

Measuring the University Competence Comparatively For Nurturing Future Leaders

Dr. Uma Shankar Singh¹, Osman Sahin²

Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics ISHIK University Erbil, Kurdistan

Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics ISHIK University Erbil, Kurdistan

***Corresponding author**

Dr. Uma Shankar Singh

Article History

Received: 04.10.2017

Accepted: 10.10.2017

Published: 30.10.2017

DOI:

10.36347/sjebm.2017.v04i10.001



Abstract: University education is the backbone of any country to nurture the intellectual capital. The research presented here is exploratory in nature, where the emphasis is on exploring the dimensions of leadership practices implemented in the university to transform students from a common person to a leader. The leadership decides the movement of any country and clarity in objective of the leader makes the venture successful. For this comparative evaluation of university competence, two universities have been taken in consideration for study ISHIK University and Salahaddin University are private and public respectively situated in the same city, Erbil. Both universities have implemented almost all leadership practices guided by ministry of higher education, but the implementation and effect is the major issue for the benefit of students. The study is based on a standard instrument [1] used by many countries like USA, UK and Newzealand. Leadership practices dimensions are filtered and used in this study are university culture, policies and procedures, organization and resources, programs and instructions and university community relations. For the purpose of better understanding two samples of 225 respondents collected from both universities based on the literature by Cohen. The simple random sampling method of probability sampling is best suited for this research. Primary data collected and analyzed using SPSS 23 for statistical tests like t-test and paired t-test. Findings observed based on this analysis and prepares the platform for managerial implication and conclusion. The university competence for building the leader is one of the most important aspect of the university education system. The result is the comparative outcome, so can benefit both universities to strengthen their weak areas and can help students and parents in choosing the best university for acquiring the leadership skills through the higher education.

Keywords: Education, university, leadership, culture, implication.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is the pivotal or backbone in the building process of academic learning. The difference in the learning of students gets affected by the way it's getting directed towards learning. Since decades the activities are going on to bring positive or developmental change in academic learning process but still the vision is less clear, the effort of the university is also depending on the leadership, even after years of efforts of the university only leadership matters, and the broader concern is to find the effects of promoting the learning of all children with the implementation of ingredients of successful leadership. There is a gap in between factual figure and the faith in the selection of leadership pathway as it has a strong gap of evidences to answer many questions. This research is conducted in Erbil governorate of Kurdistan region based on studies carried in Universities of Minnesota and Toronto. Where the main concern of the study to find the impact of academic learning process to facilitate

educators, policymakers and all citizens who are responsible for developing the university education and building future leaders. It turns out that leadership not only matters: it is second only to teaching among university-related factors in its impact on student learning, according to the evidence compiled and analyzed the impact of leadership tends to be greatest in university's where the learning needs of students are most acute. Charting a clear course that everyone understands, establishing high expectations and using data to track progress and performance is a process of showing the clear roadmap. Providing teachers and others in the system with the necessary support and training to succeed is the process of supporting with providing human support. Ensuring that the entire range of conditions and incentives in districts and universities fully supports rather than inhibits teaching and learning is the process of organizational support. There is still much more to learn about the essentials of quality leadership, how to harness its benefits, and how to

ensure that we don't continue to throw good leaders into bad systems that will grind down even the best of them.

