

---

## Leadership Styles in Tertiary Institutions: Cape Coast Technical University in Perspective

**Emmanuel Baffour-Awuah**

Department of Mechanical Engineering,  
Cape Coast Technical University,  
PO Box AD 50, Cape Coast, Ghana.  
[emmanuelbaffourawuah37@yahoo.com](mailto:emmanuelbaffourawuah37@yahoo.com)

**Samuel Kwaku Agyei**

Department of Finance,  
School of Business, University of Cape Coast,  
Cape Coast, Ghana.  
[sageyi@ucc.edu.gh](mailto:sageyi@ucc.edu.gh)

---

### **Abstract**

*In tertiary educational institutions, transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles may contribute to leadership behavior among heads of departments. This was identified in this study. The study was conducted with the purpose of identifying leadership styles exhibited by heads of academic department (HODs) in Cape Coast Technical University, formerly Cape Coast Polytechnic with reference to transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. The aim was to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses in leadership behavior among HODs in the institution. The paper adopted simple random sampling and multi-step sampling procedures to sample fifty faculty members. Response rate was 92.5 percent. Data collected was primary in nature. The paper found that academic heads of departments exhibit all three styles of leadership; transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles at mean scores of 3.08, 3.15 and 3.04 respectively, on a 5-point Likert scale. The study confirmed the complementary nature of transformational and transactional leadership styles within the organization. The paper recommends that management and the Department of Human Resource should organize pre-service and in-service training for both incumbent and future heads of department and with particular reference to leadership competencies and skills.*

---

**Keywords:** Educational institutions; follower; laissez-faire leadership style; transactional leadership style; transformational leadership style;

---

### **Introduction**

To a very large extent, organizational leadership has influence on management of people, working environment, performance of duty, application of employee expertise, employee interactions, communication among employees and managers, and how coworkers and managers spend time and react with each other (Richter, Schwarz, Lornudd, Lundmark, Mosson & Hasson, 2016; Baffour-Awuah, 2015; Hukpati, 2009; van Niekerk, 2005). As a result, scholars and practitioners of leadership aim at ensuring effective leadership which can create internal and external working environment purposed for generating the interest of shareholders, employees and the general public (Conger & Kanungo, 1990). The consequence is to the benefit of organizations (Conger and Kanungo, 1990; Bass 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985) and employees (Arnold & Feldman, 1992; Breaugh, 1981).

In order for organizations to continue existence, they need to be accountable. The pressure from public and private sectors of society invites organizations to be accountable and responsible. This requirement demands organizational leadership that can meet the continually changing dynamics of modern business organizations of which public tertiary institutions cannot be exempted. According to Rouche, Baker and Rose (1989), transformational leadership features exhibit the best leadership style and are the cardinal donor towards positive consequences in universities, polytechnics and colleges. Indeed transformational leadership is the model usually associated with leadership in tertiary educational institutions (Baffour-Awuah, 2015; Hukpati, 2009; van Niekerk, 2005; Bush, 2003).

Educational institutions require transformational leaders who motivate teachers to achieve higher learning outcomes and higher levels of job satisfaction (Hukpati, 2009; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter 1990; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). This is because transformational leadership has an exalting influence to stimulate followers to work beyond expectation and by doing so develop and achieve personal capabilities (Bass, 1985). The transformational leader empowers followers; align organizational objectives, goals and vision in consonance with that of followers with the aim of building a common vision. The purpose is to generate satisfaction among employees. Employee satisfaction has also been found to result in higher performance and enhanced organizational commitment (Richter, Schwarz, Lornudd, Lundmark, Mosson, & Hasson, 2016; Hukpati, 2009; Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass, Avolio & Goodheim, 1987) in educational institutions.

Leadership challenge in Ghanaian institutions (Zame & Hope, 2008) has been a continuous bothering (Hukpati, 2009) to researchers and stakeholders. This has been of greater concern due to lack of access to tertiary institutions resulting in the creation of more colleges, universities and polytechnics. If these institutions are to perform creditably then there is the need for enhanced leadership skills towards achieving transformational leadership qualities. Various studies have shown that transformational leadership brings job satisfaction and improved learning behavior (Springer & Mulford, 2002). Studies by Bryman (1992), Herzberg (1966), Locke (1978; 1969), McGregor (1960) and Maslow (1954) have all revealed the relevance of transformational leadership attributes in relationship management styles, employee performance and employee job satisfaction. Thus, in order to be administratively, financially and academically viable, competitive and sustainable, transformational leadership greatly becomes relevant in tertiary institutions in Ghana. Though the consequences of transformational leadership on institutional outcomes and employee outcomes are obvious, research in public tertiary institutions is limited (Kest, 2007). Earlier writers have indicated that few existing studies are concentrated on primary and secondary institutions with the rest largely restricted to western countries (Nguni, Slegers & Denessen, 2006; Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2003; Bass, 1998). Kuchinke (1999) and Hukpati (2009) observe that in spite of the fact that the consequences of transformational leadership have been comparatively greatly researched contextually in North America, its influence outside that continent is not popular. Hukpati (2009) further noted that not more has been studied, and generally and openly chronicled in terms of leadership research in Ghana (Zame & Hope, 2008). In view of these, the issue of transformational Leadership in Ghana can be said to have been scarcely researched and therefore needs attention. This study was carried out to better understand leadership practices in Cape Coast Technical University (formerly Cape Coast Polytechnic). The purpose of the study, therefore, was to ascertain leadership styles practiced at the academic departments of the institution within the context of transformational leadership model as propounded by Bass and Avolio (1994). The aim was to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses in leadership behavior among HODs in the institution. The objectives of the study were, however, to examine

the levels of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles among heads of academic departments. Theoretically, the study was intended to bridge the gap in limited leadership research in Technical Universities in Ghana (Zame & Hope, 2008) and further contribute to the few studies in developing countries with particular reference to Africa. Furthermore, it was intended to provide guidelines for discerning into educational leadership studies. Presumably, recommendations of the study were to help improve leadership behavior to achieve conducive working environment; employee commitment to duty; maximize work input and consequential output; and finally, improve student performance.

