



## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

WWW.CIKD.CA

journal homepage: <https://www.ijol.cikd.ca>



# The Effects of Adaptive Leadership on Organizational Effectiveness at Public Higher Education Institutions of Ethiopia

Kefale Solomona Nebiyu<sup>1</sup>, Tilaye Kassahun<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup>St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

### ABSTRACT

#### Keywords:

*Adaptive leadership, Higher education, Organizational effectiveness, Public higher Education institute*

#### Received

20 May 2021

#### Received in revised form

12 June 2021

#### Accepted

13 June 2021

#### \*Correspondence:

[tilayek@gmail.com](mailto:tilayek@gmail.com)

This study explores the effects of adaptive leadership practices on organizational effectiveness and the link and prediction of both constructs in higher education institutions located in the Amhara National Regional State of Ethiopia. The study adopted a descriptive survey and correlational research design with a quantitative method. The target population of the study consists of 5460 deans, directors, and academic staff members. The sample size was determined to be 620 using a sample size determination formula. A questionnaire with multi-item scales from prior developed models was adapted to gather primary data. Percentages, mean values, one-sample t-test, correlation, and regression analysis were used to examine the data. The findings revealed that leaders practice adaptive leadership at every level because of the current uncertain and dynamic challenges confronting institutions. Furthermore, leadership practice, characterized by adaptation and knowledge building, has led institutions to be effective organizations. The findings also indicate that the constructs have a positive and substantial association. This suggests that the more adaptive leadership is practiced in the institutions under investigation, the higher the goal attainment and organizational effectiveness will be.

©CIKD Publishing

Higher education is vital for achieving economic progress, political stability, and peace, as well as for establishing a democratic culture and society, as the globe becomes increasingly interconnected, interdependent, and a global village (OECD, 2005). It is known that higher education institutions (HEIs) are both sources of cultural change and are required to continually renew themselves in response to societal developments (Burkhardt, 2002). Nowadays, HEIs are in the midst of dynamic challenges in response to environmental, social, economic,

technological, and political transformations all over the world (Temple, 2011). As stated by Temple (2011), leaders of HEIs are under pressure to accommodate the needs of a variety of stakeholders, including governments, students, administrative, and academic employees. In addition, Corlett (2005) described how leaders at higher education institutions are held to high standards in terms of research, teaching, and community engagement. This indicates that the leaders of HEIs are expected to play a significant role in developing various techniques and mechanisms for setting different strategies and mechanisms to overcome the unprecedented challenges they face in the current world. Clearly, in the current competitive context, one of the considerable variables in mapping the success or failure of a firm is leadership (Mesterova, Prochazka, Vaculik, & Smutny, 2015). As Avolio (2007) asserted, although leadership is not a cure-all, it does play a critical role in bringing about major organizational change and progress. These days, the success of organizations relies on the skilled performance of leaders and leadership practices that resolve complex, dynamic, and ill-defined organizational problems (Avolio, 2007). Hence, the nature of the present world's challenges requires us to adopt a leadership approach that allows leaders to be flexible and able to adapt to changing sociological and political environments (Heifetz, 1994).

Given the complexities of today's world and the global economy, traditional leadership articulations centered on hierarchical patterns are becoming less useful (Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton, & Schreiber, 2006). This means that, in a setting where many of the challenges are not clear-cut, leaders must use adaptive leadership strategies (Heifetz, 1994). In defining adaptive leadership, Heifetz (1994) expressed that "it is the activity of mobilizing people to tackle the toughest problems and do the adaptive work necessary to achieve progress" (p. 24). According to Heifetz (1994), leaders can utilize the adaptive leadership framework to help them navigate the uncertain environment in which educational institutions must operate. Thus, as Heifetz, Grashaw, and Linsky (2009) described, the adaptive leadership approach is more valuable as a leadership approach in current HEIs. This is due to its acceptance of ambiguity and complexity in situations and its active pursuit of inventive solutions that contribute to effectiveness and success (Heifetz, 1994). As a result, with the rapid rate of change in the workplace and worldwide, adaptive leadership abilities are becoming increasingly important (Heifetz et al., 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997), more than ever, having a competitive advantage is crucial.

To better describe the need for adaptive leadership in the frequently changing contemporary world, with the existing commonly used leadership paradigms such as transactional and transformational, servant, and authentic leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977) respectively, the leader is at the core of everything. Adaptive leadership, on the other hand, focuses on the leader's behavior and interactions with followers, as well as the leader's ability to mobilize and motivate followers to adapt to change (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). In addition, Coldwell, Joosub, and Papageorgiou (2012) stated that the previous theories encompass personal and occupational values while adaptive leadership is a leadership style that can adjust to changing circumstances and prosper (Heifetz et al. 2009). Heifetz (1994) further expressed that the adaptive leadership framework is underpinned by the diagnostic distinction between technical problems and adaptive challenges, implying that the majority of leadership failures are diagnostic in nature, with authorities and experts misdiagnosing adaptive challenges and applying known solutions for technical problems. According to Heifetz et al. (2009)

adaptive challenges are problems that are not completely understood and for which there is not a known answer. Hence, the role of leadership shifts to building knowledge in understanding the nature of the challenges and rallying stakeholders to better understand the problem's complexity and seek out varied perspectives that can lead to diagnostic learning (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Kania & Kramer, 2004; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

As it is described by Northouse (2016), getting on the balcony (observing the situation from a high level), identifying the adaptive challenges, regulating the participants' distress as the adaptive challenge is addressed, maintaining the energy, focusing on solving the problems, and applying leadership while avoiding micromanaging are all part of the adaptive leadership framework. Northouse (2016) outlines prescriptive ways for successfully guiding through change for each of the behaviors. This means that the approach promotes leaders and followers to confront their challenges and decision possibilities through a win-win process in which both can learn, experiment, and adapt to new ways of coexisting and achieving positive outcomes (Coldwell et al., 2012). Furthermore, according to Heifetz et al. (2004), adaptive leadership is about how leaders assist people to adapt to challenges and changes. It focuses on the adjustments and learning that individuals must make in response to changing surroundings.