Reforms are taking place at all levels of the society governorate, region and country. All current university reform efforts aim to improve teaching and learning, but the differences are huge in implementation or in execution. Some other reforms are crucial in the developmental process as the teaching and learning approach influencing the real learning and development in the leadership skills of student. The curricula development using innovative methods address the institutions ability to implement innovative approaches to teaching like cooperative learning, hope to change teacher's practices one teacher at a time. As different as these approaches to university reform are, however, they all depend for their success on the motivations and capacities of local leadership. The chance of any reform improving student learning is remote unless district and university leaders agree with its purposes and appreciate what is required to make it work. Local bodies contribution as a leader is also another very important point to get considered, the local executers must get supported from local leaders and must be able analyze the situation and externally initiated reforms those can lead to social improvements [2]. The operational supports and practices must be availed to parents that can provide the cooperation to social reform among the local community participants. The critical thinking and analysis is very important for successful implementation of leadership [3]. The understanding should be deeper than the implementation of leadership practice looks like because in practical it works differently. There is a rich body of evidence about the relevance to leaders of such features of the organizational context as geographic location (urban, suburban, rural), level of universitying (elementary, secondary) and both university and district size. Each of these features has important implications for what it means to offer successful leadership.

The curricular knowledge of successful elementary principals frequently rivals the curricular knowledge of their teachers; in contrast, secondary principals will typically rely on their department heads for such knowledge. Similarly, small universities allow for quite direct engagement of leaders in modeling desirable forms of instruction and monitoring the practices of teachers, whereas equally successful leaders of large universities typically influence their teachers in more indirect ways. This evidence challenges the wisdom of leadership development initiatives that attempt to be all things to all leaders or refuse to acknowledge differences in leadership practices required by differences in organizational context. Mostly leaders contribute to student learning indirectly, through their influence on other people or features of their organizations [4].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Our review of the evidence suggests that successful leadership can play a highly significant – and frequently underestimated – role in improving student learning [5]. Specifically, the available evidence about the size and nature of the effects of successful leadership on student learning justifies two important claims: (1) Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all university-related factors that contribute to what students learn at university. While evidence about leadership effects on student learning can be confusing to interpret, much of the existing research actually underestimates its effects [6]. The total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account for about a quarter of total university effects. This evidence supports the present widespread interest in improving leadership as a key to the successful implementation of large-scale reform [7]. (2) Leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most. Especially when we think of leaders in formal administrative roles, the greater the challenge the greater the impact of their actions on learning (Smith, Katherine Taken, Smith, Murphy, and Wang, Kun [8]. While the evidence shows small but significant effects of leadership actions on student learning across the spectrum of universities, existing research also shows that demonstrated effects of successful leadership are considerably greater in universities that are in more difficult circumstances. Indeed, there are virtually no documented instances of troubled universities being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader [9]. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst [10].

When we think about “successful” leadership, it is easy to become confused by the current evidence about what that really means. Three conclusions are warranted about the different forms of leadership reflected in that literature. (1) Many labels used in the literature to signify different forms or styles of leadership mask the generic functions of leadership [11]. Different forms of leadership are described in the literature using adjectives such as “instructional,” “participative,” “democratic,” “transformational,” “moral,” “strategic” and the like. But these labels primarily capture different stylistic or methodological approaches to accomplishing the same two essential objectives critical to any organization's effectiveness: helping the organization set a defensible set of directions and influencing members to move in those directions [12]. Leadership is both this simple and this complex. “Instructional leadership,” for example, encourages a focus on improving the classroom practices of teachers as the direction for the university [13]. “Transformational leadership,” on the other hand, draws attention to a broader array of university and classroom conditions that may need to be changed if learning is to improve stated by Epstein, M. J., and Roy,

Marie-Josee [14]. Both “democratic” and “participative leadership” are especially concerned with how decisions are made about both university priorities and how to pursue them. The lesson here is that we need to be skeptical about the “leadership by adjective” literature. Sometimes these adjectives have real meaning, but sometimes they mask the more important underlying themes common to successful leadership, regardless of the style being advocated [13]. (2) Principals, superintendents and teachers are all being admonished to be “instructional leaders” without much clarity about what that means. The term “instructional leader” has been in vogue for decades as the desired model for education leaders – principals especially Ireland, R. D. and Hitt, M. A. [15]. Yet the term is often more a slogan than a well-defined set of leadership practices. While it certainly conveys the importance of keeping teaching and learning at the forefront of decision making, it is no more meaningful, in and of itself, than admonishing the leader of any organization to keep his or her eye on the organizational “ball” – in this case, the core objective of making university’s work better for kids by Hunt, J. G. J. [16]. Sloganistic uses of the term “instructional leadership” notwithstanding, there are several quite well-developed models carrying the title of “instructional leadership” that do specify particular leadership practices and provide evidence of the impact of these practices on both organizations and students by Wieseke, J, Ahearne, M., Lam S. K., and Dick, R. V. [17].

