rafiqawan@gmail.com

Khalid Mahmood PhD

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan, khalidmahmood@yahoo.com

Haroon Idrees PhD

University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan, h.haroonidrees@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Awan, Muhammad Rafiq; Mahmood, Khalid PhD; and Idrees, Haroon PhD, "Leadership Style, Culture and Commitment: An Analytical Study of University Libraries in Pakistan" (2014). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1053.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1053>

Leadership Style, Culture and Commitment: An Analytical Study of University Libraries in Pakistan

Muhammad Rafiq Awan

Chief Library Officer

University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

rafiqawan@gmail.com

Dr. Khalid Mahmood

Professor of Library & Information Science

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

khalidmahmood@yahoo.com

Dr. Haroon Idrees

Assistant Professor of Library & Information Science

University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

h.haroonidrees@gmail.com

Keyword: Leadership Style, Public Sector University Libraries; Private Sector University Libraries, Organizational Culture, Employee Commitment, Universities of Pakistan

Abstract

This study aims to find relationship of leadership style of Chief Librarians, with organizational culture and employee commitment in university libraries in Pakistan. Data for the research were collected through a survey of public and private sector universities in Punjab (province) and federal capital of Pakistan. The university libraries having more than three library professionals were included in selected sample. The perception of Chief Librarians' leadership style was taken from their subordinate professionals and its relationship was found with the culture of organization and job commitment. 115 respondents' data, collected through structured questionnaire, based on t-test, Chi-square and ANOVA tests to find the relationship among relevant variables has been presented in this paper. No significant relationship was found between leadership style and organizational culture in public sector universities, while private sector university libraries exhibit that there is significant relationship between leadership style and organizational cultures in private sector universities. There is no relationship between leadership style and employee commitment in public and private sector university libraries. A significant relationship between organizational culture and employee commitment in was found in both private and public sector universities.

Introduction & Theoretical Framework

Leaders are needed in all fields and at all levels to give their best (Adair, 2003). Leaders possess certain qualities which distinguish them from non-leaders. They utilize their potential, skill set, and influences to motivate and inspire the followers and help them thrive for the attainment of organizational objectives. Leaders do so by exercising authority, enforcement of

rules, participation, maneuvering the situation and by effectively organizing team efforts. Leaders create culture where people put their efforts for goal attainment for the organizational success. Leaders have commitment with the organizational goals and sincerity with followers, which in response, inspire the people and enhance commitment with the leader and organization. Total leaders establish their personal examples. Hence, people are discussing the issue of future leadership, whose main focus would not be the merits of public or private sector but the scarcity of moral leadership in today's society (Donkin, 2004).

“Leadership is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal.” (Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2005).

Avolio, et al. (1999) found following leadership styles through Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire:

- a. Charisma/Inspirational. Providing followers with a clear sense of purpose,
- b. Intellectual Stimulation. Encouraging followers to question for problem solving,
- c. Individualized Consideration. Understanding the needs of each follower
- d. Contingent Reward. Expectations from followers and how they are rewarded in response.
- e. Active Management-By-Exception. Monitoring the tasks closely to maintain performance.
- f. Passive-Avoidant Leadership. React only after arising serious problems & take corrective action.

Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) developed leadership style model, which includes:

- a. ***Transformational Leadership***: in which, the leader inspires and motivate its followers for task achievement
- b. ***Transactional Leadership***: in which, the leader rewards on goal achieve and punish on failure.

The leadership styles considered in this study are: *Autocratic*, *Democratic*, and *Laissez-fair* that have been given by Kurt and Lewin in their study for leadership styles at University of Iowa in 1939.

Autocratic Leader: dominates team-members, using unilateralism to achieve an objective

Participative Leader: democratic leader makes decisions by consulting his team

Laissez-faire Leader: laissez-faire leader exercises little control over his group

Leadership Style in Public and Private Sector

Leadership style is the behavior pattern used by a leader to resolve the organizational issues (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Leadership style of principals of private and public sector is more tasks oriented and less people oriented (Waqar and Siddiqui, 2010).