Consequently, in today's changing and dynamic environment, HEIs, like other organizations, must adapt to change or risk being left behind in today's competitive market. Accordingly, in this era of intensified competition and rapid transformation and change, effective institutions are those that can recognize, react to, manage, and prosper in a changing environment (Hwang & Bae, 2010). Thus, being effective necessitates the ability to adjust to a fast-changing environment while still achieving one's objectives (Hwang & Bae, 2010). This reveals that the practice of leadership that tries to adapt to the present-day overall challenges creates an organization that continuously learns and transforms itself to further enhance the effectiveness of the organization (Jacob & Shari, 2013). Therefore, compared to other models of leadership, adaptive leadership finds organizational effectiveness through the attainment of organizational goals via adaptive change intervention (Owens & Valesky, 2007).

These days, the leadership at public HEIs in Ethiopia is facing many emergent issues and challenges. As described by Teshome (2018), the main adaptive challenges facing Ethiopian public HEIs presently are the challenges of workforce diversity management, student unrest and turbulence, academic staff turnover, lack of sufficient budget, advancement of new technology in the teaching-learning process, and other uncertain problems due to prevalent political and social motives. Thus, these challenges have affected the activities of the leaders of the institutions and their effectiveness. The findings of a study conducted at three public universities in Ethiopia by Durie and Beshir (2016) indicate that academic leaders are mainly engaged in routine and low-priority activities rather than change-oriented activities, which could make the institutions competitive in the current dynamic world. As a result, educational leadership in Ethiopian HEIs is uneven, incoherent, lacking in practice, and research-based (FDRE, 2019). Hence, Ethiopian public HEIs should investigate ways to better adapt to the current uncertain challenges to be effective in attaining their expected objectives. Thus, a necessary condition to deal with the current challenges, of course, is to have adaptive leaders who understand the challenges and are able and willing to make significant efforts to constructively deal with the changes to transform and make HEIs responsive.

Empirical studies conducted on the effects of adaptive leadership practices on organizational effectiveness have been undertaken in the adaptive leadership practices matched with culture transformation in health companies have been studied for their effectiveness (Corazzini, Twersky, White, Weiner, & Colon, 2014). Moreover, adaptive leadership's influence on organizational design, structures, and processes have been explored by researchers (Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden & Hu, 2014; Hempe, 2013). While most research studies have revealed important discoveries on adaptive leadership in commercial and health care organizations, there is a vacuum in understanding the effects of adaptive leadership practices in complex adaptive higher education systems (Dinh et al., 2014; Hempe, 2013). In addition, there has been very little empirical study demonstrating the effectiveness of this leadership technique to date (Dugan, 2017; Northouse, 2016). This suggests that there is a deficit in knowledge about the actual process of adaptive leadership in higher education institutions that considers the complex realities of 21st-century leadership in organizations.

As stated by different authors, adaptive leadership practices and organizational effectiveness in HEIs are currently a relatively unexplored area of research and application (Bryman, 2007; Dugan, 2017). So, practicing adaptive leadership practices for the effectiveness of HEI's is a subject that needs to be investigated further. Moreover, studies on the effects of adaptive leadership practices for the effectiveness of organizations have primarily been carried out in industrialized countries (Garcia-Morales et al., 2012; Hempe, 2013; Zagorsek, Jaklic, & Stough, 2004). However, research involving underdeveloped countries and Ethiopian public HEI where the context is very different is nonexistent. Finally, to the author's knowledge, there are no empirical studies conducted on this issue in developing countries context generally and in the Ethiopian public higher education perspective specifically. Hence, there is a need for a study that could deliver a fresh understanding of the current status, effects, and relationships between adaptive leadership and organizational effectiveness at public universities located in the Amhara National Regional State (ANRS): Ethiopia. Hence, the following research questions are formulated to be addressed in this study:

1. To what extent is adaptive leadership practiced by the leaders of public universities located in the ANRS?
2. To what extent has organizational effectiveness been attained by the HEIs under consideration?
3. What is the association between adaptive leadership strategies and organizational effectiveness at the HEI understudy?
4. Which dimension of adaptive leadership predicts organizational effectiveness?

Considering the theoretical framework, this research focuses on adaptive leadership, as conceived and taught by Heifetz (1994) and elaborated on by successive coauthors (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). According to Glover et al. (2002) and Nelson and Squires (2017) organizational leaders can utilize an adaptive leadership framework to negotiate unexpected conditions, ongoing competition from rivals, and technological advances so that their enterprises can remain sustainable. The theory also assists these leaders in dealing with internal and external difficulties that influence the company. The goal of adaptive leadership is to get rid of the technical approach to dealing with adaptive problems (Heifetz et al., 2009). The adaptive leadership theory was thought to be an acceptable paradigm that leaders can utilize to

boost organizational success rates, given the energy that is required by the leader and team members to solve complicated changes and difficulties (Ebrahimi et al., 2016; Feldbrugge, 2015). Thus, this study uses adaptive leadership theory as a theoretical framework for thinking about the current challenges facing higher education and the process by which leaders in higher education might generate solutions to those challenges.

Furthermore, the theoretical framework of organizational effectiveness used in this study is Cameron's model for assessing organizational effectiveness (Cameron, 1978). According to Cameron (1978), various effectiveness models and techniques have been created, but sadly little study has been done on organizational effectiveness in higher education. Cameron's approach to evaluating organizational effectiveness had been used successfully in a number of institutional settings, from schools to corporations. Cameron's (1978) analytic instrument, which was employed at the university level, revealed nine characteristics that are shared by all successful universities. After carefully selecting the criteria, constituency, and institutions, Cameron (1980) performed effectiveness studies in institutions of higher education and discovered nine unique areas that administrators considered were indicative of an effective university. These categories represented organizational qualities that were deemed to be indicative of effectiveness by the institution's internal primary decision-makers. The nine dimensions included: (1) student's educational satisfaction, (2) their academic, (3) personal development, (4) professional development, (5) faculty's job satisfaction, (6) professional development of teachers, (7) resource acquisition, (8) system clarity, and (9) organizational health. A literature review also indicates that, this model has been devised by researchers in this field more than others for the evaluation of organizational effectiveness in higher education (e.g., Ashraf & Kadir, 2012; Hertelendy, 2010; Kwan & Walker, 2003; Lejeune & Vas, 2009; Smart, 2003). Moreover, a comparative result between some models of organizational effectiveness in higher education shows some overlapping, and the trace of some of Cameron's nine dimensions can be observed in two other models developed by Pounder (1999) and An et. al. (2011). This demonstrates Cameron's model's comprehensiveness in assessing organizational effectiveness in higher education institutions. Hence, the review of theoretical and empirical studies on the subject under consideration and the practical observation of adaptive leadership practices has aided the researcher in developing a conceptual framework that will act as the study's guide. It emphasizes that proper implementation of adaptive leadership and its various dimensions leads to organizational effectiveness and success.