### ***The concept of leadership***

Both researchers and business operators have found it difficult to agree upon a single definition for leadership (Hukpati, 2009; Kreitner, 2005). Equally, coining precise or accurate description of leadership has been a difficult task due to the complexity and intricacies of its nature (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Yukl, 2002). This is due to the fact that leadership has various sub-categories which are also disconnected in principle thus providing confined and incomplete explanation and analysis within the context of philosophy, arts and science. It is for this reason that Cuban (1988) suggested that in distinguishing between leaders and non-leaders, many researchers and academician have been unable to provide a concise and unambiguous explanation towards the concept of leadership. With reference to school improvement and school effectiveness, however, Hukpati (2009) referred to leadership as a management function which deals with how followers are influenced with the aim of achieving set objectives of organizations. Thus leadership involves the common actions of both leaders and followers for achieving the common welfare of the organization. It is in line with this that Bennis and Nanus (1985) referred to leadership as the action of involving all organization members to deal with problems and challenges which hinder and prevent efforts aimed at achieving the goals, vision and objectives of an organization.

According to Owens (2001), leadership is an act of working to arrive at organization goals with and through the efforts of other people. Owens (2001) argued that leadership is not what is done to people or how leaders act towards others. Rost (1991) therefore views leadership as a consequential outcome of an accomplished relationship between leaders and followers with the mutual purpose of effecting intended organizational dynamism. Leadership is therefore a relationship, a social process and relates both a leader and a subordinate. Thus, in defining leadership, four fundamental parts come to the fore. According to Rost (1991), these components include active participation; involvement and inclusion of leaders and subordinates; provision of direction intended to bring to the fore organization dynamism; bringing to bear relevant organizational dynamism to leader and subordinate; and exercising influence. It can, therefore, be inferred that in exercising influence, leaders need to build and lead a team having built first better interpersonal relationships (Velsor & Leslie, 1995) if they are to work with and through others. Leadership is therefore not required to involve manipulation, abuse, untrustiness; it is not to be overcritical; should involve team players and involve good communication (Kreitner, 2005). The purpose is to effect organization vision, goals and objectives aimed at achieving positive organizational change as a common and shared enterprise and direction (Kotter, 1990); and as a reaction to changes in the business environment. In trying to arrive at this purpose, effective leaders are faced with the challenge of endeavoring to be competent and confident while eschewing the “kiss of death” of arrogance (Bunker, Kram & Ting, 2002). Effective leaders do not only wield power nor exercise authority but additionally coach, motivate inspire and give emotional support when they are able to align subordinates with organizational goals and vision (Kotter 1990).

Writing in a book entitled “Job Satisfaction and Motivation”, Nnadi (1997) observed that good leaders are goal oriented; excellence-strivers; self-motivators, responsibility-delegators; change- adaptors and team-players. Effective leaders are able to carry followers along with them by working as a team. Thus, in order to be successful, leaders are required to direct the people, develop the people as well as develop the organization. This requires balancing effectiveness and efficiency. In order to be effective, leaders should be able to get the job done by reaching the stated organizational objectives at the stated time. An efficient leader is able to work towards a positive benefit-cost ratio. Effective and efficient leaders are power-sharers, relying on interpersonal relationships instead of working through subordinates. Institutional vision and goals are therefore achieved when there is cordial relationship between both team players which, in effect, encourage consensus-building as a fundamental basis for effective and efficient leadership. Recognizing this fact, Hukpati (2009) argues that effective management leads to effective leadership in successful educational institutions; thus endorsing the opinion of McGinn and Welsh (1999) that in determining the performance of educational institutions, the leadership factor plays an indispensable role.

Contextually, leadership may be considered formal or informal. The formality of leadership is dependent on the leader to anticipate and adjust to changing business environment by being proactive and always prepared. In spite of leaders who are appointed informally, being expected to function to achieve organization vision, goals and objectives, may also arise out of illegitimate roles and undesignated positions. Such leaders, having natural leadership behavior, may influence subordinates and or team mates. In the process they may develop followers and develop the organization to achieve institutional and organizational goals. Thus leadership, whether formally or informally established, could be transformational (Baum & Manix, 2002; Bass, 1999; Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Hater, Bass & Barkema 1988) and therefore be effective and efficient (Kreitner, 2005) to the benefit of all stakeholders.

### ***Types of leadership***

In educational settings, leadership may be instructional (Hallinger, & Heck, 1998; Goldring & Pasternak, 1994), shared instructional (Contey & Goldman, 1994) and transactional and transformational (Fullan, 2001; Leithwood, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1999). The purpose of instructional leadership is to impact on both institutional and classroom environment (Bouchamma, 2012). The instructional leader combines management decisions and normal school routines with reference to educational goals to exercise professional duty. Professional duty includes teaching and learning (Goldring & Pasternak, 1994). Instructional leaders are considered to be the best in instructional delivery combined with close monitoring of student performance and subordinate delivery. The instructional leader drives this by applying chain of command and channel of communication of top-down management technique. Thus instructional leadership involves effective and efficient learning-teaching process through instruction as well as curriculum development and implementation (Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Hallinger & Heck, 1996).

On the other hand, shared instructional leadership, though similar to instructional leadership, brings to a successful end institutional goals and vision by moving followers along. One major characteristic of shared instructional leadership is that leaders maintain coherence, agreement and consonance of educational programmes through investment in teachers' instructional resources and support (Country & Goldman, 1994). Shared instructional leadership involves responsibility sharing on curriculum development, skill supervision and staff development. Thus such leaders ensure that there is productive collaboration between institutional head and the followers when it comes to curriculum, instructional and assessment activities for the common good of players and institutional enhancement. Thus staff

collaboration and team-spirit are cardinal principles. The leader, in this context, practices participative leadership.

Another type of leadership style exhibited in educational institutions is transactional leadership, usually referred to as *battering* (Bass, 1985; Hukpati, 2009; Leithwood, 1999). The principal characteristic of transactional leadership is that follower's services are generally exchanged for positive tangible rewards to keep followers giving their best (Fullan, 2001; Leithwood, 1992). The leader in this case controls the rewards. Rewards may be in cash, promotion or assignment. In transactional leadership environments the leader actually leads while subordinates have the conviction that they are not responsible for their personal decisions and actions. The transactional leader depends on top-down mechanism to allocate resources, control subordinates and initiate change processes. The transactional environment is generally rife with domineering tendencies from the leader. In summary, transactional leadership breeds where exchange influences individual performance. It motivates subordinates towards the achievement of little business environmental changes. It does not encourage follower empowerment and fails to ensure organizational vision, meaning of work and follower trust. Finally, transactional leadership functions when there is agreement between leaders and followers; and when they agree and understand the necessary organizational duties and responsibilities.

