James Madison University

JMU Scholarly Commons

Dissertations, 2020-current | The Graduate School

5-6-2021

Transformational leadership: The roles of leader's fromal education and professional training

Ahmet Shala
James Madison University

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss202029

 Part of the Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons, and the Strategic Management Policy Commons

Recommended Citation

Shala, Ahmet, "Transformational leadership: The roles of leader's fromal education and professional training" (2021). *Dissertations, 2020-current*. 61.
https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss202029/61

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the The Graduate School at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, 2020-current by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Transformational leadership:

The role of leader's formal education and professional training

Ahmet Shala

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

In

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Strategic Leadership Studies

May 2021

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

Committee Chair: Adam Vanhove

Committee Members:

Karen Ford

Benjamin Selznick

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family.

To my late parents Bardhec and Gjyla Shala,
who with their life example, hard work and honesty thought me,
even during my childhood, about transformational leadership, although I did not know
nor heard then about its term.

To my wife Hatixhe,
and to my four children, Gjylieta, Kushtrim, Arbenita and Arber,
who have stood by me during this long process in so many ways. Thank you for your unconditional love and support throughout my academic and life journey. You have taught me the meaning of unconditional love, sacrifice and unwavering faith. Everything I do is for you. You are my greatest accomplishment of my life.

To all my students,
who continue to recognize the value of being well educated and who take
hard work to transform their societies.

May Lord Bless You All as I am Blessed with You!!

Acknowledgements

There are many individuals who share in this accomplishment.

First, I would like to thank my Chair, Dr. Adam Vanhove, whose (tough) guidance during this process was invaluable. Although we were not able to establish a close personal relationship, which are very important interactions between a student and a mentor, especially at a PhD study level and particularly at a leadership program, I am thankful and grateful for his support, direction, and sound advice that kept me on track with my studies and professional growth.

Second, I want to thank my committee members: the (former) director of the School of Strategic Leadership Studies, Dr. Karen Ford, one of the best teachers during the studies, and Dr. Ben Selznick, a young but very thoughtful, cooperative, dedicated and an inspiring scholar. A special thank goes to Dr. Margaret Sloan, currently the acting director of the SSLS, an exceptional scholar and personality that I had the privilege to be her student in several classes she offered. I feel grateful to have experienced the academic rigor offered by all of them.

A wholehearted thank goes to my dear friend, colleague and classmate Jim Krauss for his genuine friendship and countless hours that he has dedicated to me during my studies. The very same gratitude's go to my classmates: Alyse Lehrke, Melissa Altman, Kristi Shackelford, Katheleen Johnson, Andrew Miller, John Ginnity, and Vu Troung—Raymond.

A very special and a big "thank you" goes to the vice president (VP) of JMU, Dr. Nick Langridge, a role model of a young leader, who, since my arrival here at JMU in

January 2015, together with President Jon Alger, their teams, and their families, have made me never feeling alone and/or a foreigner here at JMU and in the valley. With their phone calls, meetings and receptions at university events and at their homes and families, made me felt loved, cared, equal and as a special part of the JMU family. Indeed, I have no words to thank them enough for everything they have been offering to me. The same thanks go to Michael Stoloff, the dean of the Graduate school, to Laura Kate Schubert and Rodolfo Barrett from Student's Support Center, and to Brooke Rhodes from the SSLS.

Furthermore, a wholehearted thanks go to Mike Stoltfulz and his entire family (his late Father Karl, his beautiful mother Barbara, his wife Melissa and to their amazing sons Gabriel and Lukas) who became to me my second family, here in the Valley. Their generosity and care, indeed, has been type of a Biblical and beautiful story for me.

A big thank goes to my special friend, Dr. Arber Shehu, a young Kosovar graduate student at the JMU's nutrition department, for his genuine friendship, care, and encouragement that he so genuinely and tirelessly offered to me during my research.

And finally, I want to acknowledge and thank my beautiful and lovely family here in the US and those back in Kosova. First, and foremost, I would like to thank my beautiful and most dedicated wife in the world, Hatixhe, who had supported me in every step of my life, especially through these four years of my study and research here in the US; whose love, patient and dedication has been unconditional and empathetic through all my life; our two beautiful and lovely daughters, Gjyljeta and Arbenita, and our two handsome and lovely sons, Kushtrim and Arber, who, in spite of their busy life's, always found time to give me a call and/or text me, expressing their most genuine love, care,

encouragements and support in very unique ways. Furthermore, to my beautiful siblings, my late sister Hala and the current sister Shefkije and my brothers Mehmet and Eset and their families, in Kosova and Europe. They have been calling and expressing their love and support in permanent and meaningful ways.

Without my family's love and support I surely would never be able to finish this PhD nor to be who I am and where I am today. It was indeed a long journey and they never complained, even once, about numerous times I was unavailable to them when they probably needed me the most. They never made me feel guilty about missing so many family functions they needed me to do at their toughest times and moments in their life's. They never complained or criticized me, in spite they missed and suffered because of my absence. For this I want to thank and tell them, from the bottom of my heart, that I LOVE them so much. They are the best family any could ask for, and I am proud of them and I am most THANKFULL to all of them.

And last but not least, many thanks go to my friends here in the Valley, the US, in Kosova, and around the world, who with their phone calls, visits and prayers encouraged me to stay focused and felt loved.

THANK YOU TO ALL!

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

THE ROLE OF LEADER'S FORMAL EDUCATION AND PROFESIONAL TRAINING

Content

List of Tables

Appendixes

Abstract

Transformational leadership is a popular leadership theory that instigates extraordinary changes in individuals, teams and organizations. Transformational leaders motivate, enhance and transform their direct subordinates' and followers' actions, and their ethical aspirations are beyond their immediate self-interest. The current literature and research is focused on the transformational leadership outcomes, but little is known about the antecedents of transformational leadership. This research is an attempt to discover the impact of leaders' formal education and professional training on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

The target population of this research were the top leaders of the organizations from different sectors (education, production, banking, trade/distribution, services, and communication sectors) operating in Kosova. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X-short) and a demographic questionnaire were used to collect the necessary data (Groves & Fowler, 2007; Kasunic, 2005). After data cleaning (Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins, 2001; Creswell, 2014; MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara, 1996), a sample of 252 top managers from different organizations was analyzed using multiple regression analyses.