Models has been the most researched; it consists of three sets of leadership dimensions (Defining the University’s Mission, Managing the Instructional Program and Promoting a Positive Learning Climate), within which are 10 specific leadership practices. Research provides other well-developed but less-researched models of instructional leadership. (3) “Distributed leadership” is in danger of becoming no more than a slogan unless it is given more thorough and thoughtful consideration. As it is frequently used in the field and in education leadership research dating back nearly 70 years, the ideas underlying the term “distributed leadership” have mainly commonsense meanings and connotations that are not disputed. Neither superintendents nor principals can do the whole leadership task by themselves. Successful leaders develop and count on contributions from many others in their organizations. Principals typically count on key teachers for such leadership, along with their local administrative colleagues by Gardner, W. L. [18]. In site-based management contexts, parent leaders are often crucial to the university’s success. Superintendents rely for leadership on many central-office and university-based people, along with elected board members. Effective university and district leaders make savvy use of external assistance to enhance their influence. While many in the education field use the term “distributed leadership”

reverentially, there is substantial overlap with such other well-developed, longstanding conceptions of leadership as “shared,” “collaborative,” “democratic” and “participative.” Furthermore, when viewed in terms of the definition of leadership suggested here, practical applications of leadership distribution may easily get confounded with the mere distribution of management responsibilities. Promising efforts have recently begun to extend the concept of distributed leadership beyond its commonsense uses and provide evidence about its nature and effects. These efforts suggest, for example, that it is helpful for some leadership functions to be performed at every level in the organization; for example, stimulating people to think differently about their work [11].

On the other hand, it is important for other functions to be carried out at a particular level. For example, it seems critical that leaders in formal positions of authority retain responsibility for building a shared vision for their organizations. Also, it seems likely that different patterns of leadership distribution throughout districts and universities, for example, might be associated with different levels of effects on students [19]. This is a promising line of research that may prevent distributed leadership from becoming just another “leadership flavor of the month.” Given the state of our understanding about distributed leadership, therefore, policymakers and leadership developers would do well to adopt a more conservative attitude toward the concept until more evidence is developed to move the term beyond the obvious and provide a clearer understanding of its actual impact on universities and students by Agle, B. R., Mitchell, Ronald K and Sonnenfeld, Jeffrey A [20]. Like experts in most fields, successful leaders have mastered not only “the basics,” but also productive responses to the unique demands of the contexts in which they find themselves. In this sense, all successful leadership is “contingent” at its roots. Indeed, impressive evidence suggests that individual leaders actually behave quite differently (and productively) depending on the circumstances they are facing and the people with whom they are working by Yukl G [21]. This calls into question the common belief in habitual leadership “styles” and the search for a single best model or style by Finkelstein S and Hambrick DC [22].

RESEARCH PROBLEM

We need to be developing leaders with large repertoires of practices and the capacity to choose from that repertoire as needed, not leaders trained in the delivery of one “ideal” set of practices. We believe this evidence argues for further research aimed less at the development of particular leadership models and more at discovering how such flexibility is exercised by those in various leadership roles. This should be self-evident by simply reminding ourselves about how leaders of all but the smallest districts and universities spend the bulk

of their time and with whom they spend it – whether successful or not. But a considerable amount of research concerning leadership effects on students has tried to measure direct effects; rarely does this form of research find any effects at all. It is only when research designs start with a more sophisticated view of the chain of “variables” linking leadership practices to student learning that the effects of leaders become evident. Considering all research and literature the research problem observed as “though the university education system is contributing to build the leader but at which extent its reaching based on the ability of the system and available resources, comparatively in public and private universities”.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research conducted here to measure the ability of the university education system that can create future leaders, for this purpose following objectives formulated are:

- To know the components lying in the environment can contribute to build leadership skills.
- To explore the leadership items needed for university students.
- To measure the competence levels of the university public and private both.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current paragraph is giving the detailed idea about the methodological approach applied to this study. The study is based on primary data collected through the structured questionnaire visiting the respondents who are the university students. The primary focus of the study presented here is to measure

the university ability to prepare the future leaders in its executive practices. Statistical techniques like frequency and percentage got presented to have the clear picture of presentation of sample size selected for the study. Reliability test confirmed the instrument’s acceptance for this study. Further t-test and paired t-test performed with the data collected. The study is based on a standard instrument [1] used by many countries like USA, UK and Newzealand. Leadership practices dimensions are filtered and used in this study are university culture, policies and procedures, organization and resources, programs and instructions and university community relations. The total nineteen items included in instrument for measurement. Altogether 225 respondents get incorporated in this study as the qualified respondents providing the valid data. The present study is conducted in Kurdistan with public and private universities separately. The statistical package SPSS has been used for analysis. All interpretation and findings explained and presented further.

DATA ANALYSIS

For Public University

Table-1: Reliability Statics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0.957	19

The Table 1 presented above is showing the value of Cronbach’s Alpha, the reliability value on nineteen items which is 0.957 shows that for the public university the instrument is highly reliable and data collected through this can get used for the study.

Table-2: Demographical Data

Parameter	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	66.7
	Female	33.3
Age	16 Years-25 Years	71.1
	26 Years -35 Years	26.7
	36 Years -45 Years	2.2
	55 - Above	00
Marital Status	Single	82.2
	Married	17.8
Education	Intermediate	2.2
	Graduate	51.1
	Post graduate	46.7
Family Income/ Month	Ph.D.	00
	Up to \$1000	31.1
	\$ 1001 - \$2000	53.3
	\$ 2001 - \$3000	13.3
	\$3001 - \$4000	2.2
Profession	\$4001 and more	00
	Student	32.9
	Private Employee	44.4
	Govt. Employee	6.7
	Business	16.0
	Self-Employee	00

The above presented Table 2 is getting explained here as six demographical variables and their distribution. For gender the male population is double of female population as exposed more outside and in the society males are more participative in education compared to females. The very youth population of age group 16 Years-25 Years has contributed the maximum to the study as 71.1% shows the most students studying

in public universities are very young. Single students are more for the academic learning in universities almost five times more compared to married students. Fifty percent of the respondents are having graduate level of education. A high segment of respondents come from moderate income family. The respondents are mostly being with private employment.

Table-3: Items Data

Parameter		Frequency	Percent
University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	19	8.4
	Neutral	91	40.4
	Agree	71	31.6
	Strongly Agree	34	15.1
University builds a collaborative culture	Strongly Disagree	14	6.2
	Disagree	15	6.7
	Neutral	86	38.2
	Agree	61	27.1
	Strongly Agree	49	21.8
University empower teachers in decision making	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	33	14.7
	Neutral	57	25.3
	Agree	91	40.4
	Strongly Agree	34	15.1
University build a culture of teacher leadership	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	9	4.0
	Neutral	59	26.2
	Agree	87	38.7
	Strongly Agree	60	26.7
University build a culture of mutual trust and respect	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	4	1.8
	Neutral	68	30.2
	Agree	87	38.7
	Strongly Agree	56	24.9
University manages improvement	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	14	6.2
	Neutral	78	34.7
	Agree	72	32.0
	Strongly Agree	56	24.9
University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	20	8.9
	Neutral	53	23.6
	Agree	95	42.2
	Strongly Agree	47	20.9
University manages time effectively	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	33	14.7
	Neutral	44	19.6
	Agree	86	38.2
	Strongly Agree	57	25.3
University adapt policy to local context	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	14	6.2
	Neutral	53	23.6
	Agree	101	44.9
	Strongly Agree	52	23.1
University run staff meetings effectively	Strongly Disagree	9	4.0
	Disagree	9	4.0
	Neutral	54	24.0
	Agree	80	35.6
	Strongly Agree	73	32.4