## **Method**

### **Sampling and Sampling Technique**

The study employed descriptive survey and correlational research designs. Currently, there are 10 federal public universities in the ANRS which are classified into four strata of generation based on their age or period of establishment. The established stratum was used in the selection of sample universities for this research. To make the study manageable, six universities (60%) of the total from each generation/stratum were chosen as study samples using stratified random selection.

The target population of the study consists of 5460 deans, directors and, local permanent academic staff members currently on duty at the sample public universities. The sample size was determined to be 620 using a sample size determination formula. After determining the total sample size of each university, respondents in their corresponding university were assigned proportionally to the total population of staff members in their respective colleges and departments. Finally, a simple random sampling procedure was used to select individual sample responders.

### **Materials**

The data for the study was collected from 620 respondents through standardized questionnaire items that were applied by adapting the items in the context of Ethiopian HEI. The questionnaire consists of adaptive leadership, organizational effectiveness, and demographic sections prepared in the English language. First, adaptive leadership scales were adapted from the study of Northouse (2016) questionnaire comprising six dimensions and 28 items. The construct was measured by using 6-point Likert scale items ranging from (1) Almost never to (6) Almost always. Organizational effectiveness questionnaire items were taken from Cameron's (1978) model of organizational effectiveness with its nine dimensions. The items were measured using 6-point Likert scales ranging from Always true (6) to Never true (1).

### **Validity and Reliability**

To determine the validity and reliability of the instrument item scales in the context of HEIs, a content validity check and Cronbach alpha test was performed, respectively. To ensure content validity, the research instrument was subjected to expert judgment validation by six professionals/panelists who examined the content to see if it measures what it claims to measure based on the study's core questions and objectives. Based on the feedback received, the directions established to respond to items on each construct are developed independently to clarify instructions for responders. In addition, three organizational effectiveness items pertaining to graduate employment opportunities were removed from the instrument because some respondents may not have access to this information. Apart from that, language correction, which included phrasing adjustments and the removal of redundant and unneeded terms, was carried out under the supervision of language experts. Thus, the instrument was enhanced in the final draft by making relevant modifications and adjustments. Moreover, Lawshe's (1975) content validity check model was also used to see how far each item is pertinent to measuring the major constructs of adaptive leadership and organizational effectiveness. According to the guideline, the minimum valid value of Content Validity Ratio (CVR) for the evaluated item to be retained is  $p = .05$ , and the CVR value is somewhere between zero and .99 (Lawshe, 1975). As a result, the average value of the CVR was determined for the entire item in the instrument and found to be  $p = .90$ , indicating that the questionnaire may be used for the desired purpose.

Considering the reliability of institutional effectiveness instrument items, it has been reported with a high value of Cronbach's alpha by several researchers. Though there are high values of reliability of the instrument in different studies, it does not confirm reliability in the context of Ethiopian higher education institutions. Therefore, the reliability of the questionnaire items on the constructs was checked using Cronbach's alpha ( $r$ ) based on the pilot test

conducted with 50 randomly selected staff members working in different leadership positions at one university other than those included in the study. After calculating the responses of the pilot group, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for adaptive leadership questionnaire items was  $r = .81$  and organizational effectiveness  $r = .80$ . Reliability tests resulting in the alpha of 0.7 and above are generally accepted as having high reliability (Rovai et al., 2014). Therefore, the overall internal consistency between the constructs indicates a high value ( $r = .81$ ), which suggests that the questionnaire is reliable and could be used to obtain pertinent data for the intended purpose.

### **Procedure**

The distribution and collection of the questionnaire to sample respondents were self-administered by the author. Hence, the questionnaires were distributed to 620 sample respondents. However, 27 questionnaires were not returned, and seven more were discarded because they were incomplete. After undertaking the necessary data cleaning process, the authors found a total of 593 copies duly filled and returned questionnaires which were usable for the data analysis with a 95.6 % return rate. Before conducting the actual statistical tests, data screening for any irregularities based on correlation and regression tests assumptions was checked for analyzing data gained through the questionnaire, mean values less than 3.00 (Low); values from 3.01 to 4.00 (Moderate); and values of 4.01 and above (High).

### **Results**

The analysis of demographic characteristics of respondents indicates values of respondents' sex composition, educational levels, service years in the institutions, and current occupational status. Concerning the sex composition of the respondents, as depicted in Table 1, the great majority (86.5%) were males, which indicates male dominance in the career. Considering the educational levels, the majority of the participants were at the MA/MSc (75.2%) level, followed by BA/BSc holders (13.8), and the rest (11%) were with Ph.D. This implies that respondents have the appropriate educational background to easily observe and respond to the practices of the current leadership style and its effect on the attainment of organizational effectiveness in the HEIs. Considering respondents' length of service years in the universities, the result indicates that the majority (54.3%) of the respondents have served more than five years, which indicates that they could have better knowledge of the practices and status of their organization's leadership style and its effect on the outcome variable.

Table 1  
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

No.	Item	Frequency	Percent	
1	Sex	Male	513	86.5
		Female	80	13.5
		Total	593	100
2	Education Level	BA	82	13.8
		MA	446	75.2
		PhD	65	11
		Total	593	100
3	Service year in the university	Below 5 years	271	45.7
		5 to 10 years	232	39.1
		Above 10 years	90	15.2
		Total	593	100
4	Occupational status	Leader only	69	11.7
		Instructor only	398	67.1
		Leader and Instructor	126	21.2
		Total	593	100

The analysis of data gained through the questionnaire on the first research question ascertains that there exist adaptive leadership practices in the institutions with an aggregate mean value of 4.20. As shown in Table 2, the result of one sample t-test also illustrates  $t = 120.86$  with a  $p < .05$ , indicating no significant difference between the mean and the population mean. This indicates that respondents perceive that the leadership of the institutions practices adaptive leadership under study. Considering the mean and t values of the dimensions of adaptive leadership, all are significant with  $p < .05$ , and the highest mean value is observed on the dimension, which indicates that the leaders "maintain disciplined attention" with a mean value of 4.55 and  $t = 50.46$ . The result is followed by the dimension, which designates that leaders "identify adaptive challenges" with a mean value of 4.46 and  $t = 58.62$ . The other dimensions are labeled as "get on the balcony" and "regulate distress" with 4.02 and 3.91 mean values and 32.21 and 38.89 t values, respectively.