Hierarchical regressions were conducted to test the relationships between leader's formal education and professional training elements on one side, and transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, separately, on the other side, as dependent variables. Results have shown a significant impact of leaders' graduate degrees and the type of school on transformational leadership, across sectors, but not on leadership effectiveness. Post hoc analyses revealed that a leader's graduate degree had a significant

impact on all four “I” sub-dimensions of transformational leadership, but none on the leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions. The type of school, and the country of origin of education had a partial impact on both transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions. The results of this study are a modest contribution about the antecedents of the transformational leadership.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Transformational leadership theory gained popularity in the 1980s and remains a prevalent leadership theory. According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is a form of leadership in which relationships between leaders and their followers are organized around a collective purpose in ways that transform, motivate, and enhance the actions and ethical aspirations of followers. Transformational leaders promote higher levels of morality and motivation and create valuable and positive changes in followers through four I's (Idealized Influence, Motivational Inspiration, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration). Their goals are to develop followers and transform them into leaders. By providing future perspectives, transformational leaders encourage followers to attain unexpected goals (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Yammarino, 2002; Sosik, Potosky & Jung, 2002), and move the entire organization toward the ideal perspective (Cacioppe, 2000), where followers are engaged and perform beyond their immediate self-interest (Bass, 1999).

Most of the existing research on transformational leadership focuses on the characteristics of the transformational leaders and on the performance outcomes of transformational leadership. These studies find that transformational leadership positively influences teams' and organizations' performance both directly and indirectly (Bass, 1999; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, 2012; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Menguc, Auh & Shih, 2007). Transformational leaders indirectly influence organizational performance through inspiring, mobilizing, and transforming their followers, which materializes the organization's objectives such as: high profit, good

financial results, large market share, quality product, and survival at pre-determined time utilizing relevant strategy for action (Koontz & Donnell, 1993). Directly, they influence the organization's learning and innovation, expressed by higher number of patents obtained and larger R&D expenditure (Jung, Chow & Wu, 2003; Menguc, Auh & Shih, 2007).

The antecedents of transformational leadership are not as well understood. Bass and Riggio (2006) urge that, "we still need to learn a lot more about the roots of leadership, generally, and of transformational leadership in particular" (p. 232). To discover the roots of transformational leadership, further investigation is needed (Bass, 1995). Some attention has been paid to the five-factor model of personality traits as antecedents of transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000). Results revealed that Extraversion and Agreeableness positively predicted transformational leadership, while the other three factors' influence was negligible (Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Openness). Even less research exists about the role of formal education and professional training on transformational leadership and related leadership effectiveness outcomes (extra efforts, effectiveness, and satisfaction).

Formal education and professional training are important factors for the success of leaders, teams, organizations, and societies. Studies find that teams and organizations with well-educated and trained employees and management perform better in many aspects, such as subordinate commitment and follower development and performance (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater & Spangler, 2004). Bass (1985), Bass and Avolio (1990), Doh (2013), Connaughton, Lawrence, and Ruben (2003), and Elmuti, Minnis, and Abebe (2005) suggest that a leader's education is related to organizational performance (e.g.

reaching organization goals and objectives, higher productivity). In this context, it was found that executives with PhDs, on average, scored twice as high on the Behavioral Inventory Form for Professionalism in Nursing (BIPN), than those with associate's degrees (Hisar & Karadag, 2010). Furthermore, Khan and Afzal (2011) found that the higher the education of the organization's members the higher the organization's performance (e.g. productivity). However, these studies do not explain the effects of education on transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness. Thus, the focus of this research will be on the impact of the leader's formal education and professional training on transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness.

The major theorists of the transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Burns, 1978, 2003), as well as other authors (Elmuti, Abebe & Nicolosi, 2005; Elmuti, Minnis & Abebe, 2005), advocate that transformational leadership can be learned through the process of education and professional training. Bass and Avolio (1990) argue that, "we have evidence to indicate that transformational leadership can be learned by managers at all hierarchical levels with satisfactory cost-effectiveness" (p.33). Although limited, there is evidence suggesting that a leader's education and training is related to transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness. Drake (2010) found that the educational level of leaders had a positive effect on many aspects of transformational leadership. What is yet to be understood are the effects of the specific elements of the leader's education and professional training on transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness outcomes.

This study can provide evidence regarding antecedents of transformational leadership, but it would be difficult to really learn much about antecedents of

transformational leadership without understanding the context in which those antecedents exist. Thus, the specific characteristics of education and training rooted in the historical, political, and economic context of Kosova, Balkans, and the region could be an attractive field of research for the possible antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

Very little is known about the effects of leader's education and training in developing regions like Kosova, the Balkans, and South Eastern Europe. In this context, we cannot really learn much about the antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness without understanding the socio-economic, educational, and political situation in Kosova and the region in which this study has been conducted. Therefore, it is necessary to shortly debrief about the context of this research.

Eastern Europe (EE), except Greece, for over half of the last century, was dominated by the communist ideology, where the state controlled and had full power over all sectors, in particular, the education system at all levels (Cuckovic, 2006; Mora, 2001; Vlasceanu & Purser 2002). In these types of circumstances, all textbooks, research, and curriculums had to go through a rigorous screening and clearance processes about their ideological fit. Through a similar scrutiny were teachers, the academic staff, and, in particular, the education and business leaders. At this time, it was hard to develop the needed leadership skills that could cope with changes in a very dynamic market.

The collapse of communism as an ideology and a system in the 1990s resulted in the collapse of its state systems and sectors such as economic, judiciary, political, and education. In some parts of the socialist block (e.g. Yugoslavia, Kosova) the collapse of

communism resulted in tragic and genocidal wars, which have left a long-lasting repercussion for many aspects of these societies.

Recovery and stabilization of these countries has been a long and painful process. However, the reforms and investments that have been made in Kosova and in most of the countries of this region, be it by their governments or by international donors, in all fields of their societies, has made tangible progress (Basic Education Coalition, 2004; Goddard, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007).

No doubt that these types of circumstances, developments, and changes, especially those in the field of formal education and professional training, have left their "traces" and impacts on the leader's formation within this region. Therefore, one of the objectives of this study is to search, analyze, and discuss some of the key elements of the leader's formal education and professional training as possible antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, which could be specific for this region, but also could be applied to similar circumstances in other parts of the world.

Almost no research was found that has investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and multiple relevant elements of the leader's formal education (the leader's highest degree achieved, country of origin of the education provider, "age" of formal education for each degree, and the ownership of the formal education provider (the type of school—public or private) and professional training (length of professional training, the country of origin of professional training provider, and the "age" of professional training). The purpose of this research is to fill this literature gap about these possible antecedents of transformational leadership by

assessing the impact of these key elements of a leaders' formal education and professional training on their transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness.

The majority number of the respondents of this study were educated in Kosova, the Balkans, and the surrounding region. This region has faced unique socio-economic and political turbulence throughout the last decades. The conflict and the war circumstances and conditions in which the majority of the respondents lived and have been educated in this region certainly have left a significant impact on the quality and the variety of the leader's formal education and professional training and as such on the leaders' formation and their leadership capabilities and effectiveness. The variability in education and training quality makes Kosova and the region a viable testing ground for assessing effects on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

Research questions

This study proposes the following research questions:

Q1: Is transformational leadership related to the leader's formal education?