To differentiate the leadership style of public and private sector, Hudson (2009) used its Business Attitudes Questionnaire (BAQ) to analyze the personality characteristics of 1,185 senior leaders in Europe. Among these leaders, 485 were selected from private and 700 from public sector. The results were compared to over 64000 people all over the globe. His key findings were as follows:

- Public sector leaders are long term strategy oriented.
- Private sector leaders desire quick results.
- Public sector leaders believe in control and command.
- Private sector leaders trust their subordinates.
- Public sector leaders are less optimistic and they go behind thoughtful approach.
- Women leaders in public sector are out spoken.
- Young leaders in private sector avail more opportunities for personal development.

Further results of research show that the nature of public sector organizations is comparatively complex and these results are equally applicable for global leadership. Major findings of this study includes that private sector leadership style is not the benchmark for public sector. It varies from organization to organization and certain factors will determine particular traits. It was further suggested that mutual exchange of leaders may extremely be useful for both the sectors, especially for learning point of view.

“One can not list a few truly great people and names like Winston Churchill, Emily Pankhurst, Florence Nightingale and Nelson Mandela are likely to be mentioned. The names of outstanding company Chief Executives and Chairmen are less likely be included. This illustrates a crucial difference between the effects of the quality of leadership in the public sector compared to the private sector. Many excellent commercial business leaders have made wonderful contributions not only to their company, but also to the health of the economy and the well-being of each one of us” (O’Breien, 2004).

Voon, Ngui, & Ayob stated that style of leaders can be the basis of organizational success because the target achievement can only be made by taking up suitable leadership style which affects the job satisfaction, commitment and productivity in the public sector.

Guyot (1962) conducted a study about the difference in the motivational level of private and public sector leaders. He states that motivational factors in public sector are very few as compared with public sector.

According to Brooks (2007) “leaders do not often evidence the current skill sets that are required of them and this is more acute in the public sector”.

Kim (2005) says public sector employees have certain positive attributes which contribute to organizational performance; however, individual-level factors may affect organizational performance.

The effective public sector leaders always depend upon transformational leadership behavior while leaders have both transformational and transactional leadership styles (Rukmani, Ramesh & Jayakrishnan, 2010).

As per the views of Boyne (2002), public sector organizations are said to be more bureaucratic which means a clear division of responsibility and hence more role clarity for employees as well as managers

Venkatapathy (1990) concluded that Public sector organizations are considered to be more cautious, rigid and less innovative due to its organizational design, strictness to rules and strategic considerations.

Bodla & Nawaz (2010) revealed in their study that in the public sector universities’ dominant leadership style is transactional and they use rewards as motivational factor to the subordinates. Hence, researchers seemed doubtful about the presence of proper reward system in the public sector universities

Leadership Style in Private Sector

There are certain reasons which show that the private sector does not infect or lose its customers while the public sector does (Wood, 2008). A study by Zhu (2007) revealed that organizational culture and transactional or transformational leadership styles have impact on employee receptivity. A research by Hansen and Villadsen (2010) shows that leaders in private sector are more inclined towards directive style.

The leadership style in the private sector in Turkish business organizations, dug out by Ozmen, (2005) as per perception of employees about their managers is more inclined towards task orientation rather than people orientation.

According to the findings of Chaudhry and Javed (2012) “transformational leadership has positive, strong and significant association with the Commitment. But the motivational level in respect of Laissez Faire is low because of no interference of management”.

Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Job Commitment

The phenomenon of culture and leadership is complex one to study. Due to multifarious linkages among the postulates of both phenomena; it is, however, difficult to recognize the mutual effects. Hofsted (2001) narrates that for the ultimate interpretation and adaptation of organizational culture, it is a prerequisite to understand local traditions, management practices and human resource development. In this context, in order to carry out study, it is imperative to know the subject framework for better understanding of relevant areas.

Commitment is feeling of emotional attachment with something or someone. This attachment might be mental or intellectual with a person, group or with organization (Eisenberger et al., 2001). It has also been defined as “loyalty, identification, and involvement with some appropriate object” (Buchanan, 1974). In an organizational setting, such loyalty involves feelings of attachment, which develops as individuals share values in common with other members of the group.