Transformational and transactional leadership styles are considered complimentary (Bass, 1998) (Bass, 1999). According to Sergiovanni (1990) transactional leadership is the most preferable leadership and premium to diurnal organization routine work, though it lacks the ability to lead to follower improvement (Leithwood, 1999). The transformational leader however, aims at democratic and participatory decision-making of all school staff and builds both followers and institutional capacity. Transformational leaders elevate positively, alter and shape subordinate values as well as motives and actions. Transformational leadership motivates followers towards elaborate institutional dynamism. It empowers followers; gives work meaning, vision and encourage trust among team players. Comparatively, transformational leaders relatively ensure motivation and challenge followers; they are problem-solvers; give attention to personal needs and development; inspire followers; empower followers; provides self-worthiness towards followers; and breeds committed followers who share the vision and goals of the organization. Transformational leaders are therefore able to effect change in the organization through change in individuals. They also stimulate intellectual development among followers. Considering the characteristics and features of transformational leadership style in relation to the other leadership styles discussed above, it is evident that any committed educational institution worth of achieving its organizational vision, goals and objectives would opt for transformational leaders to propel its institutional agenda.

### ***The theory of transformational leadership***

The conceptualization of transformational leadership was first made distinctive in relation to transactional leadership by Downtown in 1973 when working on the distinctive nature of rebellious, revolutionary, reform-oriented and ordinary leaders. Burns (1978), when studying the outstanding performance of political leaders, identified two separate types of leadership styles; transformational or transactional. Comparatively, it was the work of Burns (1978) that gained much popularity. According to him, leadership styles can be located on a continuum, based on non-reactive, anxious and effective characteristics of a leader. At the top of the continuum is transformational leadership, middle is transactional leadership, and *laissez-faire* or avoidant leadership is at the bottom end. This means that, in terms of motivating followers for enhanced performance, transformational leadership is the most proactive and effective, followed by transactional leadership and *laissez-faire* leadership in that order.

Although the two-factor theory of leadership propounded by Bass (1985) agrees that leadership styles are transformational and transactional or laissez-faire, subsequent studies explain that transformational leadership and transactional leadership are complimentary instead of mutually exclusive (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Waloman Bass & Yamminvino, 1990; Avolio & Bass, 1988) as conceptualized by Burns (1978). In the view of Bass (1985) transformational and transaction leadership constitute two conceptually related dimensions but independent leadership styles. The development of the transformational-transactional theory of Bass (1985) has proceeded to a contemporary form which is in vogue today. In the current form, transformational leadership has four dimensions as idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). Antonakis, Avolio and Sivasubramaniam (2003) however, viewed idealized influence and inspirational motivation behavior as closely related, representing the two with charisma.

A charismatic leader influences by, with and through personality. Charismatic leadership therefore requires leaders who have the capacity to put vision together and are respected by followers. Individually considerate leaders are always in the known of followers concerns as a result of paying personal attention to followers needs and interacting through effective listening. A transformational leader should be admirable and easily identified with followers. Bass (1985) therefore, argued that the transformational leader inspires, excites and arouses followers to establish relationship between partners through personal understanding instead of the application of rules, instructions, regulations, punishments, rewards and formalities.

Transformational leadership stimulates followers intellectually, that is, challenges followers to adapt to the habit of critical thinking and invent and innovate new ideas and thinking culture. Followers are encouraged to be creative and challenge their own culture, beliefs and values; those of the leader; as well as the organization and this constitute the intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership. Individual consideration regards each follower as a unique person, treating them based on individual potentials, skills, experience, qualification and abilities. This involves giving personal advice, paying attention, mentoring, coaching and providing opportunities for occupational growth and development. The identification, development and application of intimate characteristics of every follower are to the growth the development of the individual, leader and organization. The onus dwells on the leader in this regard, to fully appreciate and understand the needs of individual followers and make perpetual effort to develop them to the optimum budding.

Kelly (2003), Hall, Johnson, Wysocki and Kepner (2002) and Gellis (2001) have found that there is interdependency, coexistence and additive-influence among the four dimensions of transformational leadership. In sum, this style of leadership is visionary; individual-centered; believes in peer and subordinate development and stimulates followers intellectually (Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Bass (1985) also identified three dimensions of transactional leadership as contingent rewards, active management and passive management. However, recent developments classify active and passive management as management by exception. Contingent rewards stipulate both expected level of performance of followers and expected rewards applicable. The extent to which the leader transacts or exchange performance with regards is the major characteristic of contingent reward system. Active leaders monitor, evaluate and review the behavior of subordinates and act proactively towards problems and challenges and difficulties. Passive leaders, on the hands, react to individual and organizational difficulties, challenges and problems. This implies that, generally, management by exception is the extent to which preventive measures are taken through the application and submission of rewards toward subordinate performance. It is in this vein that Waldman, Bass and Einstein (1987) as well as Burns (1978) contrasted transformational leader to transactional leader whose cardinal

principle is to transact or exchange rewards based on exhibition of expected behavioral tendencies.

Lying at the bottom of the leadership continuum is the laissez-faire leadership which is deemed as the absence of leadership. In laissez-faire leadership, authority and responsibility is granted to subordinates to work things out themselves and perform according to their own direction when leader is absent (Kreitner, 2005). The study under investigation, with reference to the Bass (1985) leadership model, examines the types of leadership styles since limited studies exist in educational institutions in spite of its numerous implications for these organizations (Leithwood&Jantzi, 2000). The transformational-transactional leader builds respect; trust and enhances the desire of followers to collectively perform to achieve shared goals. This implies that most effective leaders are both transformational and transactional (Bass, 1999). The leader is also able to alter the direction of leadership as convenient to suit any kind of follower that may be encountered. This ensures enhanced organizational commitment, greater performance and conducive working environment (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Avolio & Goodheim 1987; Hukpati, 2009; Nguni et al, 2006). Thus, transformational-transactional leaders are able to chart visionary course in agreement with institutional goals, mission and objectives with the involvement of followers. Through individual propping transformational-transactional leaders aid and promote follower satisfaction which in turn grease the wheels of educational effectiveness, efficiency, improvement and dynamism (Bouchamma, 2012; Barnett, McCormic & Conners, 2001).

## **Method**

This section gives a brief organizational structure and historical description of the organization under study. It also describes the method employed in sampling and data-collection. It finally describes the data-collection instrument.