Table 2  
*One-Sample T-Test Statistics on Adaptive Leadership Dimensions*

Variable and its Dimensions	<i>t</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>M</i> difference	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i> (2- tailed)
Adaptive leadership	120.86	4.20	592	1.20	.24	.000
Get on the Balcony	65.62	4.25	592	1.25	.46	.000
Identify Adaptive Challenges	58.62	4.46	592	1.45	.60	.000
Regulate Distress	56.46	4.24	592	1.24	.53	.000
Maintain Disciplined Attention	50.46	4.55	592	1.54	.74	.000
Give the work back to the people	38.89	3.91	592	0.90	.56	.000
Protect leadership voices from below	32.21	4.02	592	1.01	.76	.000

Based on sample respondents' responses to the items related to organizational effectiveness, the results of the analysis in Table 3 show that respondents perceive institutions as effective, with an aggregate mean value of 4.89. This result is supported by the one-sample t-test value, which illustrates a value of  $t = 110.04$  with a  $p < .05$ . Moreover, in evaluating the attainment of



organizational effectiveness dimensions, the highest value is observed in the "student academic development" dimension with a mean value of 5.11,  $t = 56.34$ , and  $p < .05$ , followed by "system openness and community interaction", "organizational health", and "ability to acquire resources" with 5.08, 5.05, and 5.00 mean, and  $t$  values of 57.23, 56.64, and 52.68, respectively with an overall  $p < .05$ . The dimensions which are "professional development and quality of the faculty" with a 4.86 mean and a 53.96  $t$  value, and "student educational satisfaction" with a mean of 4.78 and a  $t$  value of 45.04, both with  $p < .05$ , also indicate the effectiveness of the institutions. Compared to other dimensions, the one with the lowest mean value is "student career development" with a 4.24 mean, 25.183  $t$  value with a  $p < .05$  significant level. This implies that institutions compared to other dimensions, are working less on students' occupational and vocational progress. To further evaluate the fields of organizational effectiveness in which HEIs under study are more effective, a one-sample  $t$ -test was conducted between the main organizational effectiveness fields developed by Cameron (1986), i.e., academic field, moral field, and external adaptation field.

Table 3

*One-sample t-test statistics (Organizational Effectiveness Dimensions)*

Variable/ Dimensions	$t$	$M$	$df$	$M$ difference	$SD$	$p$ (2- tailed)
Organizational Effectiveness	110.04	4.89	592	1.88	0.41	.000
Student educational satisfaction	45.04	4.78	592	1.75	0.68	.000
Student academic development	56.34	5.11	592	2.01	0.63	.000
Student career development	25.18	4.24	592	1.31	1.01	.000
Student personal development	43.60	4.67	592	1.56	0.63	.000
Faculty and administrator employment satisfaction	39.58	4.44	592	1.32	0.67	.000
Professional development and quality of the faculty	53.96	4.86	592	2.26	0.67	.000
System openness and community interaction	57.23	5.08	592	2.77	0.62	.000
Ability to acquire resources	52.68	5.00	592	2.26	0.63	.000
Organizational health	56.64	5.05	592	2.27	0.57	.000

According to the test's findings, respondents believed that HEIs are more effective in the academic field ( $M = 5.04$ ,  $SD = .87$ ,  $t = 57.10$ ,  $p < .05$ ), followed by effectiveness in the external adaptation field ( $M = 4.96$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ,  $t = 57.030$ ,  $p < .05$ ) (Table 4). Moreover, Pearson correlation analysis was performed between adaptive leadership practices and organizational effectiveness to ascertain the degree of relationship between adaptive leadership as the predictor variable and organizational effectiveness as the dependent variable.

Table 4

*One-Sample Statistics (Fields of Organizational Effectiveness)*

Level	$N$	$M$	$SD$	$t$	$df$	$p$ (2-tailed)
External	593	4.96	.83	57.03	592	.000
Moral	593	4.78	.75	57.30	592	.000
Academic	593	5.04	.87	57.10	592	.000

The result of the correlation study, as shown in Table 5, indicates a substantial positive correlation ( $r = .64$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Furthermore, the correlation test used to determine the association between adaptive leadership dimensions and organizational effectiveness found that all correlations are significant at level  $p < 0.01$ . The highest score within adaptive leadership

construct is “maintain disciplined attention” with ( $r = .44; p < .01$ ). The lowest relationship is ( $r = -.19; p < .01$ ) scored by the construct “protect leadership voices from below”.

Table 5

*Correlations (Adaptive Leadership Practices and Organizational Effectiveness)*

		Adaptive Leadership	Organizational Effectiveness
AL	Pearson Correlation	1	.64**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.00
	N	593	593
OE	Pearson Correlation	.64**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	
	N	593	593

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In addition, as shown in the model summary Table 6, the "R Square" value of 41.5% reveals that the independent variable adaptive leadership explains the entire variation in the dependent variable organizational effectiveness. In other words, the amount of coefficient of non-determination, which accounts for 58.5%, indicates that the effect of the independent variable is also noteworthy.

Table 6

*Model Summary (Adaptive Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness)*

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.64 <sup>a</sup>	.41	.41	.63

a. Predictors: (Constant), AL

In addition, the regression model with all adaptive leadership dimensions produced  $R^2 = .41$ ,  $F(1, 591) = 419.63$ ,  $p < .01$  (Table 6 and Table 7). This means that the independent variable statistically predicts the dependent variable (i.e., the overall regression model is a good fit for the data).