Research Design

Survey method is opted when the purpose is to find descriptive relationship among the variables in phenomena. It is beneficial when non experimental data about an occurrence is needed to collect through structured questionnaire and it would be difficult to find observable facts directly from the population (McIntyre, 1999). This method is being widely used in library and information Science research. There may be plenty of research topics in librarianship for which survey research can be used, e.g. when a researcher desires to work in the areas of user satisfaction, services quality, reading habits, information seeking behavior and library management etc.

According to Busha and Harter (1980) survey research can be used in Cross-Sectional Surveys, Longitudinal Surveys, Trend Studies, Cohort Studies and Panel Studies.

Sampling

The purpose of study was to identify the relationship among leadership style of chief librarians as perceived by their professional staff and their perception about organizational culture and level of commitment in the university libraries of public and private sector.

The sample of 115 university libraries was taken including private and public sector university libraries. It was taken into consideration that only those libraries would be the part of sample where at least three library professionals were working. Among the selected sample, 84 libraries were from public sector universities, while 27 libraries were from private sector universities.

Instrument

A structured questionnaire was distributed and collected personally from the respondents. Instrument was comprised of four parts. Part I of the instrument was comprised of demographic information of the respondents, in the part II leadership style of chief librarians was indentified through T- P Leadership Questionnaire, through part III instrument organizational culture of libraries was found by using questions adapted from Rowe and Mason (1987) and in part IV employee commitment was judged by using questions about level of commitment of library professionals at Likert Scale.

All the scores were calculated through prescribed formulas. Statistical analysis was done by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Various tests were used as per need for testing the hypothesis.

Descriptive statistics

Basic features of data can be described through descriptive statistics. It provides the simple and easy understanding about sample and calculations. Tables and graphical representation of data can be easily done through this statistic. It helps the researchers to present the quantitative descriptions in a manageable form. T-test, Chi-square and ANOVA were applied for analysis purpose.

Data Analysis and Discussion

Respondents from Public and Private Sector Universities

After the emergence of Pakistan only public sector was having the monopoly of providing higher education, resulting the presence of university libraries in the same sector. In the past two decades private sector has been emerged swiftly. The table I shows the representation of respondents from public and private sector university libraries. Seventy three percent of the respondents were serving the public sector universities and 27 percent belonged to private sector university libraries. The data shows that the majority of library professionals are still attached to the public sector universities. It is evident that large libraries are still attached with public sector universities.

Table I. Ratio of respondents from public and private sector universities

Sector	Frequency	Percent
Public Sector Universities	84	73
Private Sector Universities	31	27

The current decade has experienced a rapid increase in the private sector education. Many private sector universities and institutes of higher education have been given the charter. However, the dominant proportion of library professionals is still in the public sector universities. Other factor behind this thinking is that the private sector universities normally did not prefer to develop their libraries due to their poor physical infrastructure, financial stability and research culture. In spite of very attractive salaries in private sector library professionals still prefer public sector universities. Job stability might be the other factor for sticking with public sector.

Organizational Design of University Libraries

From the results that have been shown in the table II, we can conclude that very high percentage (82%) of designation of respondents is assistant librarians and librarians. It means that a good organizational design has yet to be evolved in university libraries which formally create system of task and authority to control activities for achievement of organizational goals. Middle management layers and frontline management layers are absent in the most of the university libraries' organizational design. Jones (2001) says that "organizational design has important implication for an organization's ability to deal with contingencies, achieve a competitive advantage, effectively manage diversity, and increase its efficiency and ability to innovate new goods and services." The organizational design which is being represented from the results shows that university libraries are flat organizations. There is no smooth promotion of library professionals, command and control mechanism and standard operating procedures within the organizations of university libraries. Organizational design theorists agreed that flat organization becomes lethargic with the passage of time. People become de-motivated and careless because they find no route for personal and professional development.

