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PENGARUH KEPIMPINAN TRANSFORMASI DAN ORGANISASI PEMBELAJARAN TERHADAP PELAKSANAAN PENGURUSAN KUALITI MENYELURUH DI UNIVERSITI AWAM DI LIBYA

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan mengenal pasti pengaruh Kepimpinan Transformasi dan Organisasi Pembelajaran terhadap pelaksanaan Pengurusan Kualiti Menyeluruh (TQM) di dua buah universiti awam di Libya. Kaedah gabungan (mixed method) telah digunakan dalam proses pengumpulan data. Kaedah tinjauan dengan menggunakan soal selidik sebagai alat ukur kajian telah digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data kuantitatif, manakala teknik temu bual pula telah digunakan untuk pengumpulan data kualitatif. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa TL dan LO mempunyai pengaruh yang signifikan ke atas pelaksanaan TQM di universiti terpilih dalam kajian ini. Dapatkan kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa TL dan LO mempunyai pengaruh yang signifikan ke atas pelaksanaan TQM di universiti di Libya. Walau bagaimanapun, keputusan menunjukkan bahawa hanya tiga dimensi LO yang bertindak sebagai moderator yang signifikan terhadap hubungan antara TL dengan TQM iaitu; Mental Models, Shared vision and Systems thinking. Selain itu, hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa terdapat kekangan yang dihadapi oleh universiti awam Libya dalam melaksanakan TQM. Kekangan ini adalah berkaitan dengan aspek kemahiran kepimpinan dan usaha-usaha universiti dalam menyesuaikan diri dengan perubahan untuk menjadi sebuah LO. Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, dapat disimpulkan bahawa dalam melaksanakan TQM di universiti awam, pihak Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi Libya seharusnya mengambil kira aspek kepimpinan dan keterbukaan organisasi tersebut untuk belajar dengan kemahiran pengurusan yang baru agar prasyarat yang perlu ada dalam melaksanakan TQM dapat diwujudkan dalam organisasi tersebut. Hal ini sekalius dapat membantu meningkatkan kelancaran dan keberkesanan pelaksanaa TQM dalam organisasi berkenaan.
THE INFLUENCE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND LEARNING ORGANISATION ON TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION IN LIBYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the influence of transformational leadership and learning organisation on the implementation of total quality management (TQM) in two public universities in Libya. The mixed method was used in the data collection process. A survey method using a questionnaire was used in collecting quantitative data, while interviews were used for qualitative data collection. The findings showed that TL and LO have significant influence on TQM implementation in the selected universities. The findings also indicated that TL and LO have significant influence on TQM implementation in Libyan public universities. However, the results indicated that there are only three dimensions of LO that acts as the significant moderator on the relationship between TL and TQM namely; Mental Models, Shared vision and Systems thinking. Moreover, the interview findings indicated that there are a few constraints faced by the Libyan public universities in implementing TQM. The constraints are related to the aspect of leadership skills and the efforts of universities in adapting to change and becoming an LO. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that in implementing the TQM in public universities, the Libyan Ministry of Higher Education should consider the needs of developing the aspects of leadership and organisational readiness to learn new management skills as part of necessary requirement in implementing TQM. Thus, this can help to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of TQM in the organisation.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Higher education plays a crucial role in the development of societies and nation building. The impact of international business and global management trends on higher education has placed challenges on higher education institutions (HEIs) to be in line with the globalisation needs. In an attempt to overcome current challenges, many countries around the globe are now moving towards ‘mass’ higher education (Moi, 2006). Therefore, HEIs need to alter their degree programs and courses in order to remain viable in the changing labour market (Sloan, 2009). Thus, the preservation of high quality standards in education has become a major concern of HEIs and governments. This requires ongoing evaluation and government funding to ensure its’ successful in schools, universities and other educational institutions (Najafabadi, Sadeghi, & Habibzadeh, 2008).