### ***Study organization***

Fundamentally, Cape Coast Technical University has two sections made up of academic and non-academic divisions. The present study focuses on the academic division. Leaders in the academic division belong to lectureship grade on the promotion ladder and are members of departments. The leaders are subordinated to deans of school. Schools, also referred as faculties in this study, exist as School of Engineering, School of Business Studies and School of Applied Science and Arts. Department of Mechanical Engineering; Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering; Department of Civil Engineering; and Department of Building Technology belong to School of Engineering. The School of Business Studies comprises the Departments of Accountancy Studies; Marketing Studies; Secretaryship and Management Studies; and Purchasing and Supply. Departments that are under the ambit of School of Applied Science and Arts are Fashion, Design and Textile Studies; Statistics; Hotel, Catering and Institutional Management; and Tourism Departments.

Cape Coast Technical University was first established in 1984, as the first and only polytechnic that was established as a polytechnic, the other polytechnics having been metamorphosed into polytechnics as technical institutions. It came into operation in 1986. It was under the Ghana Education Service until 1992 when the Polytechnic law 321 (1992) came into effect. As a polytechnic, it was placed under the Ministry of Education through the National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE) like the other polytechnics in Ghana, under the polytechnic law. It however became an autonomous body in 1996, having had complete comparatively lower tertiary institution status in 2007. It was supposed to be a full tertiary institution with similar status as public universities after five years, that is, by 2012. This did not materialize like all the other polytechnics in Ghana. Presently the institution has gained

qualification to be a Technical University under the Technical Universities Act, 2016 (Act 992).

Besides the administration division, key units that support academic departments include the Directorates of Research and New Programs; Business Development and Advisory; Information and Communications Technology; Quality Assurance; Open and Distance Learning; International Affairs and Institutional Linkages; and Office of the Dean of students Affairs. In view of the mandate of the polytechnic, the vision of the institution is to become a leading polytechnic in Ghana that offers high quality career-oriented, vocational and technical education for national development. In order to achieve this vision the institution is committed to the training of highly skilled human resource in Engineering, Business, and Applied Arts and Sciences in close collaboration with industry and commerce (The Technical Universities Act, 2016; Cape Coast Polytechnic Strategic Plan, 2007; The Polytechnic Act, 1992;).

### ***Method***

The academic staff of the institution was 102 (Planning Office, 2014) Comprising 88 male and 14 female. Ninety faculty members were, however, targeted due to leave of absence and availability. Fifty members were sampled using simple random sample technique. Multistep sampling procedure was adopted by first selecting 9 out of the 13 existing academic departments. Using the simple random sampling technique again, three departments were selected from each school. Simple random sampling was also used to select six faculty members from each department. Thus, the questionnaires were self-administered to 54 faculty members. Data collected was primary in nature. The simple random sampling technique was adopted for several reasons. First the units were independent from each other. Second, the population size was relatively large with fixed parameters. Lastly, it is more representative and facilitates inductive generalization. The technique ensured that sampling units were given equal opportunity to be included in the study. In the process, subjects were first identified (departments and then faculty members) by contacting the planning office of the institution for the total number of academic departments and faculty members. The lists provided were then numbered on pieces of paper with the corresponding numbers noted. Papers were then folded and put in an open container. With selector blind-folded, subjects were picked one after the other to represent departments and then faculty members.

The self-administered questionnaire was distributed in person. Subjects were allowed enough time to respond. It took a period of ten working days to collect the last questionnaire. Data was collected in the month of July, 2015, when the institution, then a polytechnic, was in recess. This is the period when academic pressure and stress was expected to be minimal. There was no application of undue pressure or duress. Though not all 54 questionnaires were fully completed, the 45 questionnaires, representing a response rate of about 83%, obtained for the study was reliable based on Yamene (1967) equation which gave 44.5 as the recommended minimum sample size. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was employed for processing the data. The analytical tools employed were descriptive analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Means and standard deviations, frequencies and percentages were therefore employed in the analysis. Tables were specifically utilized in data display.

The researcher had no personal interest in the study and therefore findings, conclusions and recommendations are for academic purposes, though results and recommendations of the entire study could have useful implication for the institution and future researchers. Respondents' rights to free consent, informed consent, privacy, anonymity and confidentiality were totally respected, in the course of study as suggested by (Osuala, 1993; Sproul, 1988 and Bailey, 1978). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form) 65 scoring interpretation was adopted.



### ***Instrument***

Primarily, data was collected using questionnaire to measure leadership styles of academic heads of department. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, viz. bio-data and respondents view of leader's behavioral qualities. The latter was used to determine leaders' leadership style. The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MIQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) was used to determine faculty members' ratings of head of department's leadership style. The questionnaire was used to measure transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership in a leader's performance. These leadership styles have many sub-scale dimensions and associated behavior (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The scale is therefore employed to measure the three leadership styles as observed by subordinates. The instrument has become quite popular for numerous reasons (Bass, 1997). Firstly, extensive insight, skill and knowledge relating to leadership and prediction of organizational performance were considered in its design. Secondly, elements that were taken into consideration during its design is specifically personal to individuals, hence reliably helps separate exceptional from marginal leaders. Thirdly, it has a generic nature in terms of culture and organization. Fourthly, it takes relatively less time to respond. Fifthly, there is extensive research support with regards to reliability and validation in numerous independent studies in journal papers. Finally, in terms of "survey data" and "organizational outcomes" it provides the best relationship with reference to leadership assessment techniques.

The MLQ scale has both the rater and self-forms. While the rater form is responded by other people who rate the leader to indicate their perception of the leader, the self-rated form is reacted to by the leader who rather assesses himself of perceptions of his personal leadership behavior. It could therefore be used to indicate the difference between how people view the leader's behavior and how he sees himself. In our context, however, only the rater-form (Form 65) was utilized to show the perception of faculty members on the leadership behavior of academic heads of department. The Likert scale 1 to 5 was used for convenience though the Form 65 recommends 0-4. Score 1 represents not at all (NAA); 2 represents once in a while (OIAW); 3 represents sometimes (S); 4 represents fairly often (FO); and 5 represents frequently, if not always (FINA). Thus score range 1-5 is considered low; 6-10, moderate; and 11-15, high. On the scale; questions 1, 8 and 15 indicate idealized influence behavior; 2, 9 and 16 show inspirational motivation behavior; 3, 10 and 17 represent intellectual stimulation behavior and 4, 11 and 18 indicate individual consideration behavior; all being transformational leadership characteristics. Item 5, 12 and 19 represent contingent rewards behavior; 6, 13 and 20 indicate management by-exception behavior; both also representing transactional leadership elements. Item 7, 14 and 21 are laissez-faire leadership features. Thus the MLQ (form 65) has 21-items beveled to show the leadership style(behavior) of a leader. The scoring interpretation of the questionnaire was used to make inferences and draw conclusions on the average score obtained for each item.