Table II. Designation of the respondents

Designation	Frequency	Percent
Assistant Librarian	49	43
Cataloguer / Classifier	3	3
Depository Librarian	1	1
Deputy Chief Librarian	3	3
Deputy Librarian	2	2
Junior Cataloguer / Classifier	3	3
Librarian	45	39
Library Officer	1	1
Manager (IRC)	1	1
Senior Librarian	5	4
Serials Librarian	1	1

Relationship between Leadership Style and Organizational Culture in Public Sector University Libraries

One of the null hypotheses of this study was that ‘There is no relationship between the leadership style and organizational culture on the basis of public and private sector universities.’ This relationship was calculated in a contingency table by applying Chi-square test. The results of the test have been shown in table III. The analysis explores that as per perception of the respondents, libraries whose chief librarians were having autocratic leadership style, exhibit comparatively high value of achievement culture (32 out of 78 respondents), the value of bureaucratic culture is at the second in rank (18 out of 78), clan culture is at the third position (16 out of 78 respondents) and adaptability culture is at the fourth position. The ratio of Laisses-fair leadership style and its relation in public sector university libraries is very low, 3 respondents perceiving Laisses-fair leadership in their chief librarians considered that their libraries exhibit achievement culture, one respondent felt that the library shows bureaucratic culture and 1 favored clan culture and none of the five respondents considered adaptability culture in their libraries in public sector. The 0.755 alpha value is higher than 0.05 acceptable value and chi-square value is 1.19 at 3 degree of freedom. On the basis of the results null hypothesis which stated that there is no relationship in the leadership style and organizational culture in public sector universities can be accepted.

Table III. Cross tabulation of leadership style and organizational culture in public university libraries

Leadership Style	Organizational Culture			
	Achievement Culture	Bureaucratic Culture	Adaptability Culture	Clan Culture
Autocratic	32	18	12	16
Laisses-Fair	3	1	0	1

Pearson Chi-Square = 1.19, df = 3, Sig. = 0.755

Relationship between Leadership Style and Organizational Culture in Private Sector Universities

The number of respondents from private sector universities was 31 out of 115. According to the hypothesis of this study, there is difference in the relationship among leadership style and organizational culture in private sector. To check the hypothesis cross tab was used along with chi-square test to see the relationship among these variables. The results of test revealed that the respondents who supposed that their chief librarians had autocratic leadership also alleged that their libraries show signs of achievement culture. This figure (15 out of total 28) is the highest score, seven respondents felt that their libraries had bureaucratic culture under autocratic

leadership style of chief librarian, one respondent favored adaptability culture and five considered clan culture under the autocratic style of their respective chiefs. As far as the score of Laissez-fair leadership of chief librarians is concerned in the private sector university libraries, only 3 respondents seemed to demonstrate clan culture in their libraries but none of them favored other three cultures. It is interesting to note that the result of chi-square shows a significant relationship in the leadership style and organizational culture among the private sector university libraries. The chi-square value is 9.54 at 3 degrees of freedom and the 0.023 alpha is highly significant. This revealed the fact that private sector library professionals considered that there must be better organizational culture in the working environment. Our null hypothesis which claims that there is no such relationship has been rejected.

Table IV. Cross tabulation of leadership style and organizational culture in private universities

Leadership Style	Organizational Culture			
	Achievement Culture	Bureaucratic Culture	Adaptability Culture	Clan Culture
Autocratic	15	7	1	5
Laissez-Fair	0	0	0	3

Pearson Chi-Square = 9.549, df = 3, Sig. = 0.023

Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment in Public Sector Universities

To see the significant relationship between the means of employee commitment and two groups of leadership style among the public sector universities the independent t-test was applied. The result reveals the mean scores as autocratic = 3.69 and Laissez-fair = 3.54. The mean difference among the variables was 0.149, the alpha value 0.735 and the value of t = 0.587.

Table V. Cross tabulation of leadership style and employee commitment in public sector universities

Leadership Style	Mean	Std. Deviation
Autocratic	3.69	0.55
Laissez-Fair	3.54	0.63

F = 0.115, t = .587, Sig. = 0.735

The data in table V shows that there is no significant relationship in the leadership style and employee commitment on the basis of leadership style in the public sector libraries. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, which indicates that professionals feel equally committed under both leadership styles.

Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment in Private Sector Universities

As per the null hypothesis there is no relationship in employee commitment and leadership style in private sector universities. By applying the above test in the same manner the values are presented in the table 4.20. The mean of autocratic leadership is 3.69 and laisses-fair is 3.53, F ratio = 0.031 at significance level of 0.860 and the value of $t = 0.461$ and the mean difference = 0.159. The results of the test (table VI) show that there is no significant relationship between the leadership style and employee commitment on the basis of autocratic and laisses-fair leadership styles in the private sector libraries.