Inevitably, this challenge was experienced by Arab countries as well, at the end of the 1990s as the educational systems in such countries faced great challenges in improving the education quality at the university level. Infact, many issues have compelled governments to respond to the new requirements of development in the domains of science and technology as well as strong social demand for a wide range of educational fields and the growing calls for nation development (Sharkawy, 2003). As a consequence, quality management (QM) has been implemented as a mechanism to improve the quality of education in universities in Arab countries including Libya. According to Ahmed and Hussein (2009) and Ali and Shastri (2010), QM is a
common factor that will shape the strategies of HEIs in their attempts to satisfy various stakeholders including students, parents, the industry and society as a whole. Pellettiere (2006) stated that the implementation of QM is one of the key issues that affect individuals, groups and organisations in their attempts to trace TQM implementation in many ways. Furthermore, Pellettiere believed that the capability to learn and adapt to advanced systems is one of the elements of sustainable competitive advantage to such institutions.

1.1 Background of the Study

HEIs have to remain viable, relevant and responsive to the demands from the internal and external environment, such as the globalisation process, advances in technology, the importance of developing a knowledge society and shifting demographics. Thus, in order to provide quality education to fulfil these needs and demands of target stakeholders, QM has been implemented in HEIs (Dean & Bowen, 1994; Spencer, 1994; Bigelow & Arndt, 1995).

QM, in the context of higher education, includes control, assurance and improvement. It covers processes, by which an institution discharges its corporate responsibility for articulating, maintaining and enhancing the academic standards of those activities for which it is responsible (HEQC, 1995, p. 3). It also guarantees the mentioned processes are performed efficiently and effectively.

Quality management has made issues regarding to academic standards explicit. Academic standards are those expectations which have been established for students to meet, and institutional quality assurance procedures are the means by which institutions can demonstrate to those with an interest in higher education (e.g. students, employers of graduates and government) whether or not they are meeting those standards and expectations. Quality management also encompasses those external processes which have
been developed to account for the public funds they receive. These include the processes operated by the government and its agencies (Csizmadia, 2006, p. 25).

Moreover, according to Trow (1994), it is necessary for an HEI to have QM in order to improve its quality and work efficiently. In addition, Van Vught (1996) asserted that adequate QM is needed in higher education as a mean to help the HEIs achieve their QM purposes. For higher education in Libya, the quality management process was adapted from the Total Quality Management (TQM) approach (Najafabadi et al., 2008; Sharkawy, 2003).

TQM is a philosophy in organisational management that emphasizes the quality of the entire process of producing a product. According to Mallapaty (1999),

Basically, TQM is concerned with establishing a quality management system that brings quality into work processes (preventing mistakes rather than detecting them), involves everyone (internal and external customers), values staff training and puts special emphasis on service-user satisfaction. TQM is a comprehensive, top-down and continuous approach to quality management (p. 18).

TQM has proven to be the most persisting management theory in industries and businesses since the early 1980s. In 1961 Armand Feigenbaum has established the total quality concept with the name of total quality control (TQC) (Lien.; Minwud, C., Mingkuo, 2010.; & Slack et al., 1995). However, the idea of 'quality' has been used since 1950s by scholars such as Crosby, Juran and Deming; yet without the word 'total'. Supporting this, according to Sahney et al. (2004), the establishment of the European Foundation of Quality Management in 1988 has been focused on the role of TQM on customer satisfaction.
The TQM term was associated with the quality management in higher education institutions in Libya as TQM is a management approach that emphasizes on customer satisfaction (Najafabadi et al., 2008; Sharkawy, 2003; Ahmed & Hussein, 2009). According to Sahney et al. (2004), in an attempt to react to the demands and ever increasing pressures from its stakeholders, the higher education system in particular finds itself in a market oriented environment, with internal and external customers, whereby, ‘delighting the customer’ is the rule for survival in the long run. And ‘delighting the customer’ is the core message of TQM and hence, there is a need to identify and apply the relevant concepts of TQM to each and every aspect of academic life, that is, to the teaching, learning and administrative activities.

Libya is without a doubt living in a world witnessing a quality revolution and daily changes affecting all types of businesses, enterprises, organisations and individuals. Thus, as many developed countries, Libya has prioritised the quality of its higher education as this level of education produces human capital for national development (Al-Mansouri, 2005).