University set as a role model	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	8	3.6
	Neutral	57	25.3
	Agree	72	32.0
	Strongly Agree	78	34.7
University establishes open door policy for parents	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	18	8.0
	Neutral	42	18.7
	Agree	63	28.0
	Strongly Agree	92	40.9
University provides a social service to community –act as social worker	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	10	4.4
	Neutral	57	25.3
	Agree	61	27.1
	Strongly Agree	87	38.7
University foster meaningful relations	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	20	8.9
	Neutral	47	20.9
	Agree	72	32.0
	Strongly Agree	81	36.0
University market itself	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	15	6.7
	Neutral	56	24.9
	Agree	63	28.0
	Strongly Agree	86	38.2
University is very strong in council/ ministry	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	4	1.8
	Neutral	68	30.2
	Agree	87	38.7
	Strongly Agree	56	24.9
University communicates with all stake holder	Strongly Disagree	5	2.2
	Disagree	14	6.2
	Neutral	53	23.6
	Agree	101	44.9
	Strongly Agree	52	23.1
University act as community leader	Strongly Disagree	9	4.0
	Disagree	9	4.0
	Neutral	54	24.0
	Agree	80	35.6
	Strongly Agree	73	32.4
University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum	Strongly Disagree	9	4.0
	Disagree	9	4.0
	Neutral	54	24.0
	Agree	80	35.6
	Strongly Agree	73	32.4
Total		225	100

The above table 3 has presented the nineteen items as the frequency and percentage where almost all items are getting higher value for agree or strongly

agree which is good for the further study on public university.

Table-4: One-Sample t- Test

Parameters	Test Value = 4		
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection	-8.379	224	.000
University builds a collaborative culture	-6.641	224	.000
University empower teachers in decision making	-7.509	224	.000
University build a culture of teacher leadership	-3.058	224	.002
University build a culture of mutual trust and respect	-3.372	224	.001
University manages improvement	-4.411	224	.000
University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel	-4.851	224	.000
University manages time effectively	-4.229	224	.000
University adapt policy to local context	-3.125	224	.002
University run staff meetings effectively	-1.671	224	.096
University set as a role model	-1.564	224	.119
University establishes open door policy for parents	-.930	224	.354
University provides a social service to community –act as social worker	-1.209	224	.228
University foster meaningful relations	-1.322	224	.187
University market itself	-.954	224	.341
University is very strong in council/ ministry	-3.372	224	.001
University communicates with all stake holder	-3.125	224	.002
University act as community leader	-1.671	224	.096
University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum	-1.671	224	.096

One sample T –Test performed and presented as Table 4 above, where 19 items checked for its acceptance on the data for public university, where eleven items are having significant result and eight items are not having significant result, so it should not get included in the further study.

For Private University

Table-5: Reliability Statics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0.721	19

The Table 5 presented above is showing the value of Cronbach’s Alpha, the reliability value on nineteen items which is 0.721 shows that for the private university the instrument is highly reliable and data collected through this can get used for the study.