Table VI. Cross tabulation of leadership style and employee commitment in private sector university libraries

Leadership Style	Mean	Std. Deviation
Autocratic	3.69	0.57
Laisses-Fair	3.53	0.52

F = .031, t = .461, Sig. = 0.860

Relationship between Employee Commitment and Organizational Culture in Public Sector Universities

For testing the null hypothesis, i.e., ‘there is no relationship between employee commitment and various culture types in the public sector universities’ ANOVA was used. The results in table VII show that the mean scores of employee commitment in achievement, bureaucratic, adaptability and clan cultures are 3.78, 3.44, 3.54 and 3.85 respectively. The value of F is 2.52 and alpha is 0.064 which is not statistically significant at $p= 0.05$.

Table VII. ANOVA table for the responses of employee commitment by organizational culture in public sector university libraries

Type of Organizational Culture	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement Culture	3.78	0.58

Bureaucratic Culture	3.44	0.47
Adaptability Culture	3.54	0.58
Clan Culture	3.85	0.49

F = 2.52, df = 3, Sig = 0.064

Employee commitment is another factor which is given attention for efficiency and performance in the public sector. So, multiple factors beyond the conventional employee commitment help to explain various motivational bases among employees (Lee, 2004). It has been proved in many researches that there is relationship in organizational culture and employee commitment even in the public sector. As far as the case of university libraries is concerned, we find no significant relationship in this regard. The results (table VII), however, show that it is near to statistical significance.

Relationship between Employee Commitment and Organizational Culture in Private Sector Universities

To test this relationship in private sector universities, the analysis of variance in four types of organizational cultures was used. The results in table VIII show the values of ANOVA. The mean of achievement culture is 3.70, bureaucratic culture is 3.57, adaptability culture is 3.00 and clan culture is 3.82 while F is 0.717 and alpha is 0.551. These values show that there is no significant relationship between the two variables.

Table VIII. ANOVA table for the responses of employee commitment by organizational culture in private sector university libraries

Organizational Culture	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement Culture	3.70	0.61
Bureaucratic Culture	3.57	0.62
Adaptability Culture	3.00	
Clan Culture	3.82	0.41

F = 0.717, df = 3, Sig = 0.551

Difference in Leadership Style Organizational Culture and Job Commitment in Public and Private Sector University Libraries

It is generally considered that management and leadership style in public and private sector varies largely. Public sector is more authoritative and bureaucratic as compared to private sector. The results (table III) show that leadership style and organizational culture have no relationship in public sector universities. However, laissez-faire leadership style somehow exists in public sector university libraries having little ratio of achievement culture. While strong ratio of autocratic leadership and presence of achievement and bureaucratic culture is also found in public sector university libraries. Results also show that a reasonable ratio of achievement and clan cultures also exists under authoritative library leaders in public sector university libraries. Public sector libraries showed no relationship in leadership style and organizational culture and employee commitment. So our hypotheses related to public sector university libraries have been rejected.

The growing higher education in private sector is having poor library infrastructure. Most of the library leaders in private sector have been previously serving public sector university libraries. So the characteristics of public sector seem dominant in private sector university libraries. However, the organizational culture is quite different in public sector university libraries. There is significant relationship in public and private sector university libraries. The dominant culture of private sector university libraries is achievement culture with some ratio of bureaucratic and clan cultures. The results (table VIII) reveal no significant relationship between organizational culture and employee commitment in private sector university libraries. It is however, evident that private sector university libraries showed significant relationship between leadership style and organizational culture, but this relationship could not be traced in other two variables.

Conclusion

This study concludes the following facts:

- 1- There is no relationship between leadership style and organizational culture in public sector universities.
- 2- There is significant relationship between leadership style and organizational cultures in private sector universities. Most of the private sector universities have been established by the corporate sector chief executives and they have introduced corporate culture in their academic organizations. So people consider the leadership style and organizational culture accordingly.
- 3- There is no relationship between leadership style and employee commitment in public and private sector university libraries.
- 4- There is no significant relationship between organizational culture and employee commitment in public and private sector universities.
- 5- One of the considerable points in the results is that none of the chief librarians in public and private sector is having participative leadership style which shows that majority of chief librarians are autocrats and very few fall in Laissez-Faire category.