Q2: Is transformational leadership related to the leader's professional training?

Q3: Is effective leadership determined by the leader's formal education?

Q4: Is effective leadership related to the leader's professional training?

To answer these questions, a validated Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5-Short) instrument and researcher-developed demographic questionnaire was used to collect data from over 250 top leaders of different organizations in Kosova. Multiple regression analyses were conducted with elements of the leader's formal education and professional training to predict transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness outcomes. Data were analyzed using hierarchical linear regression analyses.

Predictor variables were entered in the following order: control variables (Model 1), formal education variables (Model 2), and professional training variables (Model 3). Adding formal education variables, then professional training variables into an increasingly complex model, has allowed for tests of incremental variance to be accounted for (see Appendix 1).

The practical benefits of this research will be presented to the policymakers and executive leaders of different levels and statuses (e.g. governmental, corporate, civil, and researchers), primarily in Kosova, but also to a wider audience. These results will offer scientifically supported information about the impact of different elements of leader's formal education and professional training on transformational leadership and the leader's effectiveness outcomes. The findings will help the relevant decision and policymakers to make more rational and well-informed decisions during different budgetary, human resources (HR) and marketing activities and processes. At the governmental level, these findings will help the budgetary officers to allocate, plan, and support those schooling and educational levels, departments, curriculums, degrees, and training centers that have shown higher results on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness outcomes. At non-governmental and business organizations, these results will help HR and training units to design and apply more appropriate training programs to increase transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. Findings may also inform recruitment and promotion processes. Furthermore, the managers of marketing departments and other experts of the promotion field can use the results of this study to target and promote those education and training programs backed by scientific evidence and make them more attractive for their potential clients.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Burns (1978) in his book about leadership distinguished two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership is an exchange act and a process between the leader and the follower(s). Transactional leaders try to satisfy their followers' basic needs in exchange for achieving the leaders' objectives. Followers respect and accept the authority of the leader in exchange for a type of gain. They will perform their tasks and duties only to the level of the value of the gain of the transaction. Transformational leadership is a process of influencing the beliefs and values of followers up to a point where the goals of the organization and the vision of the leader are internalized (Bass, 1985, 1990; Carlson & Perrewe, 1995; Yukl, 1989). Transformational leaders inspire followers' actions and create an aura of confidence, trust and competence by demonstrating conviction that the mission is achievable (Avolio, 1999, 2004; Avolio & Yammarino, 2002; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Under a transformational leader, followers will undertake creative actions to accomplish a clear set of measurable goals (Anderson, 1992; Hoffman, Bynum, Piccolo & Sutton, 2011).

Transformational Leadership Four I's

Based on Burns' (1978) work, Bass (1985) further developed transformational leadership theory. Initially, he identified three components of transformational leadership: charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Furthermore, Bass in cooperation with other scholars (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994, 1997) have refined transformational leadership theory by defining charisma as a construct with two components: Idealized Influence Attributed (IIA) and

Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB), adding inspirational motivation as the fourth component. The current literature considers transformational leadership to be comprised of four dimensions (known in literature also as four I's): Idealized Influence (Attributed and Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

Idealized Influence. This sub-dimension known also as charismatic leadership views the leader as a symbol of a vision for the future, and as a symbol of trust building and integrity. According to Bass (1985), transformational leaders use charisma, clear communication, and high performance expectations to build trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect. By acting with integrity (e.g., displaying ideal traits of honesty, passion, pride), they become a role model (Idealized Behavior) for their followers and subordinates (Bass, 1985).

Inspirational Motivation. The inspirational motivation sub-dimension refers to a "team spirit" atmosphere, where a transformational leader inspires, motivates, and challenges followers in a meaningful manner (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The leader talks optimistically and articulates a compelling vision for the future, talks about what needs to be accomplished, expresses confidence that goals will be achieved, and increases followers' level of motivation and self-efficacy (Bass, 1985, 1988).

Intellectual Stimulation. This sub-dimension views the leader as a stimulator of innovative thinking patterns, which happens when the leader constructively questions assumptions, reframes problems, and approaches old situations in new ways and directions (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leaders support and stimulate their subordinates' and followers' efforts to be innovative and creative. Intellectually

stimulating leaders will not criticize their subordinates and followers when they differ from their ideas. They will arouse followers to recognize their own beliefs and values (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988).

Individualized consideration. This sub-dimension views the role of the leader as coaching and developing people through strong one-on-one relationships and developmental growth. This type of leader promotes self-development, treats team members as individuals, listens to others' concerns, helps develop others' strengths, and identifies differing needs, abilities, and aspirations for team members (Bass, 1985, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1997). They dedicate extra time even for their followers' private lives, challenges and opportunities and provide continuous follow-up and feedback.

Criticism to Transformational Leadership

In spite of its popularity, transformational leadership theory has faced some harsh criticism. One of the main criticisms against transformational leadership theory is about the lack of discriminant validity between the four I sub-dimensions (Barbuto, 1997; Bryman, 1992; Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1993; Yukl, 1999a, 1999b; Carless, 1998); in particular, between charisma (idealized influence) and inspirational motivation. Consequently, I will focus on overall transformational leadership scores, instead of separate four I's dimension scores in this study.

Full-range Leadership

Extending work on differentiating transactional and transformational leadership styles, Bass and Avolio (1994), and Avolio and Bass (2002) have developed a full-range leadership model. In addition to the four transformational leadership dimensions, the full range of the leadership model includes: two transactional leadership dimensions

(Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception Active), two passive avoidant leadership (Management-by-Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire) and three leadership effectiveness outcomes (Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction). Even though this research is not about transactional leadership or passive avoidance, a short introduction to these dimensions will help the reader to make a clearer distinction about different leadership styles and approaches. Contingent Reward is based on economic and emotional exchanges between the leader and subordinates or followers achieved by clarifying role requirements and rewarding desired outcomes (Bass, 1985). Management-by-Exception (Active) and Management-by-Exception (Passive) are negative transactions where the leader monitors the subordinates' and followers' tasks based on their deviations from standards and norms and acts only on mistakes and errors (Bass, 1988). Using Management-by-Exception (Active), leaders engage with their followers on preventing the mistakes, while in using Management-by-Exception (Passive) leaders wait until a mistake happens and then intervene. Laissez-Faire leadership is considered as the absence of leadership (Bass, 1998). These types of leaders avoid taking positions or making decisions. They abdicate their authority.