Table-6: Demographical Data

Parameter		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	144	64.0
	Female	81	36.0
Age	16 Years-25 Years	135	57.2
	26 Years -35 Years	55	26.2
	36 Years -45 Years	35	16.6
	55 - Above	00	00.0
Marital Status	Single	155	73.8
	Married	70	26.2
Education	Intermediate	60	21.5
	Graduate	106	50.4
	Post graduate	47	22.4
	Ph.D.	12	5.7
Family Income/ Month	Up to \$1000	64	28.4
	\$ 1001 - \$2000	100	44.4
	\$ 2001 - \$3000	18	8.0
	\$3001 - \$4000	13	5.8
	\$4001 and more	30	13.3
Profession	Student	82	31.9
	Private Employee	55	26.4
	Govt. Employee	26	12.2
	Business	36	17.1
	Self-Employee	26	12.4

The above presented Table 6 is getting explained here as six demographical variables and their distribution. For gender the male population is double of female population as exposed more outside and in the society males are more participative in education compared to females. The very youth population of age group 16 Years-25 Years has contributed the maximum to the study as 57.2% shows the most students studying

in private universities are very young. Single students are more for the academic learning in universities almost three times more compared to married students. Fifty percent of the respondents are having graduate level of education. A high segment of respondents come from moderate income family. The respondents are mostly being student.

Table-7: Items Data

Parameter		Frequency	Percent
University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection	Strongly Disagree	124	55.1
	Disagree	35	15.6
	Neutral	27	12.0
	Agree	13	5.8
	Strongly Agree	26	11.6
University builds a collaborative culture	Strongly Disagree	113	50.2
	Disagree	37	16.4
	Neutral	36	16.0
	Agree	18	8.0
	Strongly Agree	21	9.3
University empower teachers in decision making	Strongly Disagree	75	33.3
	Disagree	65	28.9
	Neutral	41	18.2
	Agree	9	4.0
	Strongly Agree	35	15.6
University build a culture of teacher leadership	Strongly Disagree	53	23.6
	Disagree	61	27.1
	Neutral	68	30.2
	Agree	8	3.6
	Strongly Agree	35	15.6
University build a culture of mutual trust and respect	Strongly Disagree	49	21.8
	Disagree	76	33.8
	Neutral	34	15.1
	Agree	36	16.0
	Strongly Agree	30	13.3
University manages improvement	Strongly Disagree	14	6.2
	Disagree	82	36.4
	Neutral	69	30.7
	Agree	27	12.0
	Strongly Agree	33	14.7
University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel	Strongly Disagree	18	8.0
	Disagree	66	29.3
	Neutral	76	33.8
	Agree	33	14.7
	Strongly Agree	32	14.2
University manages time effectively	Strongly Disagree	27	12.0
	Disagree	49	21.8
	Neutral	54	24.0
	Agree	49	21.8
	Strongly Agree	46	20.4
University adapt policy to local context	Strongly Disagree	13	5.8
	Disagree	43	19.1
	Neutral	77	34.2
	Agree	51	22.7
	Strongly Agree	41	18.2
University run staff meetings effectively	Strongly Disagree	18	8.0
	Disagree	40	17.8
	Neutral	63	28.0
	Agree	53	23.6
	Strongly Agree	51	22.7

University set as a role model	Strongly Disagree	40	17.8
	Disagree	35	15.6
	Neutral	45	20.0
	Agree	54	24.0
	Strongly Agree	51	22.7
University establishes open door policy for parents	Strongly Disagree	34	15.1
	Disagree	44	19.6
	Neutral	42	18.7
	Agree	63	28.0
	Strongly Agree	42	18.7
University provides a social service to community –act as social worker	Strongly Disagree	31	13.8
	Disagree	39	17.3
	Neutral	63	28.0
	Agree	40	17.8
	Strongly Agree	52	23.1
University foster meaningful relation	Strongly Disagree	29	12.9
	Disagree	46	20.4
	Neutral	80	35.6
	Agree	47	20.9
	Strongly Agree	23	10.2
University market itself	Strongly Disagree	40	17.8
	Disagree	38	16.9
	Neutral	81	36.0
	Agree	43	19.1
	Strongly Agree	23	10.2
University is very strong in council/ ministry	Strongly Disagree	50	22.2
	Disagree	39	17.3
	Neutral	79	35.1
	Agree	29	12.9
	Strongly Agree	28	12.4
University communicates with all stake holder	Strongly Disagree	11	4.9
	Disagree	87	38.7
	Neutral	52	23.1
	Agree	22	9.8
	Strongly Agree	53	23.6
University act as community leader	Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
	Disagree	43	19.1
	Neutral	54	24.0
	Agree	96	42.7
	Strongly Agree	22	9.8
University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum	Strongly Disagree	11	4.9
	Disagree	43	19.1
	Neutral	64	28.4
	Agree	64	28.4
	Strongly Agree	43	19.1
Total		225	100