Libyan researchers voiced the importance of providing a recognition style that encourages a collaboratively created vision for the Libya institutes, especially in the higher education sector (Najafabadi et al., 2008, Sharkawy, 2003, Ahmed and Hussein, 2009). Their efforts involved guiding the institutions through effective change, developing and gaining commitment to organisational visions, connecting to followers and encouraging them to perform beyond expectations.
However, the rapid evolution in the number of HEIs has led to the low level of performance of many of these institutions. The low level of performance is caused by several factors, including lack of faculty specialists, weak institutional infrastructure, lack of necessary equipments for educational activities and an absence of quality programs for such institutions. For example, there are a large number of students in departments and disciplines were not required by society and the labour market (Abu Jaafar, 2009), aside from the quantitative and qualitative evolution in the provision of services. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation estimates that the quantitative increase in the number of students in higher education in Libya is the highest level among Arab states (Bashir, 2005). Total quality management (TQM) and the notions of sustainable development have been applied to educational policy. In Libya education, government and private institutes has reflective effects on the country’s ability to provide professional personals. Therefore, higher education and its internal relations among staff and TQM are axial to the success of sustainable development.

The national strategy for higher education in Libya has outlined plans to be followed by the higher education management system in order to diagnose and identify problems, develop visions and goals, and identify executive steps. The most important priorities proposed by this strategy are the reformation of the administrative and financial system to ensure the independence of universities without which no real change can be made or be effective (Al-Theeb, 2009). Moreover, the Ministry of Higher Education (2004) in Libya made a decision in 2004 to establish a centre for quality assurance at HEIs that applies TQM principles throughout the branches of all universities and colleges. However, Abdul Karim
(2010) explained that, for the time being, these branches are still ineffective, which is a big issue faced by HEIs in Libya.

Al-Theeb (2009) indicated that despite most HEIs in Libya having established centres for quality, there is a diversity in the level of universities and colleges in terms of the implementation of activities and assessment tools for quality and institutional performance. His results showed that the organisational culture is still not encouraging the implementation of evaluation activities and QA. The most important need at the individual level is to provide lectures to widen awareness of the importance of quality and evaluation activities.

According to Koch (2003), many critical issues hinder the implementation of TQM in HEIs such as leadership, customer identification and organisational transformation. Unlike business organisations, the chancellors and leaders of HEIs do not possess ultimate authority and the necessary resources. A lack of necessary authority makes it difficult to arrange their values and goals through layers of HEIs.

While HEIs are places for learning and creating knowledge throughout their research, it is ironic that they have been lagging behind other organisations in implementing TQM. This failure is due to the structural and traditional characteristics of HEIs (Tartouri & Jwayhan, 2006). Ali and Shastri (2010) noted that HEIs that have deep-rooted traditions dated back numerous centuries are reluctant to change. Universities and colleges are organised based on departmental units. In adopting TQM, organisations’ cultures move from product focus to market focus. The faculty’s primary loyalty is directed towards the academic field. Market
requirements for their students are of secondary importance, except for some professional schools such as business and engineering. In business organisations, there is a cross-linkage and sophisticated communication among various functional departments. By contrast, most individual departments of HEIs operate in a vacuum. Leaders of HEIs who want to be competitive in today’s fast-paced, ever-changing world must be able to effectively and efficiently react to change and also implement change in response (Gulam, 2005).

AbdulKarim (2010) stressed that Libyan university leaders need to develop their managerial competences by providing them with knowledge and organisational skills that help them implement various plans. Although some TQM practices have been unsuccessful, previous empirical research has shown that TQM has a positive effect on organisational performance, including innovation performance. Some studies show that there is a significant relationship between organisational learning and innovation (Lien, 2010).

Taylor (2008) contended that leadership is a crucial factor in organisational improvement efforts, while Inman (2007) emphasised that in higher education, it is increasingly recognised that the traditional model of a leader as the head is no longer appropriate. TL has increasingly become associated with individuals at different levels of an organisation and improvement is strongly associated with the effectiveness of leadership throughout the organisation (Inman, 2007).

One of the key factors in the successful implementation of TQM is leadership. Dettmann (2004) explained that leaders must recognise the value of organisational
support towards increasing quality if they wish to remain competitive in the increasingly global world of business. He stated:

Improving the quality of products and services has become a national priority as never before in the ever increasingly competitive world market. As is the case with the industrial sector, the institutions of higher education have also come under increased societal and governmental pressures to demonstrate their quality and economic and societal value. To cope with industrial trends, colleges and universities across the nation have chosen to apply industrial concepts, formulas, and management techniques in addressing their own needs for improvements in value, quality and competitiveness (p. 1).