Antecedents of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership has been the focus of intensive research. A number of studies have shown a strong relationship between positive organizational outcomes (e.g., employee satisfaction, high efforts and motivation, organizational effectiveness and performance) and transformational leadership (Bass, 1990). Studies (Avolio, 1994; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Yukl, 2006) found that transformational leadership behaviors are associated with subordinates' behavior and

perceptions about leader effectiveness. However, much less is known about the antecedents of transformational leadership. It is still enigmatic why some leaders act and lead in transformative way and some do not (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). Very little is known about knowledge, skills and abilities that help a leader to express more transformative behavior. According to Brayman (1992), leadership should be viewed from three aspects: skills, perspectives and dispositions. Skills and perspectives can be taught and trained, but dispositions cannot. Literature finds that most Big Five personality traits, which are dispositional in nature, have positive relations with transformational leadership. Extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness were positively correlated with transformational leadership, while neuroticism had a negative relation (Bono & Judge, 2004; Lopez, 2013). Importantly, each of the effects were relatively weak in strength, as is typical of dispositional traits due to their distal nature. The focus of this study is on the characteristics of the quality of formal education and professional training experiences that reflect learning and leadership skill development.

Leader's formal education and professional training. Elmuti, Minnis and Abebe (2005), in their broad literature review about education and leadership, offered a wide descriptive overview about the curriculums of (mainly) business schools. Their findings suggest that the present leadership education curriculum in business schools is not adequate in many regards; that business schools need to focus on revitalizing the leadership education curriculum and come up with a program that prepares students with practical and dynamic skills, and incorporates multidisciplinary, global-oriented and ethical leadership education, which enables them to be the future business leaders. Leadership skills such as communicating ideas effectively, using an analytical and

structured approach to the problems and strategic thinking can be learned and developed through different forms of formal and non-formal education, on-the-job training, self-training, case simulations, or coaching by successful leaders (Dubrin, 2001; Doh, 2013; Hung, 2015). According to Hung (2015), leadership skills such as self-confidence and integrity can be developed through training and meaningful experience; while skills of presenting ideas persuasively and communicating them more effectively can be learned and enhanced through formal training and self-learning (Doh, 2003). According to Doh (2003) and Dubrin (2001), strategic thinking and leadership skills can be learned by case studies, simulation or role play or talking with successful leaders in formal training programs. Through these types of training, leaders will deepen their knowledge and understand the market specifics of their operation field.

Educational level has been shown to affect many workplace outcomes. Well-educated and trained leaders and employees have a wide positive impact on the teams' and organizations' performance. Thomas and Feldman (2009) and Ng and Feldman (2009) found that in addition to a positive influence in core task performance, educational level is also positively related to creativity and citizenship behaviors and negatively related to on-the-job substance use and absenteeism. Highly educated leaders and/or workers are likely to contribute more effectively to noncore activities at work as well. They displayed greater creativity and demonstrated higher citizenship behaviors compared to the less educated workers. Positive effects of education were also a topic of Khan and Afzal's (2011) study. In their research about the educational level of the organization members in different sectors in Pakistan, they found that the higher the education of the organization's members, the higher the productivity, performance,

commitment, achievement of organization's goals, and agreement with the core values among the organization members. The study revealed also that with the increase of education, the involvement of employees in their work, as well as their efforts toward achieving the organization's goals and mission improved.

Besides formal education, the positive effects of professional training have been a topic of many studies. Hisar and Karadag (2010), in their research on professional behaviors of nurse executives, concluded that the levels of education and training were significant predictors of leadership effectiveness. It is the professional training process through which leaders and managers can learn and improve their techniques and leadership skills and obtain the qualities they need to become better leaders. According to Bass (1985), followers and subordinates who were trained on transformational leadership behaviors have shown higher rates of early promotion. However, this cannot be considered as a general rule. No one should expect that a few trainings in transformational leadership would make a typical transactional leader into a transformational leader (Bass, 1985; 1990). For any leader or manager, becoming a transformational leader is a long process, but "transformational leadership can be learned, and it can — and should — be the subject of management training and development" (Bass, 1985, p. 27). Barling, Weber and Kelloway (1996) assessed the effects of transformational leadership training in a group of 20 managers assigned randomly in two groups, where just one of the groups was trained. The results of a multivariate analysis showed significant effects of training on subordinates' perceptions of leaders' transformational leadership, subordinates' own organizational commitment, and a branch-level financial performance. Further studies found that training and counseling

significantly affect transformational leadership strategy (Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000; Kelloway & Barling, 2000), decrease passive leadership behavior, increase satisfaction with leadership and inspire extra effort of followers (Hassan, Fuwad, & Rauf, 2010; Parry & Sinha, 2005). Research also suggests that transformational leadership – enhanced by training—significantly affects followers' development and objective performance measures (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002).

Through education and training, leaders learn and get better equipped to transform their way of thinking and acting, and have an impact on the transformation of their followers and the entire organization. Furthermore, Mason, Griffin, and Parker (2014) found that leader's self-efficacy, perspective taking, and positive affect significantly increased through training and improved transformational leadership behavior. Because of the positive effects of training and the improvement on their leadership behavior, these leaders received higher ratings by their supervisors, team members, and peers. Effective leadership training interventions are important not only to achieve change in behavior, but also to avoid negative psychological outcomes for leaders (Mason et al., 2014). Therefore, investigating the elements of a leader's formal education and professional training, in specific circumstances that Kosova and the region experienced in the last decades, where the most of respondents of this study are expected to be, should be of an interest to a better understanding of transformational leadership and the leadership effectiveness antecedents.

The components of the leaders' formal education and professional training. Within the leader's formal education, besides the degree itself, there are other components that might impact the leaders' transformational capabilities and their

effectiveness. Elements that will be investigated in this research are: the leader's highest degree achieved, country of origin of the education provider, the ownership of the education provider (the type of school—public or private) the leader's "age" of formal education degree. Furthermore, the leader's professional training components that will be investigated are: the total length of training, country of origin of the training provider, and the leader's "age" of professional training.

Leader's highest degree achieved. The impact of the leader's education in transformational leadership and the leadership effectiveness continues to be a topic of interest. For example, Drake (2010) assessed the relationship between educational level of nursing administrators and transformational leadership. She found that nurses with master's degrees gained much higher scores (Likert scale 0-4) in transformational leadership (2.37) than those with an associate's degree (1.76) and/or those with a bachelor's degree (2.10). She concluded that nurse education had a significant impact on their transformational leadership skills and outputs. Similarly, Xirasagar, Samuels, and Curtin (2006) found that physician leaders who also held an MBA were rated higher on transformational leadership than those without an MBA. Similarly, Kelly, Wicker, and Gerkin (2014), in their study about nurse education and training found that increasing a nurse leader's level of formal education has a significant effect on improving overall transformational leadership practices and behaviors that inspire a shared vision and challenge the process. According to the authors, to build transformational frontline nurse leaders, organizations should balance formal leadership training programs with advanced degree attainment to encourage leaders to envision and challenge the future.