Table 7

*ANOVA (Adaptive Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness)*

Model		SS	df	MS	F	p
1	Regression	168.41	1	168.41	419.63	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	237.19	591	0.40		
	Total	405.61	592			

Note. a. Dependent Variable: OE; b. Predictors: (Constant), AL

Furthermore, the regression results depicted in Table 8, indicate that adaptive leadership has a considerable positive effect on organizational effectiveness signified by the coefficient of a Beta factor ( $\beta = .64$ ,  $p < .01$ ), indicating a significant relationship between both constructs. It might be stated that adaptive leadership has a major impact on organizational effectiveness.

Table 8

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup> (Adaptive Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness)*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
		B	SE	$\beta$		
1	(Constant)	1.18	.19		6.13	.000
	AL	1.02	.05	.64	20.48	.000

a. Dependent Variable: OE

Table 9 presents the results of the regression analysis for the first study question, which is concerned with determining the predictive potential of adaptive leadership dimensions on

organizational effectiveness. Moreover, Beta coefficients were employed to evaluate the direct effect of each dimension of the independent variable on organizational effectiveness. Thus, the effects of the dimensions “get on the balcony” ( $\beta = .10, t = 2.60, p = .009$ ), “protect leadership voices from below” ( $\beta = -.21, t = -5.68, p = .000$ ), “identify adaptive challenges” ( $\beta = .31, t = 6.97, p = .000$ ), “maintain disciplined attention” ( $\beta = .39, t = 11.23, p = .00$ ) and “give the work back to the people” ( $\beta = -.14, t = -3.69, p = .000$ ) on organizational effectiveness of the HEIs were statistically significant. That is to say, 10.5%, 21.9%, 31.4%, 39.2% and -14.8% of organizational effectiveness was accounted by leaders’ practices in the above mentioned five dimensions of adaptive leadership. The value of one dimension which is “regulate distress” with a test result of ( $\beta = .06, t = 1.62, p = .10$ ) disclosed no statistically significant effect on organizational effectiveness.

Table 9

*Coefficients (Adaptive Leadership Dimensions and Organizational Effectiveness)*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$		
(Constant)	1.76	.35		4.98	.000
GB	0.18	.07	.105	2.60	.009
IAC	0.42	.06	.314	6.97	.000
1 RD	0.10	.06	.069	1.62	.106
MDA	0.43	.03	.392	11.23	.000
BP	-0.21	.05	-.148	-3.69	.000
VP	-0.23	.04	-.219	-5.68	.000

*Note.* a. Dependent Variable: OE; (GB - Getting on the Balcony, IAC – Identify Adaptive Challenges, RD- Regulate Distress, MDA- Maintain Disciplined attention, BP- give the work back to the people, VP- protect leadership voices from below)

## Discussion

### The Extent of Adaptive Leadership Practices

The results of the analysis regarding the first research question revealed that the leaders and academic staff members of HEIs understudy perceive that the university leadership is practicing adaptive leadership at every level. The results indicated that even though the leaders did not specify that they are practicing adaptive leadership deliberately, the activities that are done to identify adaptive challenges, to find solutions with the collaboration of multiple stakeholders, empowerment of employees to find solutions to challenges, and provision of a holding environment designate that, respondents perceive the practices of adaptive leadership in universities. The findings are backed up by research conducted by Hempe (2013), who argues that educational leaders must use adaptive leadership strategies in a world where there are no easy answers to many of the problems. Furthermore, Heifetz and Linsky (2004) advocated for educators to embrace the practice of adaptive leadership in light of the complex world. Adaptive leadership, according to Heifetz et al. (2009), is a vital feature for companies that are better equipped to learn, innovate, perform, and adapt to the types of external pressures that HEIs are currently facing.

According to Owens (2004), educational organizations today are presented with highly complicated difficulties, often misunderstood and ambiguous, with unclear results. Thus, institutions must be flexible and sensitive to changing conditions. Accordingly, traditional top-down leadership is ineffective in today's higher education scene and is out of step with research on effective companies, which shows the importance of adaptive leadership (Alanoglu & Demirtas, 2016). In addition, Owens (2004) described that every leader in the world must deal

with change, but not all leaders are able to make changes that allow their businesses, governments, or communities to adapt successfully and sustainably. Therefore, it can be concluded that the current challenges have made HEIs leadership practice a model appropriate for the political, technological, and social contexts of the nation. Consequently, the finding implies that, compared to other dimensions, leaders demonstrate the dimension of maintaining disciplined attention remarkably, which indicates that leaders as adaptive leaders focus on encouraging followers to stay dedicated to their work, fostering conversation to resolve problems, and refocusing employees' attention on the transformation process. This ensures that the members of the HEIs are focused on the topic at hand and gives staff a sense of organization in their work and operations (Heifetz et al., 2009). This result is similar to Arthur-Mensah and Zimmerman (2017), who stated that adaptive leadership assists employees in navigating through adaptive change, and persistence to success stems from having a disciplined mind to stay focused on the task at hand despite work avoidance, resistance, and disputes. Furthermore, according to Volden (2018), a positive leader-follower connection can foster an interactive climate among employees, reducing stress and attrition. Hence, leaders must cultivate a positive leader-follower relationship with team members to improve organizational success through adaptive leadership that improves people's inclusion (Arthur-Mensah & Zimmerman, 2017).

### **The Status of Organizational Effectiveness**

The overall results on the status of organizational effectiveness show that respondents perceive institutions are adapting to the current dynamic environment and working to achieve their goals and be effective. It also implies that, regardless of differences in magnitude, HEIs are working to realize organizational effectiveness. This finding is supported by Kwan and Walker (2003), who stated that these days, governments across the globe have become increasingly determined to make higher education more responsive and accountable to their stakeholders. Thus, the quest for effectiveness is a pressing concern for the current world universities (Kwan & Walker, 2003), which also holds for HEIs under study. The finding is reinforced by Akhtar and Ahmad Khan's (2011) study, which describes how educational leaders are challenged to increase their organization's effectiveness by satisfying stakeholders' needs and embracing new technology in today's competitive environment. This implies that institutions need to improve their current competencies and enhance their organizational effectiveness to stay competitive. In addition, Jacob and Shari (2013) also described that, in an environment that includes shrinking resource availability and increased competition, organizational effectiveness would be the key to the survival of an organization. Hwang and Bae (2010) similarly described how the existing global organization should improve its capacity to adjust to a fast-changing environment and fulfill its objectives by ensuring the satisfaction of its members. Therefore, the finding of this study reveals that HEIs are adapting to the current challenges by implementing adaptive leadership, which makes them competitive towards the attainment of their overall goals.