In universities, leaders, deans and directors are operating within ever changing environments where stakeholders are increasingly demanding about capability, results and students achievement. Thus, leaders must be cognisant of the internal and external environments in which they operate. In this regard, Woolley (2003) (as cited in Fitzgerald, 2003) found that new managerial skills introduced through corporate training programs took root in those sub-units whose leaders had the skill and embraced TQM as a new managerial behaviour. While engaged in strategic change, executive managers may display leadership that is classified as either transformational or transactional. A type of leadership frequently associated with organisational change is transformational leadership (TL), which ensures that the necessary values are in place to better guide the organisation (Sloan, 2009).

TL refers to leaders who have certain charismatic characteristics that help shape their leadership behaviour and thus enable them to lead others to achieve a set of organisational goals. TL principles influence followers by establishing a vision for a better future, inspiring followers as opposed to controlling them, leading through role modelling, contributing to subordinates’ intellectual stimulation, enhancing the
meaningfulness of goals and behaviours, fulfilling followers’ self-actualisation needs, empowering followers through intrinsic motivation, exhibiting confidence in subordinates’ capability to attain higher levels of achievement and enhancing collective identity (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the principles of TL began to be applied to schools with an emphasis on collaboration, participation and shared responsibility. These efforts were primarily directed towards universities’ comprehensive reform and improvement in terms of administration, namely the relationships between faculty members as employees and administrators as leaders. TL became the first evolutionary step away from the old instructional leadership model that operated under a clear hierarchy with administrators at the top and students below (Button, 2003).

The characteristics of TL are the factors that make a transformational leader behave in certain ways compared with other leadership theories. According to Bass & Avolio (1998), there are four domains of TL namely:

1) **Idealised Influence**: The idealised influence component of TL is also referred to as charisma; it encompasses the leader’s behaviours of vision communication and motivational language use, and it serves as an example of what it means to carry out the proposed vision (Chesser, 2006; Lippstreu, 2010).

2) **Intellectual Stimulation**: This is defined as the transformational leader’s desire to challenge followers’ thinking about problem-solving strategies and promote creativity and innovation (Jackson, 1999; Wiestling, 2010; Seaver, 2010).
3) Individualised Consideration: This refers to the leader’s actions that guide followers towards reaching their respective levels of potential. In this role, the leader acts as a mentor and coach, offering followers work opportunities that challenge their growth and development. At the heart of individualised consideration is the leader’s concern for each individual’s unique gifts and talents (Seaver, 2010; Jameson, 2010).

4) Inspirational Motivation: Transformational leaders also engage in behaviours that articulate expectations and show the leader’s commitment to the goals of the organisation. These behaviours enhance the meaningfulness of followers’ work experiences and offer them challenging goals and opportunities (Hoehl, 2008; Iwuh, 2010; Martin, 2010; Lea, 2011).

The characteristics of transformational leaders are crucial in ensuring the effective implementation of TQM. This is as recommended by Mkhopadhyay (2005), which leaders in TQM organisations must; (1) have a vision of TQM for his/her university; (2) have a clear commitment to the quality improvement process; (3) communicate the quality message; (4) ensure that customer needs are at the centre of the university’s policies and practices; (5) ensure that there are adequate channels for the voice of customers; (6) lead staff development; (7) be careful not to blame others without looking at the evidence first when problems arise, as most problems result from university policies, not staff failure; (8) lead innovations within their universities; (9) ensure that organisational structures clearly define their responsibilities and provide the maximum delegation compatible with account capability; (10) be committed to the removal of artificial barriers, whether organisational or cultural; (11) build effective teams; and (12) develop appropriate
mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating success (p. 146). Based on the list, it can be seen that there is a correspondence between the features explained by Ukhopadhyay (2005) with the four TL dimensional recommended by Bass & Avolio (1998).

Besides the important role of leaders, the organisations must also be able to adapt and willing to change so as to meet the needs of the TQM implementation. The future organisational structure should be more focused towards becoming a LO that generate and enhance knowledge. Organisational learning refers to a group of people who continually improve their ability to create whatever we want (Senge, 1990). Meanwhile, according to Garvin (1993), the LO is a skilled organisation to create, capture and disseminate knowledge and modifying organisational behavior towards new knowledge. The purpose of an organisation to learn is to meet the demands of improving the efficiency and modifications in order to meet the current changes (Dodgson, 1993). Accordingly, continuous organisational learning has been used as a measure to cope with the changes in technology, increase productivity and innovation. The adaptation of learning organisation is able to make the organisation become flexible and can be changed to meet the demands of stakeholders.