Through modern educational programs and curricula, not only nurses but leaders from all fields learn and study specific managerial and leadership skills that help them to increase their professional and personal influence on their subordinates and followers. Specialized graduate programs in the field of management and leadership have been offered in Kosova (RIT Kosovo, n.d.) and other developed and transitional countries where some of the respondent leaders have been educated. These programs are expected to have improved the managerial and leadership skills of those leaders (Fakulteti Ekonomik Prishtine, 2020; World Learning, 2020; Zgaga, Klemenčič, Komljenovič, Miklavič, Repac, & Jakačić, 2013). These programs and degrees have helped leaders to learn specific skills, such as the ability to see the 'big picture' (Clutterbuck & Megginson, 1999), to work across boundaries (Colvin, 1998), to initiate, manage, and lead mergers and business alliances (Garrow, Devine, Hirsh, & Holbeche, 2000), and to deal with personal relationships, such as managing people, working in teams, focusing on customers, and developing a strategic vision (Thompson, 2000). Furthermore, according to Collin (1997), leaders, through masters and PhD programs, will improve both their know-how (skill, competence, tacit knowledge) and their know-that (propositional, cognitive knowledge). These specific skills that respondents of this study may have gained at different graduate programs are expected to have a positive impact on their transformational leadership and their leadership effectiveness. Thus, I hypothesize that:

H1a: Leaders with graduate degrees will score higher on transformational leadership.

H1b: Leaders with graduate degrees will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

Leader's total length of training. The highest degree achieved in formal education reflects the amount of time leaders spend accruing professionally relevant knowledge and skills. Analogous to this, in the professional training domain is the amount of time spent participating in such training. In order to fully understand how to transform and develop their followers, leaders need a permanent cognitive and schematic changes (Lord & Brown, 2004; Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998). In a meta-analysis about the effectiveness of the leadership training, Lacerenza, Reyes, Marlow, Joseph, and Salas (2017) found that leadership training is substantially more effective than previously presented by some authors, referring to Schwartz, Bersin, and Pelster (2014). To test the effects of training, the authors used four criteria (reactions, learning, transfer, and results), which all were found to increase after leadership trainings. The strength of these effects differs based on various design (the length of training), delivery, and implementation characteristics (Burke & Day, 1986). They found that the effectiveness of training programs depended on the duration of the training. According to Lacerenza et al. (2017), training duration exhibited a positive significant relationship with organizational and subordinate outcomes ($\beta = 0.32$, $SE = 0.00$, $t = 2.43$, $p < .02$). Furthermore, Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) found that students of the teachers who were trained in a program that lasted 102 hours outperformed students of their colleagues who were trained in a program that lasted only 44 hours on cognitive and practical tests. This suggests that leaders with more training can improve their managerial, communication and organizational skills and become more effective, inspire their followers to extend their efforts beyond their limits, and reach satisfactory outcomes and relations. One of the objectives of this study is to go beyond what we already know about the effects of the

length of a single training intervention. Thus, this study will assess the effects of the professional training accumulated over the leaders' careers and its impact on their transformational leadership and their leadership effectiveness. In this context, I hypothesize that:

H2a: Leaders with more hours of professional training will score higher on transformational leadership.

H2b: Leaders with more hours of professional training will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

Country of origin of the leader's formal education and professional provider. Studies show that the quality of education, including formal education and professional training play relevant roles on the leaders' formation and their leadership styles and performance. The quality of education and professional training differ in different countries. Hanushek and Wosman (2007) found that the quality of education in developing countries is lower than in developed countries. Countries that do not function well are less able to support effective education programs. The approaches that these countries undertake are often less effective and have lower student learning outcomes. The United Nations (2018) classifies all countries of the world in three broad categories: developed economies (e.g., Western Europe, North America, Japan), economies in transition (e.g., Balkans, South-East Europe), and developing economies (e.g., Africa, most Asian countries, Latin American).

Respondents in this research predominantly are from Kosova, and most of them were educated in Kosova and countries in transition. But surely a certain percentage is expected to have been educated in developed countries too. Based on an international

knowledge assessment-PISA international test of 2018 (OECD, 2019), students from developing countries and countries in transition performed much lower on reading, mathematics, and science literacy than their peers from developed countries. For example, based on PISA results of 2018 on reading, mathematics and science performance, Kosovar students scored, on average, 33% lower compared to Finland students, who were the highest, and 27% lower compared to Austrian students, who had the lowest results among European Union (EU) members (OECD, 2019). Based on the same source, students from the Balkan's region scored, on average, 15% lower than their colleagues from the European developed countries. Kosova was also behind its neighbors, on average, by around 8%. Kosova's overall performance in science, math, and reading significantly lags behind major averages of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), EU, and the Europe and Central Asia (ECA) region (Kelmendi, 2017).

The poor results reflect the socio-economic, historical and political situation that Kosova and the region (the Balkans and the East Europe) have been experiencing for a long period of time and the implications that these conditions have not only on the education system (Basic Education Coalition, 2004; Cuckovic, 2006; Goddard, 2007; Mora, 2001; Vlasceanu & Purser 2002,). Al-Ansi (2017) considers the main factors that could impact test scores and education results in these countries are: political (instability, war and conflicts), economic (poverty, cost of learning, lack of funding, child labor, lack of infrastructure), socio-cultural (language, religion, traditions and heritage, literacy rate, ethnicity, equity and gender issues) and educational factors (non-efficiency and low quality, low effectiveness and improvement, lack of teacher training, lack of learning

materials). These are, in fact, typical characteristics that Kosova and the Balkan's region have been facing in the last four decades: war atrocities, political instability and weak socio-economic institutions. As a result of these circumstances, all levels of the education system (primary, secondary and higher education) have lacked infrastructure, well-qualified scholars, modern curriculums, and international student and teacher exchange pipelines (Kelmendi, 2017). Moreover, these circumstances have similarly affected the availability and quality of professional training opportunities for similar reasons.

The majority of the potential respondents of this study have been educated and trained in the same or similar conditions as those described above, which could have left a significant impact on their management and leadership styles and capabilities, compared to respondents educated in developed countries. Leaders that had that opportunity to study or be trained in developed countries had a chance to get a better formal education and professional training (even in-job-training). Thus, it is expected that leaders who have been educated/trained in developed countries will score higher on transformational leadership/leader effectiveness than those educated/trained in Kosova or other transitional and developing countries. I hypothesize that:

H3a: Leaders who have been educated in developed countries will score higher on transformational leadership. Not supported?

H3b: Leaders with professional training from providers from developed countries will score higher on transformational leadership.

H3c: Leaders who have been educated in developed countries will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

H3d: Leaders with professional training from providers from developed countries will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes. Not Supported – In text Ch4

The ownership of the education provider (the type of school—public or private). An important element that might impact leaders' performance is the type of school they attended—public (state) or private. In literature and practice, the term 'private school' is used and understood in different ways. According to Ashley et al. (2014), the key factor defining 'private schools' is that they are dependent on using fees to cover all or part of their operational and development costs; they have to follow the market to attract and retain students in order to be financially viable; they are managed largely independently of the state, and they are owned and/or founded independently of the state. Public schools are controlled and managed by a public education authority or agency (OECD, 2012).