### **Results and discussion**

This section presents the results of the study. It first presents the demographic profile of the respondents. It also discusses the results with reference to transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles of academic heads of department of Cape Coast Technical University. Furthermore, it presents a discussion in terms of the conceptualization of transformational leadership as an augmentation of transactional leadership with regards to the results of the study. Details of the data are presented in the Appendix.

### ***Demographic background***

About 98 percent of the sampled 45 faculty members were male. Though the sample appears to be skewed toward male, each member of the target population was given equal chance of participation since probability sampling technique was adopted in the sampling process. The mean age was about 40 years. The range was between 28 and 56 years. Two modal ages were identified. The minimum was 34 years. Standard deviation was 6.7 years. Mean working age was 9 years and 8 months, within the range of 5 and 24 years. The modal working experience was 9 years. Ninety-one percent of the respondents were master degree holders. Ranks in employment were lecturers (77.8 percent), senior lecturers (6.7 percent) and assistant lecturers (13.3 percent). The study considered nine departments in three faculties: School of Engineering, School of Business Studies and School of Science and Applied Arts. The proportions of respondents include 11.0 percent from Marketing Department; 11.0 percent from Secretaryship and Management Studies Department; and Accountancy, 11.0 percent. The rest were Building Technology, 11.0 percent; Electrical Engineering, 8.9 percent; Mechanical Engineering Department, 13.1 percent. The rest were Statistics Department, 8.9 percent; Liberal Studies, 11.0 percent; and Tourism Departments constituting 13.1 percent. In terms of faculties, 33.3 percent of respondents from each school participated. About 71.1 percent of respondents were married, 2.2 percent single; and 4.4 divorced. The remaining 22.2 percent were in a relationship. Qualifications include Bachelor degree, 13.3 percent; Master degree, 84.5 percent; and Doctorate degree, 2.2. Duration of position held by respondents ranged between less than 6 years, 17.8 percent; 6-10 years, 42.2 percent; 11-15 years, 31.1 percent; 16-20 years, 6.7 percent; and more than 20 years, 2.2 percent.

#### ***Transformational leadership styles of Heads of Departments (HODs)***

Twelve items (each constituting a behavioral attitude) in the questionnaire were used to examine the level of transformational leadership styles of HODs (Table 1). Table 1 also displays the mean scores of respondents' responses and the corresponding standard deviations. The respondents were asked as to how they feel when around their HOD. The mean score was 2.8 (SD=1.187). This implies that respondents perceive that HODs either do not exhibit this behavior at all or once in a while. In this regard the faith and respect of faculty members cannot be maintained. In addition, hopes and dreams of HODs could not be appealing to faculty members. HODs acting as role models may encounter difficulties. In order to deal with these shortcomings HODs should be open, develop their sense of humor and show that members concern and welfare are important by dealing with concerns and issues that bother most to faculty members.

**Table 1:** Mean Responses and standard deviation of faculty member's perception of HODs transformational leadership behavior

Attribute	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
I feel good around my HOD	2.8	1.19
HOD expresses few simple words that others could understand	3.02	1.08
HOD enables others think about old problems in new ways	2.95	0.93
HOD helps others develop themselves	3.09	1.10
Others have complete faith in HOD	3.31	1.20
HOD provides appealing images about what we can do	3.36	0.91
HOD provides other with new way of looking at puzzling things	3.16	0.95
HOD lets others know the things they are doing	2.93	1.01
Others are proud to be associated with HOD	3.07	1.2
HOD helps others find meaning to their work	3.18	1.07
HOD gets others rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	3.00	1.02
HOD gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	3.11	1.21
Mean	3.08	1.07

**Source:** Survey data, 2015.

The mean score in terms of the perception of how HODs express themselves about what could and should be done in the department was 3.02 (SD=1.076). This shows that respondents fairly often observe or frequently, if not always, this behavior. It is expected that for HODs to impact positively on faculty members, they should express with few simple words on what should be done. Though members fairly often or frequently, if not always observe this behavior, there is the need for improvement since the neutral score, when there is neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction is 3. This attitude could be improved when HODs provide clearer vision, encourage members to focus on their work and make members endeavor to feel how important their work is.

Respondents were asked whether HODs allow them to think about old problems in new ways. At a mean score of 2.96 (SD=0.928), respondents did not generally observe this attribute. Thus they were either did not observe this attribute at all or once in a while. This implies that HODs do not encourage members to be creative enough to look for new ways in solving problems. This also implies that HODs are not intolerant when positions seem to be at the extreme ends. Dealing with such challenges requires HODs to endeavor to groom followers to be capable of questioning their own beliefs and values in relation to those of the institution.

Upon how HODs help others to develop themselves, the mean perception score was 3.09 (SD=1.104). This indicates that HODs may be fairly often or frequently, if not always exhibit this behavior. Though this is encouraging, the level of satisfaction is low as compared to full response score of 5. In order to improve this behavior, HODs must improve upon the extent to which they show interest in the wellbeing of members. HODs should also not be assigning projects, programs and responsibilities to friends, cronies, relatives and supposed informants. In other words, duties and responsibilities should be assigned with respect to experience, skill, qualifications, and above all, who can perform better on the job. Achieving these goals further require that HODs should be attentive and listen to seemingly less important members and involve them in departmental and faculty activities.

In terms of the magnitude of faith that members have in HODs, the perception was relatively encouraging at a mean score of 3.3 (S.D=1.2). Thus HODs fairly often or frequently, if not

always command complete faith from members. This score is relatively appealing though there is more room for improving. HODs may command more faith by dedicating themselves more, holding followers trust better, maintaining more respect and faith, acting as role models in a more functional and practical way and better appealing to member's hopes dreams and aspirations.

Providing others with new ways of looking at puzzling issues is one of the attributes of leadership within the transformational leadership requirements. The study shows that HODs exhibit this characteristics fairly often or frequently, if not always with perception score of 3.16 (S.D=0.95). In spite of the fact that this score is relatively encouraging, HODs could improve upon it by nurturing members so that they can question their own beliefs and values with regards to institutional culture. They could also motivate members to be creative by innovating new methods to solve old challenges and create more tolerant working environment that can deal with positions that appear to be antagonistic.