Senge (1990) outlined five “core disciplines” that comprise the basic principles of his theory of LOs. The concept of LOs, popularised in the managerial literature by Senge (1990), represents an organisational form in which the capability for individual and group learning continuously expands. It also represents a dynamic and organic view of organisational functioning, the extent to which organisational members are continuously engaged in opportunities to reflect, learn, reflect again and then use
their cognitive and effective skill domains. The LO concept suggests that a key to improved organisational performance is the capability to continually learn. Learning becomes a necessity given to organisations that are functioning in a knowledge-driven economy (Taylor, 2008). Thus, King (2002) acknowledged LOs as providing the capability to gain insights and understanding through experience.

Since the term LO was popularised by Senge in 1990, many LO models have been proliferated in research. Senge viewed the LO as a ‘learning system’. According to Park (2008), who adopted Senge (1990), the five disciplines of an LO are as follow:

1) Personal mastery: Organisations learn only through individuals who are willing to learn. Personal mastery involves people clarifying what is important and continually learning how to see reality more clearly. As a lifelong process, its purpose is to achieve proficiency over every aspect of life (King, 2002; Bui, 2009). The idea that an LO begins with an individual’s vision, which individuals often cannot express in words, emphasises the importance of leadership responsibilities even at this early stage of learning. Leaders are those who provide meaning for the actions of followers. They are the ones responsible for helping their followers understand how their intuitions are transformed into meaningful contributions (Berson et al., 2006).

2) Mental models: These are deeply held images of how the world works with creation patterns of reasoning, which tend to limit a person’s ways of thinking and acting. LOs continually identify, test and improve their members’ mental models.
3) Shared vision: This consists of the pictures and images people carry in their minds concerning what the organisation should be and what its members should try to create; in other words, it is a shared sense of identity and mission.

4) Team learning: Senge (1994) explained team learning as the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire. Senge further indicated that when teams learn they become a model for learning throughout the organisation (King, 2002; Bui, 2009, p. 18).

5) Systems thinking: This involves the understanding that organisational endeavours are one system or a whole, made up of an invisible fabric of interrelated actions that often take years to play out their effects fully on each other. Systems thinking is Senge’s “fifth discipline” and is the foundation of his theory of LOs (Gary, 2010).

Previous research conducted by Chajnacki (2007), Ataka and Erturgutb (2010), Marshall (2010) and Reza et al. (2011) argued that the fundamental organisational redesign necessary for creating LOs involves transforming a hierarchical-based organisation into a team-based organisation. Team-based organisations mainly rely on professionals who possess high analytical skills and self-management competences in systematic problem solving, team learning, scenario planning, mental modelling and vision creation and sharing. These scholars stated that team-based organisations require three facilitating factors: (1) leadership that is widely shared, visionary and mentoring; (2) an organisational culture that encourages experimentation and reflection; and (3) the presence of a learning infrastructure in the form of learning resources and technological aids. Organisations are increasingly pressured to rejuvenate change and learn to assure themselves of short-term high
performance and long-term survival. The concepts of organisational learning and LOs offer useful strategies and actions for promoting organisational adaptation.

In organisational culture, individual development is a priority, outmoded and erroneous ways of thinking are actively identified and corrected and the purpose and vision of the organisation are clearly understood and supported by all its members. Within this framework, the application of systems thinking enables people to see how the organisation really works, to form a plan and to work openly together in teams to achieve that target (Worrell, 1995; McCaffery, 2004). Buckley and Monks (2008) and Haque (2008) stated that transition to an LO enables organisations to diversify their sources of information from within and outside of the organisation. This enables them to provide a cultural environment, thus encouraging players to think about and build a better society.

In addition, Sahaya (2012) believed that true LO find ways to correct deficiencies in leadership development, leadership roles and the feelings of anxiety and concern that arise from being placed in these positions. This is accomplished in a number of ways. First, a true LO requires a fundamental rethinking of leadership by fostering a capability to coach and teach rather than demand and direct. Apart from that, the leadership of the organisation can influence all the stages of LO as well. Most scholars agree that leadership, even within LO, is not an intrinsic capacity found in just one person, nor is it found only within one position in the company. It is instead a characteristic or a distinguishing feature that should be developed in all organisational members and fostered in all ways (Sahaya, 2012).
1.3 Statement of the Problem

Higher education is a fundamental mechanism of national development and a key factor in building capabilities and skills in the human capital. Thus quality is the crucial aspect in producing skilled workforce as required by stakeholders. Amean and Salama (2008) pointed out that many Arab countries have adopted a framework that includes QA, self-assessment reports and development plans and have also established units as mechanisms in the process of quality management in HEIs. According to this fact, the Libyan government has enriched the higher education sector with experts from the public planning council, whom were asked to prepare a national strategy targeted to develop higher education in Libya (Al-Theeb, 2009; Al-Mansouri, 2005).