In terms of the degree of attainment of organizational effectiveness characteristics, the study's findings show that institutions are more effective at student academic growth, system openness and community involvement, organizational health, and resource acquisition ability. These findings indicate that institutions are effective in terms of student achievement, growth, and progress, as well as the attention paid to interaction and adaptability with the external environment and community service. In addition, the HEIs under study can also be considered

effective in the breadth of resources they receive from outside sources and the smoothness of their operations and processes, such as goodwill and liveliness. This finding is supported by McCann (2004), who noted that the benchmark of organizational effectiveness is the successful accomplishment of the organization's aims through core teaching-learning, research, and community service strategies. It is recommended by the empirical research findings of Pearce and Conger (2003) that higher education institutions should enforce their institutional effectiveness to improve educational quality to increase student learning results, which will impact the country's economic growth and development. Pearce and Conger (2003) also suggested that leaders and educators of effective institutions consider the levels of preparation of their students and provide them with higher than anticipated academic performance. The reviewed literature similarly showed that effectiveness in educational institutions was related to the ability of leaders and teachers to help students achieve specific learning outcomes and satisfy the interests of all stakeholders in the educational community (Kwan & Walker, 2003). Moreover, the result of this study is directly related to the findings of Jacob and Shari (2013), which also implies that the leaders of HEIs often seek organizational effectiveness by investing minimal resources to achieve superior outcomes in all aspects of their mission. In addition, the dimensions of professional development, the quality of the faculty, and student educational satisfaction also indicate the effectiveness of the institutions in these fields. This indicates that the range of work achievement and improvement of faculty members, as well as the extent of incentives for work growth provided by the institutions, and the contentment of students with their educational experiences at their institutions, are likewise successful. As it is described by Ashraf and Kadir (2012), effective distribution of resources, cooperation and engagement among staff, ethics, effective communication, and performance are the influential factors that any leadership and management must consider salient towards organizational effective performance and change. Thus, when leaders of educational institutions give due attention to an effective working environment, it is likely to result in excellent student outcomes, turnover avoidance, and poor-quality services (Ashraf & Kadir 2012; Owens, 2004). Compared to other dimensions, the one with the lowest mean value is student career development. This implies that the HEIs under study are working less on students' occupational and vocational progress and career opportunities. Thus, leaders should give due emphasis to all dimensions to create a successful institution. This is also supported by Owens (2004), who stated that organizations would be able to effectively face the difficulties posed by the modern world if leaders can develop qualities that allow them to lead adaptably in complex and fast-changing contexts. Therefore, even though the overall result depicts the institutions as effective, the observed dimensions with moderate value should be considered properly to overcome the observed gaps.

The results of data analysis about the three domains/fields of organizational effectiveness prove that the HEIs under study are more effective in academic dimensions, which are mainly concerned with student academic development, professional development and the quality of faculty, and the ability to acquire resources. The result is followed by the external adaptation field in which institutions are working on student career development, system openness, and community interaction. However, the moral field in which the activities are related to student personal development, student educational satisfaction, faculty and administrator employment satisfaction, and organizational health, though results look low compared to others, the

institutions are also effective with a remarkable mean value. Concerning these findings, Alanoglu and Demirtas (2016) identified the acquisition of key skills by students through clearly developed learning outcomes as one of the main features of an effective academic organization. In addition, Hofman and Gray (2015) proposed that the most critical effectiveness indicators in academic organizations were satisfied teachers and students, academic achievement, satisfied stakeholders, and students trained as responsible citizens prepared for the social and economic context that awaits them. Hofman and Gray (2015) also stated that students' academic achievement could be a clear indicator of educational effectiveness. In this sense, Alanoglu and Demirtas (2016) suggested that leaders and educators of effective institutions should consider the levels of preparation of their students and provide them with higher than anticipated academic performance. Therefore, an effective institution provides added value to the academic performance of its students as compared to similar institutions that accept students with similar levels of preparation (Alanoglu & Demirtas, 2016). However, Gilreath (2006) affirmed that, in addition to academic achievement, several other outcomes are related to the professional development of faculty, satisfaction of stakeholders, and student career and personal development that indicate an effective institution.

### **Relationship between Adaptive Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness**

The correlation analysis of the independent and dependent variables indicates that adaptive leadership techniques and organizational effectiveness have a significant positive association. Furthermore, a correlation test to ascertain the association between adaptive leadership dimensions and organizational effectiveness indicates that all correlations among the dimensions are significant at  $p < .01$ . This suggests that the more adaptive leadership is practiced in the HEIs, the better the attainment of goals could be. The result is reinforced by the findings of Ebrahimi, Moosavi, and Chirani (2016), and Fabricius and Büttgen (2015), who described that to secure organizational success, leaders must utilize adaptive leadership strategies. In addition, the results of this study were consistent with Nolan (2017), who stated that effectiveness in organizations depended on the effectiveness of their leaders, and adaptive leadership was the cornerstone of organizational effectiveness. It is widely agreed that unless leaders can develop qualities that allow them to lead adaptively in complex and fast-changing settings, their companies will be unable to address the modern world's challenges. Adaptive leadership is viewed as a proactive and practical strategy to assist businesses in adapting to new or changing circumstances, in which leaders can facilitate change management through direct advice and the deployment of coordinating resources (Doyle, 2017). In addition, the study conducted by Hwang and Bae (2010) asserts that, compared to other models of leadership styles, adaptive leaders find organizational effectiveness through the attainment of organizational goals via adaptive change intervention. Owens (2004) also argued that to ensure the organization's long-term success, adaptive leadership stresses the creation of new information, skills, products, and procedures. Therefore, based on the findings of this research and other empirical shreds of evidence cited, it is possible to say that employing adaptive leadership and acculturating it in HEIs may help create supportive working environments characterized by goal achievement and success.