In developing countries and countries in transition, the public or state schools usually offer a lower quality of education than the private ones. This is because of the lack of funds and competing priorities. This is a typical status of these countries across the education levels – preschool, primary and higher education. According to Ashley et al. (2014) and Wales, Aslam, Hine, Tawal, and Wild (2015), private schools are far better in terms of quality learning and teaching than state schools. In a review of 59 studies in developing countries, mainly in former Soviet Union countries, Africa and Asia, Ashley et al. (2014) found a strong evidence that teaching is better in private schools than in state schools, in terms of higher levels of teacher presence and teaching activity as well as teaching approaches that are more likely to lead to improved learning outcomes. They found moderate evidence that private school students achieve better learning outcomes

when compared with state school students. Supporting arguments in favor of private schools that these authors bring are: greater teacher's presence and teaching activities, more conducive learning approaches to improve students' outcomes, lower student-teacher ratios in certain contexts, as well as better performance incentive mechanisms and performance monitoring presence and better measures on retaining effective teachers and dismissing less effective teachers. In the United States, Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1982) concluded that attending private schools increased the performance of students as measured by standardized tests of verbal and mathematical skills, but results are less consistent in reading. The authors consider that the elements of school policy that can account for these differences are school discipline and students' behavior. The same opinion is shared by Hanushek (1986, 1990), who argues that the average student does better in private than in public schools.

Similar evidence has been found for the private educational institutions in the Balkans. According to Geiger (1986), private higher education acts as a way of providing better or different higher education, both as a response to perceived inadequacy or a decline in the quality of the higher education provided by the public sector. A case study by Kacaniku (2014) about the University of Prishtina, which is the oldest and biggest public higher education institution in Kosova, describes the situation of public higher education in Kosova. According to Kacaniku (2014), the University of Prishtina faces serious problems (e.g., limited budget options, external interference in its managerial and financial autonomy, poor quality of studies, limited application of modern teaching and assessment methods, lack of adequate literature, lack of libraries in departments, inefficient functioning of administration, small number of academic staff and student

representation, lack of functional system of research and innovation). Furthermore, research activities are sporadic, uncoordinated and based on individual initiatives, rather than institutional ones. There is also a lack of masters and PhD programs, a lack of capacity for writing research projects and an insufficient capacity to absorb international funds for research projects.

By contrast, in Kosova, the private sector has gained a substantial market share at all education levels, especially in higher education. A number of private universities/colleges with international roots have been established: American University of Kosovo was established as a partnership institution with Rochester Institute of Technology (US); Staffordshire University (UK) branch in Prishtina-the Riinvest College, and UBT (University of Business and Technology) linked with Austrian private institutions. Most of these private higher education institutions have been involved in a number of international cooperation projects supporting the establishment of new study programs as well as programs for instructional improvement, such as Tempus (Baketa, 2013). According to Brownell (2013), in Central and Eastern Europe, around 30% of students go to private schools, where they can take nontraditional courses that public schools do not offer. The nontraditional courses mainly are focused on interpersonal skills and other managerial project based and leadership courses that make their students better prepared for a successful professional career. Most of the graduates from these institutions, in a relatively short period of time, gained managerial and leadership positions in the top organization in Kosova and the region. According to the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) Kosovo, named earlier as American University of Kosovo (A.U.K), 95% of the graduates of this university are working in respected positions and

well paid jobs. This high percentage of well situated graduates in high managerial and leadership positions could be attributed to the non-traditional courses that these schools offer, emphasizing management projects and leadership skills in their curriculums and practices. Thus, these individuals may be expected to have better developed leadership skills, such as those related to transformational leadership, and greater leader effectiveness. It is expected that a number of respondents of this study have gained degrees at private schools and colleges within or outside Kosova, where the private sector education quality was higher than at the public sector. Thus, I hypothesize that:

H4a: Leaders who have been educated at private education institutions will score higher on transformational leadership.

H4b: Leaders who have been educated at the privately owned education institutions will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

The "age" of a leader's formal education degree and professional training.

Another relevant element that might have an impact on a leader's formation and their transformational leadership capabilities could be the timing (the "age") of a leader's formal education and professional training. This factor will be investigated from two perspectives. First, from the knowledge retention perspective, and, second, from the socio-economic and political perspective. Some authors (Bahrick, 1979; Higbee, 1977) argue that students do not retain information and/or knowledge for a long period of time. There are two dimensions of the retention interval that can affect retention: (1) time since training occurred (i.e., retention typically decreases over time as a function of the length of the retention interval) and (2) experiences or events that occurred during the interval of time since knowledge acquisition (Semb & Ellis, 1994). According to Farr (1978), the

length of knowledge retention depends on: the degree and the depth of original learning, the type of knowledge that people reached during their education, the type of training, and the methodologies that such knowledge has been transmitted to them. The second perspective, the socio-economic and political situation that has dominated Kosova, the Balkans and Eastern Europe, might have had a relevant impact on the leaders' formation and development, because of the unique circumstances that have dominated this region in the last four decades. Transition from communism to democracy and open market economy of the entire region (1989), the collapse of Yugoslavia (1990), and the tragic wars and the genocide that Kosova and other parts of Yugoslavia have experienced (1992-1999) have impacted the educational institutions and other sectors at all levels (Basic Education Coalition, 2004; Goddard, 2007). The quality of formal education and professional training reflected the socio-political, economical and budgetary capabilities of Kosova and the region before and after the war.

In the post war era (after 1999), a substantial investment has been made in the educational sector in Kosova and the Balkan's societies. The investment was made mainly by the governmental and donor organizations as well as the private sector. According to Kosovo Education and Employment Network – KEEN (2019), teacher professional development has shown significant improvements since the period after the war (1999) both in policies and performance practices. Furthermore, in order to provide cost effective professional development, continuing professional development (CPD) centers were established in 23 municipalities (from total 36 municipalities that Kosova has) by the Kosovo Education Centre (KEC) in 2013 (Likaj, 2016). These investments certainly have improved the quality of formal education and professional training,

especially compared to the circumstances and conditions that existed during the 1990s, and particularly those during the war (1997-1999) and the time period immediately after the war of 1999. The investments were focused on the field of educational institutions' infrastructure, curriculum modernization, and teacher training. In addition, many professional trainings in the field of management and leadership have taken place, mainly supported by the donor organization, such as United States Agency for International Development (USAID), EU, World Bank (WB) and other national and international development agencies. For example, a Transformational Leadership Program (TLP) that has been conducted by USAID and the Kosova Government recently has trained a number of young Kosovar leaders from different sectors, providing specialized training in professional leadership, public policy analysis, evidence based decision making, and program evaluation (USAID, 2019; World Learning, 2020).These investments and improvements, especially those that had to do with the adoption and modernization of a formal education curriculum, as well as trainings that focused on modern management and leadership skills and those focused on market needs, should have increased the leadership capabilities of the leaders and managers. These programs can move leaders and managers beyond their skills and expertise and bring them to a stage of discussion and development of values, beliefs, and shared understandings of human beings; and through which the true leaders will emerge (Goddard, 2007). These types of projects have helped to develop the capacities of Kosovars and enable the transformational change of the Kosovar society through opportunities for advanced education, leadership development, and technical assistance (World Learning, 2020). Thus, it is expected that the newer (fresher) the leader's formal education degrees or

professional trainings the higher the scores of transformational leadership and the leadership effectiveness outcomes would be. Thus, I hypothesize that:

H5a: Leaders with newer degrees will score higher on transformational leadership.