The above table 7 has presented the nineteen items as the frequency and percentage where almost on half items the respondents are disagree or strongly

disagree whereas on half items its agree or strongly for the public university.

Table-8: One-Sample t- Test

Parameters	Test Value = 4		
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection	-21.150	224	.000
University builds a collaborative culture	-21.146	224	.000
University empower teachers in decision making	-17.334	224	.000
University build a culture of teacher leadership	-15.951	224	.000
University build a culture of mutual trust and respect	-15.098	224	.000
University manages improvement	-14.041	224	.000
University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel	-13.274	224	.000
University manages time effectively	-9.527	224	.000
University adapt policy to local context	-9.404	224	.000
University run staff meetings effectively	-7.886	224	.000
University set as a role model	-8.698	224	.000
University establishes open door policy for parents	-9.414	224	.000
University provides a social service to community –act as social worker	-9.048	224	.000
University foster meaningful relations	-13.585	224	.000
University market itself	-13.967	224	.000
University is very strong in council/ ministry	-14.530	224	.000
University communicates with all stake holder	-10.782	224	.000
University act as community leader	-9.519	224	.000
University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum	-8.190	224	.000

One sample T –Test performed and presented as Table 8 above, where 19 items checked for its acceptance on the data for private university, where

nineteen items are having significant result and are getting accepted, so it should not get included in the further study.

Table-9: Paired Sample T-Test: Public University and Private University

Pair No.	Parameters	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection - University establish and sustain a culture of inquiry and reflection	12.074	224	.000
Pair 2	University builds a collaborative culture - University builds a collaborative culture	11.742	224	.000
Pair 3	University empower teachers in decision making - University empower teachers in decision making	8.658	224	.000
Pair 4	University build a culture of teacher leadership - University build a culture of teacher leadership	10.715	224	.000
Pair 5	University build a culture of mutual trust and respect - University build a culture of mutual trust and respect	10.233	224	.000
Pair 6	University manages improvement - University manages improvement	7.964	224	.000
Pair 7	University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel - University assume functions of accounts, maintenance, personnel	6.334	224	.000
Pair 8	University manages time effectively - University manages time effectively	4.406	224	.000
Pair 9	University adapt policy to local context - University adapt policy to local context	5.109	224	.000
Pair 10	University run staff meetings effectively - University run staff meetings effectively	4.880	224	.000
Pair 11	University set as a role model - University set as a role model	5.877	224	.000
Pair 12	University establishes open door policy for parents - University establishes open door	6.219	224	.000

	policy for parents			
Pair 13	University provides a social service to community –act as social worker - University provides a social service to community –act as social worker	6.018	224	.000
Pair 14	University foster meaningful relations - University foster meaningful relations	9.340	224	.000
Pair 15	University market itself - University market itself	10.031	224	.000
Pair 16	University is very strong in council/ ministry - University is very strong in council/ ministry	9.391	224	.000
Pair 17	University communicates with all stake holder - University communicates with all stake holder	6.947	224	.000
Pair 18	University act as community leader - University act as community leader	5.628	224	.000
Pair 19	University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum - University build community support for a humane, well balanced curriculum	4.643	224	.000