### **The Effect of Adaptive Leadership Dimensions on Organizational Effectiveness**

Furthermore, the result of this study indicates that the application of adaptive leadership in institutions has significant predictive power for the effectiveness of the HEIs under study. The effects of the five dimensions (get on the balcony, protect leadership voices from below, identify adaptive challenges, maintain disciplined attention, give the work back to the people) on the organizational effectiveness of the HEIs were statistically significant. That is to say, 10.5%, 21.9%, 31.4%, 39.2%, and -14.8% of organizational effectiveness was accounted for by leaders' practices in the above-mentioned five dimensions of adaptive leadership. Compared to other dimensions, maintaining disciplined attention is the best predictor by which the dimension explained 39.2% of the variability of organizational effectiveness. This implies that HEI leaders, as adaptive leaders, focus on encouraging followers to stay engaged in the task, fostering conversation to resolve problems, and refocusing employees' attention on the transformation process. This finding is consistent with Ahyar, Vini, and Putri's (2017) study, which confirmed a significant positive effect of adaptive leadership on organizational effectiveness at universities. Thus, when followers face a tough project or situation, the leaders of the HEIs display disciplined attention to guarantee that members are focused on the topic at hand and that the work and operations are structured (Cawsey, Deszca, & Ingols, 2016). The research findings of Owens (2004) also showed that organizations' long-term survival and effectiveness rely on greater inclusion of individuals lower in the organization who may have useful information to bring to decision-making is critical for the long-term survival and success of organizations. Arthur-Mensah and Zimmerman (2017) and Owens (2004) similarly argued that when employees and other stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process and contribute their expertise obtained through experience, an organization's effectiveness improves significantly. In addition, Owens (2004) and Owens and Valesky (2007) stated that adaptive leadership in educational organizations helps facilitate organizational performance and effectiveness. Volden (2018) also suggested that leaders who involve stakeholders in their organization will witness an increase in their effectiveness. A study about employee involvement and organizational effectiveness conducted by Amah and Ahiauzu (2013) also concluded that effectiveness in organizations is primarily associated with harmony between employees, the quality of the results or outcomes of organizations, and how they achieve their highest priorities and goals, where all these factors rely on the type of leadership. In summary, the findings indicate that adaptive leadership strategies implemented by leaders facilitate the augmentation of organizational effectiveness in HEIs. Doyle (2017) stated that leaders who can adjust to changing scenarios can keep their organizations effective and running smoothly.

### **Conclusions**

Nowadays, it is evident that governments across the world have become increasingly determined to make higher education more responsive and accountable to their stakeholders. Thus, the quest for effectiveness is a pressing concern for current universities across the world. This suggests that many crucial leaders have been called upon to address the issue flexibly and successfully. This study examined practices, status, relationships, and effects of adaptive leadership on the organizational effectiveness of Ethiopian federal public HEIs located in the ANRS. Overall, this research aimed to add to the current body of information and practices

about higher education leadership and its impact on organizational success. Hence, based on the analysis made, HEIs under study are practicing a model of adaptive leadership to give solutions to the current uncertain challenges that face the institutions and become effective institutions to further attain their expected goals. The findings imply that the current challenges have made the HEIs leadership practice a model appropriate for the political, technological, and social contexts of the current world and the nation. Concerning the effectiveness of the institutions, the result indicates that the overall status of the institutions is perceived as effective. However, even though it is said to be effective, there are variations in the attainment of different dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Moreover, the result designates a positive and significant relationship in evaluating the relationship between adaptive leadership and organizational effectiveness. This reveals that the more adaptive leadership is practiced in the HEIs, the better the attainment of organizational objectives and goals. Accordingly, the results of this study indicate that the application of adaptive leadership in institutions has significant predictive power for organizational effectiveness. It is also stated that the total variation in organizational effectiveness is explained by adaptive leadership. This implies that practicing adaptive leadership through considering all dimensions significantly contributes to the effectiveness of the institutions under study.

### **Recommendations**

The findings of this study demonstrate that practicing adaptive leadership in public HEIs leads to maximizing the level of organizational effectiveness. As a result, it is recommended that HEI leadership at every level develop knowledge of the adaptive leadership framework through continuous training to employ adaptive leadership properly to develop organizational effectiveness and achieve the intended goals of the institutions. In addition, the leadership of HEIs, considering their current competitive environment, should develop methods to enhance the quality of teaching-learning, community engagement, doing research, and developing sustainably. Besides, HEI leaders should establish a set of organizational procedures for implementing different perspectives on disseminating knowledge within HEIs, which could lead to higher productivity and effectiveness. Furthermore, the concerned governmental ministry should think about the possible ways of implementing adaptive leadership in HEIs to overcome the current uncertain challenges facing institutions in the country.

### **Limitations and Further Research**

The study findings could give sight to leaders of the HEIs under study and other stakeholders to the current status of adaptive leadership practices and their effect on the organizational effectiveness of the institutions. However, as to other research works, this study, like all research projects, has limitations. First, the research considers the practice of the leadership model and its effect on six sample public HEIs located in one regional state of Ethiopia. Hence, the results and conclusions could not be generalized to all public universities in the country. As a result, further research is needed to fully comprehend the consequences of adaptive leadership on the outcome variables in the higher education sector (public and private) of the country.