It is important that leaders let followers know how they think they are doing. When this characteristic was tested, the respondents perception mean score was 2.93 (SD = 1.01). This means that leaders do not either exhibit this attribute at all or once in a while. This score is below 3 and therefore unsatisfactory. The implication is that, the degree at which HODs show interest in the well-being of members, distribute projects and programs and assignments to members, pay attention and involve relatively less important members of the department need more to be desired. To improve the situation, all members should be equally treated. HODs should give adequate and measurable respect and recognition to all members and avoid discrimination, egocentrism and altruistic tendencies.

With regards to the fact that members are proud to be associated with HODs, respondents perceived that HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always, portray this behavior (M=3.07; SD=1.2). Though the score is more than 3, it is on the low side. HODs therefore need to improve upon the attribute by ensuring they kindle the dreams, hopes and vision of members. They should exhibit love and concern for members in order to earn their faith and respect. Winning the trust of followers and creating an enabling environment so that followers will learn and follow their goals; and dedicating to members in a way that makes them feel at home even at the work place, may go a long way to ideally influence members in the faculties and departments.

Situations may arise when leaders would be required to assist followers to achieve meaningful work. This could be done through several ways. First, the leader may make followers feel that the work they do is important. Second, the leader may adopt the needed techniques that could make followers focus on what they do and third, the leader may exhibit and possess visionary purpose, goals and objectives. In testing as to whether leaders assist followers to find work meaningful, respondents perceived that HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always show this feature (M=3.18; SD = 1.1). The score may appear appealing, nevertheless, there is room for improvement. In relative terms, it is one of the attributes exhibited most, though it could be maximized by making sure HODs introduce visionary ideas, discussing and adopting techniques that will help followers have focus on what they do and ensuring that the work followers do are useful and therefore put to good use.

In most cases, followers may not question the ideas of leaders or their own. However, rethinking existing ideas is one way by which follows could be creative, innovative and re-applicative. Transformational leaders are therefore expected to exhibit this characteristic by encouraging followers rethink by questioning the old day of doing things. Respondents perception score on HODs attribute in this regard was 3.0 (SD=1.02). Thus HODs sometimes show this behavior. In order to improve upon this attribute HODs should groom members so that they can question their own and HODs beliefs, values and norms, by encouraging them to ask questions. Intimidation and victimization of outspoken followers, when eschewed, may go

a long way to improve upon the challenge. In this regard, leaders should be more accommodating and assimilating to opposing views and opinions. They should also encourage teamwork and practice idea-sharing and consensus-building.

One moral feature that is characterized by transformational leaders is the ability to draw close to followers who feel rejected by the rest of the working group members. Rejection could bring forth dejection. It could degenerate into frustration, depression, anger, envy and sometimes, in extreme situations, suicide or homicide. Though HODs fairly often or frequently if not always give personal attention to rejected members as perceived by respondents ( $M=3.11$ ,  $SD=1.21$ ), there is room for improvement. Considering the consequences of lack of it therefore, HODs may improve upon the attribute by getting closer to those who appear to feel rejected, get to know their needs and challenges, and find solution to them. They may also get them involved in various activities in the department and faculty so that they may feel part of the “team”. Their welfare should be of interest to the leader and their well-fare should be of greater concern to the HOD.

### ***Transactional leadership style of HODs***

Six items in the questionnaire (each representing a behavioral attitude of transactional leadership style) were used to examine transactional leadership style (refer Table 2). Table 2 also displays the mean scores of respondents’ responses and the corresponding standard deviations. The related responses are discussed in this section. The study revealed that HODs fairly often or frequently if not always tell subordinates what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work ( $M= 3.09$ ;  $SD=1.15$ ). With regards to the recognition/rewards provided when followers reach their goals, the mean score was 3.0 ( $SD=1.2$ ). This implies that respondents perceive that HODs sometimes provides recognition/rewards when followers reach their goals. Respondents however perceived that HODs fairly often or frequently if not always call attention to what followers can get for what they accomplish ( $M=3.1$ ;  $SD=1.24$ ). According to Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1993), transactional leadership style is relatively inferior (though not inferior in itself) to transformational leadership.

With reference to the leadership continuum, transactional leadership style lies below transformational leadership within the continuum ladder. However, Bass (1999) transformational leadership postulates that transformational leadership augments transformational leadership and that a transformational leader exhibits both types of leadership styles. Thus transactional leadership attributes when enhanced can also improve transformational leaders. Considering the scores of the respondents, it could be seen that there is room for improvement with regards to the three attributes considered. In order to enhance HODs behavioral tendencies in this regard, leaders may not tell others what to do to be rewarded. They may also be emphatic on what is expected from subordinates and give recognition to what they accomplish.

**Table 2:** Mean responses and standard deviation of faculty member’s perception of HODs Transactional Leadership style behavior

Attribute	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
HOD tells other what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	3.47	1.15
HOD is satisfied when others meet agreed upon standards	2.96	1.10
HOD provides recognition/reward when others reach their goal	3.00	1.17
As long as things are working HOD does not change things	3.04	1.11
HOD calls attention to what others who seem rejected	3.1	1.12
HOD tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work	3.33	1.15
Mean.	3.15	1.13

Source: Survey data, 2015

The other three transactional leadership style attributes include: Leaders being satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards; leaders not trying to change anything as long as things are working; and leaders telling subordinates the standards they have to know to carry out their work; the mean and standard deviation scores obtained were: M=3.47; SD=1.1; M=3.04; SD=1.12; and M=3.36; SD=1.5 respectively. Thus HODs fairly often or frequently if not always show these behaviors. In order to improve upon the situation, HODs may not wait till situations get out of hand before they put in measures to solve problems and deal with the challenges. They may have to be proactive in solving problems and dealing with challenges. HODs may also endeavor to always improve upon pertaining performances of followers. They may additionally not be quick to tell subordinates job requirements but rather allow followers to come out with what they think and feel before providing solutions to job challenges.