According to previous researchers, HEIs in Libya faced with problem pertaining to quality. Sharkawy (2003) stated that the quality of Libyan universities was declined due to the lack of skills required for the job market. This was supported by Al-Hashemi (2008) who proclaim that higher education in Libya was underwent the critical stages and had arrived at low levels. Poor management in Libyan universities and colleges is another problem, as they do not follow international standards (National Report on Human Development, 2002). Thus, Al-Manssouri (2005) confirmed that HEIs in Libya require actual reformation, starting with the philosophy, aims, policies, strategies, plans, structures, curricula, methods and techniques. As a result, QM that utilised TQM framework was implemented in 2004 to address the issue of quality in HEIs in Libya. TQM is a management concept that supports the process of continuous improvement within an organisation and where total emphasis is placed on the customer. TQM has been implemented in major
business organisations since the 1980s, and it has become a major interest to leaders in the higher education field (Owile & Aspin, 1997; Hernandez, 2001). Previous studies have indicated that TQM brings organisational improvement. According to Hendricks and Singhal (1997), Easton and Jarrell (1998) and Douglas and Judge (2001), the role of managing quality is essential in today’s environment as evidenced by the popularity of the TQM movement and the success it has brought to a number of organisations. Thus, the implementation of TQM in the Libyan HEIs in 2004 was a turning point in the HEIs management as they began to focus on the quality of their product (students’ achievement, graduate students, teaching and learning process etc.). This is an effort to improve the competitiveness of Libyan HEIs to be at par with other countries.

However, as argued by Mohamed Saad Ambarek (2010), the quality management process is still becoming a major issue in higher education institutions in Libya. The reports of quality management in Libya showed unsatisfactory outcome of the exercise. For instance, research by Tamtam, Gallagher, Abdul Olabic & Sumsun Naherd (2011) found that although TQM has been implemented, the quality of Libyan HEIs is still at the low level. In fact, a report by the European Commission on Higher Education in Libya (2010) found that Libya still faces various constraints in their quality management. The departments that in charge in TQM implementation is most likely run by non-specialists in TQM, causing administrative complications. There are also problems in management and job specification within different administrative layers, which hinders the implementation of sophisticated administrative models related to TQM. In addition, there is a lack of capable leaders, senior managers as heads of universities, deans of faculties and heads of departments
in solving problems and spearheading innovations (Mikael, 1999; Sharkawy, 2003; Gulam, 2005; Al-Teab, 2009; AbdulKarim, 2010).

Most of the previous studies agreed that the most influential dimensions of TQM include (a) top management support, (b) employee involvement, (c) continuous improvement, (d) strategic planning and (e) customer focus (Huang et al., 2010). Infact, the previous studies on TQM in Libya context also had revealed that TQM leaves positive impacts on institutions performance (Najafabadi et al., 2008; Sharkawy, 2003; Ahmed & Hussein, 2009). However, these previous studies were mainly focused on the impact of TQM on the performance of institutions, and very little discussion is done on the implementation process especially in identifying factors that influence the successful of TQM implementation in higher education institution.

Meanwhile, according to Abdalmonem Tamtam et al. (2011) in order to improve the effectiveness of TQM implementation in Libyan HEIs, there are some aspects that should be highlighted and simultaneously improved, such as the support from Libyan education system, leadership aspects and the readiness of the organisation to accept the changes and learn to adapt such changes. In other words, in order to implement an effective TQM in HEIs in Libya, leaders need to be smart to transform the organisational working culture, motivate subordinates and encourage them to be efficient in their work so as to improve the quality of their institution.