H5b: Leaders with newer professional training will score higher on transformational.

H5c: Leaders with newer degrees will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

H5d: Leaders with newer professional training will score higher on the leadership effectiveness outcomes.

Summary

Transformational leadership is a popular leadership theory that is defined as a leadership approach that causes extraordinary changes in individuals, teams and organizations. Transformational leaders motivate, enhance and transform their direct subordinates' and followers' actions and their ethical aspirations beyond their immediate self-interest (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994). Transformational leadership literature and research is mostly focused on transformational leadership outcomes – the impact of this type of leadership on the organization or team performances.

However, very little research was found about the genesis and/or the antecedents of the leader's transformational leadership skills. In this context, this research is an attempt to discover the effects of leaders' formal education and professional (leadership and management) training on their transformational leadership. The relevance of these

two forms of “education” (formal education and professional training) are of a particular importance, having in consideration the specific socio-economic and political situation of Kosova in its recent history, and how these circumstances have affected the Kosovar leadership, in particular the transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Participants and Procedures

The targeted population of this research was the top leadership of the organizations (e.g. CEOs, presidents, vice-presidents, CFOs, COOs, heads of department-sectors, university rectors, vice-rectors, and/or equivalents to these positions). The targeted population was from the education, production, banking, trade/distribution, services, and communication sectors of the organizations—businesses that are registered at the Business Registration Office in Kosova, and which employ at least 50 people. This minimum threshold of 50 employees was used to insure a consistent platform of the organization's management structure. Smaller organizations, in Kosova, might not have as stable and permanent an organizational structure, a fact that could bias effects on this study. No incentives were offered to the respondents during the surveying process. Minimum size of the sample was checked based on the following rule of thumb: at least ten times more respondents than the number of independent variables in the study and based on the best theoretical platform of this field (Creswell, 2014; Kasunic, 2005). This study contains 10 predictors, meaning complete responses from at least (10 x 10) 100 leaders will be necessary for this study to have a sufficient statistical power. When completed, the sample size of this study consisted of 252 leaders from the organizations of the above-mentioned sectors.

Data about the full range of leadership outputs (behaviors and outcomes) as well as the level and types of leaders' formal education and professional training were collected using the Multiple Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X –Short) developed by

Bass and Avolio (1995), and a demographic questionnaire developed by the author. The focus of the research was not only the formal education, titles, and degrees of the leaders, but also other elements of their education and/or professional trainings, as well as the place (countries) and timing of education of the leaders and subordinates.

A detailed timeline for the data collection plan is shown in Appendix 2. The contact details of these organizations were gathered from the Kosova Chamber of Commerce and/or other business associations, such as American-Kosovo Chamber of Commerce, German-Kosovo Chamber of Commerce, British-Kosovo Chamber of Commerce, Kosovo Business Alliance). A partial list of organizations and contact information about their leaders to be contacted is shown in Appendix 3. More specifically, the targeted people to be contacted in an organization were the CEO's and/or their personal assistants or chiefs of staff (or equivalents). These people were contacted by an initial email requesting permission to contact executives within their organizations. Included in this initial email was a short explanatory letter about the purpose of the project and assurance about anonymity and confidentiality of the survey, a letter of consent, and a description of the surveys they were asked to complete (MLQ 5X-Short and demographic questionnaire) and instructions for completion through an online link to the survey. Among permitting organizations, email contacts were requested from all executive-level employees. A week later, a follow up email was sent to those who had not responded to the request for permission. After two weeks, a follow-up phone call was made to increase the volunteer participation on the survey for this research. All email contacts from participating organizations were emailed a package with all necessary documentation (a short explanatory letter about the purpose of the project and assurance

about anonymity and confidentiality of the survey, letter of consent, and link to online survey including the MLQ 5X-Short, demographic questionnaire, and a guide on how to complete the instruments through an online survey). Upon collection, the data went through a thorough process of data screening and cleaning, such as checking for unusual responses and missing data.

Measures

Two main instruments were used in the survey: the Multiple Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X-Short) created by Bass and Avolio (1995, 1997, 2000) and Avolio and Bass (2004) and a demographic questionnaire designed by the author. Both instruments will be available in two languages, Albanian and English, and were distributed according to needs and/or requests of the respondents/organizations. The MLQ 5X-Short was used to collect and measure the dependent variables, while the demographic questionnaire was used to collect the independent variables. A table of variables is found in Appendix 4.

Multiple Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X-Short). The MLQ 5X-Short (see Appendix 5) is one of the most popular instruments that measures transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Avolio & Bass, 2004). This instrument measures the effectiveness of leaders in organizations, such as business, education, government, medicine, military, religion, and volunteer (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001). The MLQ 5X-Short has two versions (forms), the self-rating form and the rater form. The self-rating form measures the supervisor's (leader/manager) full range of leadership (based on the supervisor's self-evaluation), while the rater form is used to measure the supervisor's leadership type and the

leadership level measured/scored by the leader's subordinates. According to the MLQ author's manual and information on the editor's website, there is no need for a specific training to use the MLQ survey (Bass & Avolio, 1995). All of the MLQ survey versions are straightforward, easily understandable, and simple to fill out. However, there are two ways of processing any form of the MLQ: an online and paper and pen method.

The instrument has 45 items rated on a five-point Likert scale, where 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *once in a while*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *fairly often*, and 4 = *frequently, if not always*. MLQ 5X-Short items are organized into 12 subscales, making up four higher-order scales (three leadership types and leadership outcomes) which capture the full range of leadership.