#### ***Laissez-faire leadership style of HODs***

Three items (each an indicator of behavioral attitude) in the questionnaire were used to examine the level of laissez-faire leadership style of HODs (refer Table 3). Table 3 also displays the mean scores of respondents’ responses and the corresponding standard deviations. The items include leaders being content to let others continue working in the same way always; leaders being content with whatever subordinates want to do; and leaders asking no more of subordinate than what is absolutely essential. The respective scores for three characteristics are M=2.96; SD=1.02; M=3.0; SD=1.17 and M=3.16; SD=1.24. Within the transformational-transactional-laissez-faire leadership continuum and according to the transformational-transactional leadership models (Bass, 1985, Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass 1999), Laissez-faire leadership is no leadership and therefore not desirable in any organization. In order for laissez-faire leaders to improve, HODs should demand more from subordinates, should not allow “water to flow to its own level” and endeavor to direct subordinates when the need be.

**Table 3:** Mean responses and standard deviation of faculty member's perception of HODs Laissez-Faire Leadership style behavior

Attribute	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
HOD is content when others continue working in the same ways as always.	2.96	1.02
Whatever others want to do is okay with HOD	3.00	1.17
HOD asks no more than what is absolutely essential	3.16	1.24
Mean	3.04	1.14

Source: Survey Data, 2015

### General discussion

Table 4 shows the percentage scores of the three leadership styles exhibited by the respondents. The study focused on the type of leadership styles exhibited by academic heads of department in Cape Coast Technical University with reference to Bass (1985) and Bass (1998) leadership models. The study revealed that academic HODs in the institution exhibit transformational, transactional and laissez-leadership styles. The overall mean score obtained with regards to transformational leadership was 3.08, (SD=1.070). The implication is that generally HODs exhibit transformational leadership sometimes. On the other hand, the overall mean score for the perception of followers was 3.16 (SD=1.13) for transactional leadership style implying that faculty members held the opinion that HODs also exhibit transactional leadership style sometimes. Relatively, the level is high with a higher variability around the mean. With reference to laissez-faire leadership style, the mean score was 3.02 and SD, 1.14. The implication is that followers held the view that HODs also exhibit laissez-faire leadership style sometimes. The variability around the mean was also relatively high.

**Table 4:** Mean and standard deviations indicating faculty member's perception of HOD leadership styles

Leadership style	Mean (M)	Percent (%)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Transformational leadership	3.08	33.27	1.07
Transactional leadership	3.15	33.97	1.13
Laissez-faire leadership	3.04	32.79	1.14
Mean	3.09	33.33	1.09

Source: Survey data, 2015

The results show that 33.23%, 33.97% and 32.79% of academic heads exhibit transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles respectively. The results generally indicate that HODs averagely exhibit transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles more or less sometimes and at the same level (refer Table 4). This finding supports the position of Bass (1998) and Bass (1985) that transactional and transformational leadership styles are complimentary and that transformational leaders also exhibit transactional leadership style. With reference to Burns (1978) the findings indicate that leadership in the institution needs improvement. Ideally and based on Burns (1978) model, transformational leadership style in organizations should be exhibited more than transactional leadership since transformational leadership is located at the top of the leadership continuum and should be best preferred..It is also unfortunate to note that the level of laissez-faire leadership as a sign of non-leadership is

rather high, constituting about 33 percent of leadership styles. This level of laissez-faire leadership, undeservingly, may negate the HODs ability to effect successful change management.

### Conclusion

The study focused on the levels of leadership styles exhibited among academic heads of Cape Coast Technical University with reference to transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. The study found that academic heads of departments in the institutions exhibit all three styles of leadership; transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles at mean scores of 3.08, 3.15 and 3.04 respectively, on a 5-point Likert scale. The study confirmed the complementary nature of transformational and transactional leadership styles within an organization. With a relatively high level of laissez-faire leadership style, the study recommends that the Department of Human Resources could organize pre-service and in-service training for both incumbent and future heads of department and with reference to leadership competencies and skills. Cautious succession plans and strategies should be put in place by the departments as well as prepare prospective HODs for leadership positions. Such programs, whether refresher or otherwise, should emphasize on the encouragement of free expression devoid of intimidation so that opinions could be shared and collaborations on decision-making well motivated between heads of department and followers during the training process. It is expected that such training may help reduce stress thus boosting job satisfaction and employee morale. The practice of openness also promotes positive organizational climate and therefore needs to be added to the training curriculum. The concept of transformational and transactional leadership with its various advantages should be added to the training curriculum as well. Through seminars, workshops and updates on institutional management, the National Board for Professional and Technical Examination, The National Accreditation Board and or the University Council in collaboration with the Human Resource Department of the polytechnic should organize programs that will equip faculty heads with transformational and transactional leadership concepts and attributes, emphasizing also on the negative aspects of laissez-faire leadership style. Prospective HODs and incumbent HODs alike should impress upon authorities to organize such programs in this regard. It is also pertinent that HODs and prospective ones should make themselves available when such programs are organized. Future studies should concentrate on private and public tertiary technical and traditional universities with the aim of contributing to the theory and debate relating to transformational-transactional leadership continuum and the complementary nature of transformational and transactional leadership styles.

### References

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J. & Sivasubramanian, N. (2003). Context and Leadership: An examination of the Nine-Factor Full-range leadership theory using the multi factor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Arnold, H.J. & Feldman, D.C. (1992). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 350-360.
- Baffour-Awuah, E. (2015). *Leadership styles and job satisfaction levels among faculty members of Cape Coast Polytechnic*. Master of Business Administration dissertation submitted to the Department of Accountancy, College of Humanities and Legal Studies, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Barkema, H. G., Baum, J. A. C. & Manix, E. A. (2002). Management challenges in a new time. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 916-930.
- Barnette, K., McCormic, J. & Conners, R. (2001). *Transformational leadership: The transformation of managers and associates*. Retrieved from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>.