## References

- Ahyar, Y., Vini, W., & Putri, U. (2017). Developing an alternative model for the relationship among social capital, adaptive-integrative leadership, competitive advantage, and organizational effectiveness. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(11), 52–60
- Akhtar, N., & Ahmad Khan, R. (2011). Exploring the paradox of organizational learning and learning organization. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(9), 257–270.
- Alanoglu, M., & Demirtas, Z. (2016). The relationships between organizational learning level, school effectiveness, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(4), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i4.1262>
- Amah, E., & Ahiauzu, A. (2013). Employee involvement and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Management Development*, 32, 661–674. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2010-0064>
- An, J. Y., Yom, Y. H., & Ruggiero, J. S. (2011). Organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in Korean university hospitals. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 22(1).
- Arthur-Mensah, N., & Zimmerman, J. (2017). Changing through turbulent times—why adaptive leadership matters. *Journal of Student Leadership*, 1, 1–13.
- Ashraf, G., & Kadir, S. A. (2012). A review on the models of organizational effectiveness: a look at Cameron's model in higher education. *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n2p80>
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25–33.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315–338.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>
- Burkhardt, J. C. (2002). Boundary-spanning leadership in higher education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 8(3), 145–150.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cameron, K.S. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 604–627.
- Cameron, K. S. (1980). Critical questions in assessing of organizational effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*. Autumn, 66–80.
- Cawsey, T., Deszca, G., & Ingols, C. (2016). *Organizational change: An action-oriented toolkit* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Coldwell, D. D., Joosub, T. T., & Papageorgiou, E. E. (2012). Responsible leadership in organizational crises: an analysis of the effects of public perceptions of selected SA business organizations' reputations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(2), 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1110-8>,
- Corazzini, K., Twersky, J., White, H., Weiner, M., & Colon, C. (2014). Implementing culture change in nursing homes: An adaptive leadership framework. *The Gerontologist*. Advanced access online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnt170>
- Corlett, J. A. (2005). The good professor. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 3(1), 27–54.
- Dinh, J., Lord R., Gardner, W., Meuser, J., Liden, R., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005>
- Doyle, A. (2017). Adaptive challenges require adaptive leaders. *Performance Improvement*, 56, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21735>
- Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Durie, A. D., & Beshir, E. S. (2016). Leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions: The IPA approach. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 6(243), 2.
- Ebrahimi, P., Moosavi, S., & Chirani, E. (2016). Relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance by considering innovation in manufacturing companies of Guilan Province. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 351–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.044>
- Fabricius, G., & Büttgen, M. (2015). Project managers' overconfidence: How is risk reflected in anticipated project success? *Business Research*, 8, 239–263.

- FDRE (2019). Federal Negarit Gazeta of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. *Higher Education Proclamation, No. 1152/2019*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Feldbrugge, K. (2015). Making sense of the temporary organization in innovation: A case description. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 194*, 74–84. <http://doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.12>
- Garcia-Morales, M., Jimenez-Barrionuevo, M., & Gutierrez, L. (2012). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. *Journal of Business Research, 65*, 1040–1050.
- Gilreath, G. R., Sr. (2006). *A study of the relationship between principals' perception of instructional and organizational effectiveness and student achievement, poverty, and participation in a rigorous curriculum* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3211237)
- Glover, J., Rainwater, K., Jones, G., & Friedman, H. (2002). Adaptive leadership: Four principles for being adaptive (Part 2). *Organization Development Journal, 20*(2).
- Greenleaf, K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A Journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashaw, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Heifetz, R. A., Kania, J. V., & Kramer, M. R. (2004). Leading boldly. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2*(3), 21–31.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 75*(1), 124–134.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2004). When leadership spells danger. *Educational Leadership, 61*(7), 33–37.
- Hempe, E. M. (2013). Why are organizations that provide healthcare services fuzzy? *Australian Medical Journal, 6*(11), 542–548.
- Hertelendy, A. J. (2010). *A survey of emergency medical services programs: National EMS education program accreditation and organizational effectiveness* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Mississippi Medical Center.
- Hofman, R. H., Hofman, W. H. A., & Gray, J. M. (2015). Three conjectures about school effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Cogent Education, 2*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1006977>
- Hwang, H., & Bae, S. (2010). A study on the influence of self leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Secretarial Science, 19*(19), 125–143.
- Jacob, N. E., & Shari, B. (2013). Organizational effectiveness in educational institutions. *International Journal of Management Research and Reviews, 6*(1), 17–26.
- Kwan, P., & Walker, A. (2003). Positing organizational effectiveness as a second-order construct in Hong Kong higher education institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(6), 705–726.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975, July). *A quantitative approach to content validity*. A paper presented at Content Validity I, a conference held at Bowling Green State University, by Personnel Psychology, INC.
- Lejeune, C., & Vas, A. (2009). Organizational Culture and Effectiveness in Business Schools: A Test of the Accreditation Impact. *Journal of Management Development, 28*(8), 728–741.
- Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., Orton, J. D., & Schreiber, C. (2006). *Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- McCann, J. (2004). Organizational effectiveness: Changing concepts for changing environments. *Human Resources Planning, 27*(1), 42–50.
- Mesterova, J., Prochazka, J., Vaculik, M., & Smutny, P. (2015). Relationship between Self Efficacy, Transformational Leadership, and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Advanced Management Science, 3*(2), 109–122.
- Nelson, T., & Squires, V. (2017). Addressing complex challenges through adaptive leadership: A promising approach to collaborative problem solving. *Journal of Leadership Education, 16*, 111–123. <http://doi:10.12806/V16/I4/T2>
- Nolan, F. S. (2017). *Employees' perceptions of organizational effectiveness and ethical leadership within the hospitality industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Northouse, P. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- OECD. (2005). Higher Education Management and Policy. *Journal of the Program on Institutional Management in Higher Education, Volume 17*, No. 2.
- Owens, R. G. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

- Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2007). *Organizational behavior in education: Leadership and school reform*. (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Pearce, C., & Conger, J. (2003). *All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership*. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pounder, J. (1999). Organizational effectiveness in higher education. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 27(4), 389–400. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X990274006>
- Rovai, A., Baker, J., & Ponton, M. (2014). *Social science research design and statistics: A practitioner's guide to research methods and IBM SPSS analysis*. (1st ed.) Chesapeake, VA. Watertree Press LLC.
- Smart, J. C. (2003). Organizational effectiveness of 2-year colleges: The centrality of cultural and leadership complexity. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(6), 673–703. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026127609244>.
- Temple, P. (2011). *Universities in the knowledge economy: Higher education organization and global change*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Teshome, A. (2018). *Organizational effectiveness in higher education institutions of the Amhara region* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Volden, G. H. (2018). Public project success as seen in a broad perspective: Lessons from a meta-evaluation of 20 infrastructure projects in Norway. *Evaluation and program planning*, 69, 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.04.008>
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Elementary sampling theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Zagorsek, H., Jaklic, M., & Stough, S. J. (2004). Comparing leadership practices between the United States, Nigeria, and Slovenia: does culture matter? *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 11(2), 16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600410797774>

### **Acknowledgements**

Not applicable.

### **Disclosure Statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### **Funding Acknowledgements**

Not applicable.

### **Open Access**

The International Journal of Organizational Leadership publishes open access articles under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (CC BY) License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.