Correa et al. (2005) pointed out that leadership has a significant effect on organisational culture, policies, practices, performance and improved organisational
effectiveness (Wiestling, 2010; Iwuh, 2010). According to Ready (2006) and Taylor (2008), the leadership role is the most important factor that determines TQM success and found as a significant variable in the TQM implementation process (Berman & West, 1995). Thus, the traditional model of the leader as the head is increasingly being recognised as no longer appropriate and applicable in higher education. TL has increasingly become associated with the effectiveness of leadership in organisation (Inman, 2007; Antonaros, 2010). In addition, challenges from inside and outside the organisation have created new opportunities that place TL in high demand (Lippstreu, 2010). Correia, Mainardes, and Lourenço (2010) have argued conceptually that TL influence TQM in a few ways i.e. a) TL practices contribute positively for the creativity in TQM implementation; b) TL practices contribute positively for the innovation in TQM implementation; c) TL practices contribute positively for the organisational trust in implementing TQM; d) TL practices contribute positively for the teamwork in TQM implementation. Thus, if the development process of TL were well understood, it could be utilised for a better TQM implementation.

Researches in Libyan context by Sharkawy (2003), Gulam (2005), Al-Teab (2009) and AbdulKarim (2010) indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between TL and working efficiency in HEIs in Libya. It is also highlighted as a top management duty to lead the movement for quality. Furthermore, it was indicated that leaders who lack of clear definition towards organisational strategy and mission, values and principles that will not be able to inspire their subordinate with the TQM oriented management. Thus, research by Mohamed Saad Ambarek (2010) Tamtam et al. (2011). European commission on higher education in Libya (2010) on TQM in Libyan HEIs suggested that leadership is one of the crucial aspects that should be
considered by Ministry of Education Libya in order to ensure the success of TQM implementation.

Besides leadership, the aspect of organisational learning is also needed to be emphasized in order to enhance the effective implementation of TQM. HEIs in Libya should be open and willing to be a learning organisation to adopt and adapt the new management culture that focus on quality. An LO should be a place where networks of learning communities work to facilitate radical changes towards the successful development of the formal organisation. In addition, the leaders of this kind of organisation need to direct staff towards continuous learning to do task better. In turn, the skilful and simultaneous deployment of “harder” planned approaches and “softer” political, social and cultural approaches to the development of the LO is required (Richardson, 1995; Basham, 2010a).

An LO can create a favourable climate to support TQM implementation. Senge (1992) stated that the LO is supported by knowledge activity and likely to be positively related to organisational quality improvement. Since, TQM seems to be affected by renewal knowledge activity, the knowledge inertia will have negative impact on TQM as well as organisational learning. However, Libyan researches indicated that there is a lack of new knowledge reflection and insights in the Libyan institutions (Amean & Salama, 2008; Al-Hashemi, 2008) and this situation leads to lack of capability of organisation to adopt or adapt with TQM.

Based on this discussion, it has been shown that Libya still in the process of improving the effectiveness of their TQM implementation in public universities.
Although various efforts have been planned by the government for establishing effective TQM, the result of the implementation is still at the unsatisfactory level (Amean & Salama, 2008; Al-Hashemi, 2008). Though a few studies have been done in Libya pertaining to TQM, however they only focused on the results of the implementation and not on the factors that influence the implementation. Thus, how managers or leaders influence the process of TQM implementation by applying specific leadership behaviours that foster LO is still unclear (Johnson, 1998) specifically in Libyan HEIs. However from the findings, the researchers have recommended a few factors that need to look into thoroughly in order to improve the TQM implementation in Libyan HEIs and among them are leadership and the characteristic of the organisations (Amean & Salama, 2008; Al-Hashemi, 2008, Mohamed Saad Ambarek, 2010; Abdalmonem Tamtam et al., 2011; European commission on higher education in Libya, 2010). Many previous studies in Libya believe that leadership and organisational aspects are among the crucial factors to be considered by HEIs. Thus, this study tries to investigate the interplay of TL and LO in TQM implementation in Libyan public universities. This study select TL as it discussed by the previous study as the most effective leadership in TQM (Correia et al., 2010).

There are a few questions arise pertaining to the role of these two aspects in the implementation of TQM in public universities in Libya. Among them is ‘To what extent these aspects exist in the implementation of TQM in Libyan universities?, What is relationship between them in the implementation of TQM?, To what extent do these aspects play a role in the implementation of TQM in public universities in Libya?’. As far as this research is concern, there is no study that has been conducted
comprehensively and empirically in investigating the aspects of TL and LO in the implementation of TQM in Libyan public universities. Therefore, there is a rational for this study to be carried out in Libya.