- Bass B. M., Avolio, B. & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and assessment of transactional leadership at the world class level. *Journal of Management*, 13, 7-20.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112-121.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York. The free press
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bouchamma, Y. (2012). Leadership Practices in Effective Schools in Disadvantaged Areas of Canada,” *Education Research International*, Article ID 712149. doi:10.1155/2012/712149
- Breaugh, J.A. (1981). Predicting absenteeism from prior absenteeism and work attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 415-422.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Bunker, K. A., Kram, K. E. & Ting, S. (2002). *The young and the clueless*. Harvard Business Review, 80, 80-87.
- Bush, T. (1983). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd Edition), London, Sage Publication.
- Cape Coast Polytechnic (2007). *Cape Coast Polytechnic Strategic Plan: 2007-2012*. Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Conger J. A & Kanungo, R.N (1990). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.
- Contey, D. T. & Goldman, P. (1994). Ten propositions for facilitative leadership: In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 989 Market Street, San Francisco.
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41, 228-256.
- Gellis, Z. D. (2001). Social work perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership in health care. *Social Work Research*, 25(1), 17-25.
- Goldring, E. & Pasternak, R. (1994). Principal's coordinating strategies and school effectiveness: *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5 (3), 239-253.
- Hall, J., Johnson, S., Wysocki, A. & Kepner, K. (2002). *Transformational leadership: the transformation of managers and associates*. Retrieved from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 32 (1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principals' contribution to school effectiveness: 1989-1995. *School Effectiveness and Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hater, J. & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superior's evaluations and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.
- Hukpati, C. A. (2009). *Transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction: A comparative study of private and public tertiary institutions in Ghana*. Master's Thesis, University of Twente.
- Kelly, M. L. (2003, January 1). Academic advisors as transformational leaders. *The*

- mentor. Retrieved from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/030101mk.htm>.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York, Free Press.
- Kreitner, R. (2005). *Foundations of management: Basics and best practices*. Boston. Houghton, Mifflin Company.
- Kuchinke, K. P. (1999). Leadership and culture: Work-related values and leadership styles among one company's U.S and German telecommunication employees. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10(2), 135-154.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Education Administration*, 38 (2), 112.
- McGinn, N. and Welch, T. (1999). *Decentralization of Education: why, When, What and How?* Paris: UNESCO.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in primary schools: The Tanzanian Case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Nnadi, P. O. (1997). *Job Satisfaction and motivation*. Lagos, Nigeria: Macmillan Nigerian Publishes Ltd.
- Osuala, E.C. (1993). *Research methodology*. Benin: Africana-Fep Publishers: 10.
- Owens, R. G. (2001): *Organizational behaviour in Education: Instructional leadership and school reform* (7<sup>th</sup> Ed). Boston, Pearson Educational Company.
- Planning Office (2014). *Cape Coast Technical University*, Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational behaviours and their effects on followers trust in leader satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Richter, A., Schwarz, U. T., Lornudd, C., Lundmark, R., Mosson, R. & Hasson, H. (2016). A transformational leadership intervention to train healthcare managers' implementation leadership. *Implementation Science*, 11(108). DOI: 10.1186/s13012-016-0475-6.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. New York: Praeger.
- Rouche, J.E., Baker, G.A. & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington. Press, D.C community college.
- Seltzer, J. & Bass, B.M. (1990). Transactional leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 693-703.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47, 23-27.
- Springer, S. H. & Mulford, B. (2002). Schools as learning organizations: The case for system, teacher: In Silins, H. & Mulford, B. (2002). Schools as learning organizations: the case 446 for system, teacher and student learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 425-446.
- The Polytechnic Act (1992). *Government of Ghana*, Accra, Ghana.
- The Technical Universities Act (2016). *Government of Ghana*, Accra, Ghana.
- Van Niekerk, M. M. (2005). *Transformational leadership at a higher education institution*. Master of Arts in Industrial and Organisational Psychology, University of South Africa.
- Velsor, E. V. & Leslie, J. B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Executives*, 9, 63.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M. & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal process. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 177-186.
- Weldman, D. A. Bass, B. M. & Yammirino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward

- behaviour. The augmentation effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(4), 381-394.
- Yammarino, F. S. & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark, & Clark, M. B. (Eds). *Measure of leadership* (Pp. 151-169). West Orange, N.J: Leadership Library of America.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Zame, M. Y. & Hope, W. C. (2008). Educational reforms in Ghana. The leadership challenge. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(2), 115-128.

**Appendix**

Faculty members' perception of HODs leadership behavior using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

ITEM	NAA	OIAW	S	FO	FINA	TOTAL
HOD makes others feel good around	5 (11.1)	10(22.2)	16(35.6)	8(17.6)	6(13.3)	45(100)
HOD express with a few works that could or should do	2(4.4)	13(28.9)	18(40)	6(13.3)	6(13.3)	45(100)
HOD enables others to think about old problems in a new way.	3(6.7)	9(20)	22(48.9)	9(20.9)	2(44.4)	45(100)
HOD helps others develop themselves	3(6.7)	10(22.2)	14(31.1)	8(17.8)	6(13.6)	45(100)
HOD tells other what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	3(6.7)	12(22.2)	18(40)	10(22.2)	6(13.3)	45(100)
HOD is satisfied when others meet agreed upon standards.	2(4.4)	12(26.7)	17(37.8)	10(22.2)	10(22.2)	45(100)
HOD is content to let others continue working in the same way as always.	3(6.7)	12(26.7)	10(22.2)	12(26.7)	3(6.7)	45(100)
Others have complete faith in HOD	9(20)	15(33.3)	17(37.8)		9(20.2)	45(100)
HOD provides others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.	2(4.4)	10(22.2)	13(28.9)	19(42.2)	4(8.9)	45(100)
HOD lets others know how he thinks they are doing.	3(6.7)	13(28.9)	15(33.3)	12(26.7)	2(4.)	45(100)
HOD provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.	6(13.3)	8(17.8)	15(33.3)	12(26.7)	4(8.9)	45(100)
As long as things are working, HOD does not try to change anything	4(8.9)	9(20.0)	18(40.0)	9(20.0)	5(11.)	45(100)
Whatever others want to do is OK.	7(15.6)	6(13.3)	15(33.3)	14(31.1)	3(6.7)	45(100)
Others are proud to be associated with HOD	3(6.7)	8(17.8)	17(37.8)	12(26.7)	5(11.1)	45(100)
HOD helped other find meaning in their work	6(13.3)	7(15.6)	15(33.3)	12(26.7)	5(11.1)	45(100)
HOD gets others rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	3(6.7)	12(26.7)	14(31.1)	14(31.1)	2(4.4)	45(100)

HOD gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	6(13.3)	7(15.6)	13(28.9)	14(31.1)	5(11.1)	45(100)
HOD calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish	7(15.6)	6(13.5)	13(28.9)	14(31.1)	5(11.1)	45(100)
HOD tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work	4(8.9)	6(13.3)	11(24.4)	18(40.0)	6(13.3)	45(100)
HOD asks no more than what is absolutely essential.	8(17.8)	5(11.1)	6(13.3)	24(53.3)	2(4.4)	45(100)

Legend: NAA= not at all;OIAW=once in a while;S= sometimes;FO=fairly often;FINA=frequently if not often. (Source: Survey data, 2015)