References

- Adair, J. (2003). *The Inspirational Leader*, London: Kogan Page.
- Avolio B. J. 1999. *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bodla, M. A. & Nawaz, M. M., (2010). Comparative Study of Full Range Leadership Model among Faculty Members in Public and Private Sector Higher Education Institutes and Universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 208-214.
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: What's the difference?. *Journal of Management Studies* 39(1), 97–122.
- Brookes, S. M. (2007). 360 degree leadership in the public sector: developing an approach to collective leadership. Paper presented at the University of Delaware 3rd Transatlantic Dialogue conference. Newark, Delaware, USA.
- Burns J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Busha, C. H. & Harter, S. P. (1980). *Research Methods in Librarianship: Techniques and Interpretation*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- Buchanan, P. C. (1974). *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(2), pp. 287-289.
- Chaudhry, A. Q, & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 3(7).
- Donkin, R. (2004). Public versus private sector leadership. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 15(3). Retrieved on April 09, 2012 from http://www.richarddonkin.com/x_leadership_public_vs_private.htm
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51.
- Guyot, J. F. (1962) Government bureaucrats are different. *Public Administration Review*. 22(4), 195-202.
- Hansen, J. R., & Villadsen, A. R. (2010). Comparing Public and Private Managers' Leadership Styles: Understanding the Role of Job Context. *International Public Management Journal* 13(3), 247-274.
- Hofstede G.H. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hudson, S. (2009). Decoding the DNA of Public and Private Sector Leaders. *International Review of Public Administration*, 8 (2), 13-24. Retrieved on March, 12, 2012 from <http://eu.hudson.com/node.asp?kwd=2009-06-decoding-the-dna-of-public-and-private-sector-leaders>

- Jones, G. R. (2001). *Organizational theory: Text and cases* (3rd ed). London: Prentice Hall.
- Kim, S. (2005). Individual-level factors and organisational performance in government organisations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(2), 245-261.
- Lee, S. H. (2004). Moving forward to employee commitment in public sector: Does it matter?
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301
- McIntyre, L. J. (1999). *The practical skeptic: Core concepts in sociology*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership, theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Brien, D. (2004). Leadership in the Public sector. Retrieved on March, 10, 2012 from: [http://www.ashridge.org.uk/website/IC.nsf/wFARATT/Behind%20The%20Screens:%20Leadership%20In%20The%20Public%20Sector/\\$file/BehindtheScreens.pdf](http://www.ashridge.org.uk/website/IC.nsf/wFARATT/Behind%20The%20Screens:%20Leadership%20In%20The%20Public%20Sector/$file/BehindtheScreens.pdf)
- Ozdemir, N. İ. (2005). *Leadership style of Turkish middle level managers in private sector and its relationship with subordinate performance, satisfaction, and commitment*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Rowe, A. J. & Mason, R. O. (1987). *Managing with Style: A Guide to Understand, Assessing, and Improving Decision Making*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publisher.
- Rukmani, K., Ramesh, M., & Jayakrishnan, J. (2010). Effect of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(3), 365-370.
- Venkatapathy, R. (1990). Perception of Top Management Leadership Styles and Climate: A Study of Private and Public Executives, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 25(3), 303-311.
- Voon, M. L., Lo, M. C., Ngui, K. S. & Ayob, N. B. (2011). 'The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia', *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 24-32.
- Waqar, S. H. & Siddiqui, K. (2009). A Study about the Leadership Styles of Public and Private School Principals. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 18(1-2), 5-20.
- Wood, J. (2008). Leadership in public and private sector. Retrieved on February 01, 2012 from <http://johnredwoodsdiary.com/2008/02/01/leadership-in-public-and-private-sectors/>
- Yukl, G. A. (2005). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zhu, Y. (2007) Do Cultural Values Shape Employee Receptivity to Leadership Styles? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3) 89-90.