Above presented Table 9, having paired sample T-Test on nineteen items data collected for both public and private universities. The analysis produced nineteen pairs of comparison where showing all significant outcome means all nineteen items are being perfectly accepted in this study.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of this study presented above finds that both type of university, Public and Private are having competence to nurture future leaders. As stated in the research problem statement universities are contributing in the process of building the leaders in academic system using all its best abilities materializing the usage of available resources. All objectives set could get reached as all components got explored. The level of competence of university has got measured in making of leaders. The study concludes that public universities are more capable for building the leaders. All nineteen items have the positive outcome means Public universities are better than private universities in all aspect. Private universities need to work on all dimensions to get the success in producing future leaders.

REFERENCES

1. Leithwood K, Steinbach R, Jantzi D. School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 2002 Feb;38(1):94-119.
2. Flynn FJ, Staw BM. Lend me your wallets: The effect of charismatic leadership on external support for an organization. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2004 Apr 1;25(4):309-30.
3. House RJ, Hanges PJ, Javidan M, Dorfman PW, Gupta V, editors. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage publications; 2004 Apr 29.
4. Cannella AA, Monroe MJ. Contrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. *Journal of Management*. 1997 Jan 1;23(3):213-37.
5. Morhart FM, Herzog W, Tomczak T. Brand-specific leadership: Turning employees into brand champions. *Journal of Marketing*. 2009 Sep 1;73(5):122-42.
6. Boal KB, Hooijberg R. Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2000 Dec 1;11(4):515-49.
7. Agle BR, Nagarajan NJ, Sonnenfeld JA, Srinivasan D. Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2006 Feb 1;49(1):161-74.
8. McGrath JJ. The CEO as image maker. *Chemtech*. 1995;25(7):48-52.
9. Kantabutra S, Avery GC. Vision effects in customer and staff satisfaction: an empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 2007 May 15;28(3):209-29.
10. Rubin V, Mager C, Friedman HH. Company president versus spokesperson in television commercials. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 1982 Jan 1;22(4):31-3.
11. Reidenbach RE, Pitts RE. Not all CEOs are created equal as advertising spokespersons: Evaluating the effective CEO spokesperson. *Journal of Advertising*. 1986 Mar 1;15(1):30-46.
12. Epstein MJ, Roy MJ. Evaluating and monitoring CEO performance: evidence from US compensation committee reports. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*. 2005 Sep 1;5(4):75-87.

13. Ireland RD, Hitt MA. Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *The Academy of Management Executive*. 1999 Feb 1;13(1):43-57.
14. Yan J, Hunt JG. A cross cultural perspective on perceived leadership effectiveness. *International journal of cross cultural management*. 2005 Apr;5(1):49-66.
15. Wieseke J, Ahearne M, Lam SK, Dick RV. The role of leaders in internal marketing. *Journal of marketing*. 2009 Mar 1;73(2):123-45.
16. Gardner WL. Perceptions of leader charisma, effectiveness, and integrity: Effects of exemplification, delivery, and ethical reputation. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 2003 May;16(4):502-27.
17. Flood PC, Hannan E, Smith KG, Turner T, West MA, Dawson J. Chief executive leadership style, consensus decision making, and top management team effectiveness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 2000 Sep 1;9(3):401-20.
18. Agle BR, Mitchell RK, Sonnenfeld JA. Who matters to Ceos? An investigation of stakeholder attributes and salience, corporate performance, and Ceo values. *Academy of management journal*. 1999 Oct 1;42(5):507-25.
19. Yukl G. How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *The leadership quarterly*. 2008 Dec 31;19(6):708-22.
20. Finkelstein S, Hambrick DC. *Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects on organizations*. West Publishing Company; 1996.
21. Yukl G. How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *The leadership quarterly*. 2008 Dec 31;19(6):708-22.
22. Finkelstein S, Hambrick DC. *Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects on organizations*. West Publishing Company; 1996.