1.5 Research Objectives

Specifically, this study aims to:

1. Identify the level of TQM implemented in two public universities in Libya.

2. Identify the significant influence of TL on TQM in two public universities in Libya.

3. Identify the significant influence of TL on LO in two public universities in Libya.

4. Identify the significant influence of LO on TQM in two public universities in Libya.

5. Identify the moderating effects of LO on the relationship between TL and TQM in two public universities in Libya?

6. Investigate the factors that hindering the successful implementation of TQM in public universities in Libya.

1.6 Research Questions

1. What is the level of TQM implementation in two public universities in Libya?

2. Does TL has a significant influence on the TQM implementation in two public universities in Libya?

3. Does TL has a significant influence on the LO in two public universities in Libya?

4. Does LO has a significant influence on the TQM implementation in two public universities in Libya?
5. Does the LO become a significant moderator on the relationship between TL and TQM in two public universities in Libya?

6. What are the factors that are hindering the successful implementation of TQM in two public universities in Libya?

1.7 Research Hypothesis

The current study tests the following hypotheses:

H\text{O}1: There is no significant influence of TL on TQM implementation in two public universities in Libya

H\text{O}2: There is no significant influence of TL on LO implementation in two public universities in Libya.

H\text{O}3: There is no significant influence of LO on TQM in two public universities in Libya.

H\text{O}4: There is no moderating effect of LO dimensions on the relationship between TL and TQM in two public universities in Libya.

This hypotheses testing has been divided into 5 sub hypotheses, according to the dimensions of the LO and TQM. Below are the hypotheses each dimension:

H\text{O}4_{1}: The Moderation influence of LO (Mental Models) on The Relationship Between TL and TQM

H\text{O}4_{2}: The Moderation influence of LO (Shared vision) on The Relationship Between TL and TQM

H\text{O}4_{3}: The Moderation influence of LO (Team Learning) on The Relationship Between TL and TQM

H\text{O}4_{4}: The Moderation influence of LO on The Relationship Between TL and TQM

H\text{O}4_{5}: The Moderation influence of LO on The Relationship Between TL and TQM

1.8 Significance of the Study

The present research provides a starting point to promote quality improvement in Libyan universities. Additionally, the study can provide other data pertaining to
TQM implementation in Libyan universities by addressing the issue from the perspective of faculty members at the university level. The results obtained in the current research provide target administrators with valuable and useful information on how best they can implement and support TQM in their institutes. Furthermore, the analysis and findings can offer insights into the perception of TQM in Libyan universities. These insights may enable Libyan universities to devise and implement strategies for staff development programs to more effectively adapt to the principles of TQM and to provide the TL needed to develop and achieve an environment of TQM.

The present study enables Libyan universities and possibly other institutions to understand how to organise themselves and play the role of an LO in sustaining continuous improvement efforts. The study draws the attention of higher education officials towards an awareness of the relationship between TL and LOs and the level of TQM implementation. Finally, the study is considered to be the first in Libya that takes into consideration the influence of TL and LOs on TQM implementation in HEIs.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations in this research, with regards to the TQM implementation in Libyan Higher institutes. First, the main technique which was in a form of questionnaires were translated from English to Arabic. Although several steps were taken to produce validated instruments, the translated version of the questionnaire may not be identical to the original.
The current study is limited to population frame of 2302 faculty members from two Libyan universities, namely Omar al-Mukhtar and Benghazi. This is because Libya is now not politically stable and is insecure. Omar al-Mukhtar and Bengazi universities are both located in Benghazi and Al Beida which are far from any instability situation.

Although the MLQ consists of three leadership theories (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire), this study focused only on measuring the TL characteristics of the leaders at these two universities, using the MLQ.

Furthermore, private universities were excluded due to their educational, social and economic nature. Non-Libyan staff members were also excluded because of certain items in the questionnaires that requires some knowledge and understanding to the nature of management systems in Libyan universities.

1.9 Operational Definition

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined as indicated:

1.9.1 Quality Management (QM)

In this study, QM viewed as the act of universities managing all activities and tasks needed to maintain a desired level of excellence. This includes creating and implementing quality planning and assurance as well as QC and quality improvement using the Malcolm Baldrige instrument.