The first five subscales of this instrument are the "five I's" making up transformational leadership: Idealized Attributed (IA), Idealized Behavior (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individual Consideration (IC). These subscales have 20 items, four for each subscale. For example, one of the items on the IA subscale states: "I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group" (for the self-evaluation form), and "He/she goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group" (for the rater form). One of the items on the IB subscale states: "I (he/she) emphasize(s) the importance of having a collective sense of mission." One of the items on the IM subscale states: "I (he/she) express(es) confidence that goals will be achieved." One of the items on the IS subscale states: "I (he/she) re-examine(s) critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate." Finally, a sample item on the IC subscale states: "I (he/she) spend(s) time teaching and coaching." The five subscales' means were calculated for each respondent, then averaged to get an overall transformational

leadership score of the five I's. According to Bass and Avolio (1995), the cut-off between a high transformational leadership level and low transformational leadership level should be 3.0.

The second group are two transactional leadership subscales, Contingent Reward (CR) and Management by Exception-Active (MBEA). These subscales have eight items, four for each subscale. For example, one of the items on the CR states: "I (he/she) provide(s) others with assistance in exchange for their efforts" and on the MBEA subscale states: "I (he/she) keep(s) track of all mistakes." Similar to the transformational leadership five I's, for each of the two subscales, the mean for each respondent was calculated, then averaged to get an overall transactional leadership score.

The third group is the two subscales that measure passive avoidant leadership: Management by Exception-Passive (MBEP), and Laissez-Faire (LF). These subscales have eight items, four for each subscale. For example, one of the items on the MBEP states: "I (he/she) fail(s) to interfere until problems become serious" and on the LF states: "I (he/she) avoid(s) getting involved when important issues arise." These scores were not included in this study's statistical analysis as they were outside of the focus of this research.

The fourth group of subscales measures three leadership effectiveness criteria: extra efforts (LEE), effectiveness (LEF), and satisfaction (LS). These subscales have in total nine items. The LEE has three items, where one of the items states: "I (he/she) get(s) others to do more than they are expected to do;" for LEF, "I (he/she) am (is) effective in meeting organizational requirements," and for LS, "I (he/she) use(s) methods of leadership that are satisfying." Again, for each of the outcomes' subscales the mean score

for each respondent was calculated, and then averaged to get an overall leadership effectiveness score.

Although respondents completed the entire MLQ 5X-Short, this research used: (a) only scores on the transformational leadership scale and the transformational leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness scales); (b) the self-rating form, rather than the rater form; and (c) the online version, rather than the paper and pen form. To summarize, the leaders' self-reported ratings on the transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness scales were obtained through an online version of the MLQ 5X-Short.

This instrument (MLQ) has been used successfully in the US and around the world, both by researchers and practitioners (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). It is translated in many world languages, including Albanian (Mind Garden, 2019) and has been used in some transformational leadership research in this language (Dumi, Dede, & S'eche, 2013). This instrument has a wide range of use, but there is no evidence that it has been used for people younger than college students (Hoffman, 2017).

To check the internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha (α) was calculated for the two main dimensions—the transformational leadership average scores of 4 Is and the leadership effectiveness average scores of its three outcomes, and for their sub-dimensions of the MLQ instrument. The results show high reliability. The all are over 0.90 (see tables 3 and 3a). Studies (Alsayed, Motaghi, & Osman, 2012; Avolio & Bass, 2004) find that the last version of the instrument MLQ 5X-Short have been found to have generally high reliability in numerous languages. A study on a sample of 102 employees in a Mexican public hospital, found a high reliability coefficient on transformational style (0.98), transactional (0.89), and (0.71) laissez-faire (Garcia-Rivera & Mendoza-Martinez,

Ramirez-Baron, 2013). Furthermore, many studies in different fields and languages, including this one, have tested and found sufficient evidence of reliability and content validity of this instrument (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Casimir & Waldman, 2006).

Demographic questionnaire. The author has developed a demographic questionnaire for this research (see Appendix 6). Key variables that were collected via this instrument were elements of formal education (leader's highest degree achieved, country of education provider, "age" of formal education for each degree, and the ownership of the education provider (public or private) and professional (leadership and management) training (the length of training, location-country of training provider, and the "age" of professional training). These variables were treated as independent variables. Other variables collected were age, gender, and the size of the organization, which were treated as control variables. Examples of computations of demographic questionnaire variables are shown in Appendix 7.

Variables

Formal Education. The variables related to a leader's formal education are as follows: leader's highest degree achieved, country of education provider, "age" of formal education for each degree, and the ownership of the education provider.

Highest degree achieved. Response options included high school diploma or less (HE), two years' college/university professional diploma (AD [this type of a high professional degree diploma was a common qualification in the last century in Kosova and the region]), Bachelor of Arts/Sciences (BA), Executive Master (EM), Master of Arts/Master of Science degree (MA), and PhD/Doctoral degree (PhD). These six levels of

formal education were dichotomized into two levels: respondents with graduate degrees (Grad group) and respondents with no graduate degrees (Non-Grad group). The Grad group included respondents who have earned an EM, MA or PhD, while the Non-Grad group included all other respondents (BA, AD, and HE). This dichotomous variable will be dummy coded: 0 = *Non-Grad* (reference group), 1 = *Grad*.

Country of formal education provider. Different countries offer different levels of education quality. Institutions in western or developed countries are considered to have higher quality of education, compared to Kosova and other developing countries. For this study, there will be three categories of country of formal education provider: 1) Kosova, 2) Developed Countries, and 3) Other Countries. The Developed Countries category included institutions in USA, UK, Ireland, Iceland, Canada, Germany, Austria, France, Finland, Japan, Korea, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Australia. The Kosova category included institutions only in Kosova. The Other Countries category included institutions in all other countries not previously listed. Categorization on this variable was based on most recent degree achieved. These three categories were represented by two dichotomous dummy codes: 0,0 = *Kosova* (reference group); 0,1 = *Developed Countries*; and 1,0 = *Other Countries*.

"Age" of formal education. Education age is a continuous variable represented as the time distance between degree completion and the conducted date of the study (2018). The mean of the "age" across all degrees was calculated for each respondent and expressed in years.

Ownership of the formal education provider. The quality of education offered, particularly in Kosova and the region, is often linked with the education provider's ownership (public or private). For each degree reported by a participant, if it was from a public institution it was scored "1," while if it was from a private institution it was scored "0." For each participant, the number of public degrees was divided by the number of total degrees that a respondent earned to create a continuous variable. For example, a respondent who has a total of six degrees, all from public institutions, will have a score of 1 (6/6). A respondent with a total of four degrees, three from public institutions and one from a private institution, will have a score of 0.75 (3/4).

Professional training. This variable includes short-term trainings and/or seminars in different components of *leadership* and *management*. Leadership training included topics or classes about mission and vision statements, core values, team building, trust, communication, motivation, and other possible trainings in the field of leadership that respondents declared that they have attended and considered relevant to list in the survey. Management training included topics or classes about organizational culture, planning, finance/audit/accounting, human resources, and other management training that respondents attended and considered relevant for their career. The following professional training variables were coded: total length of training, country of training provider, and the "age" of professional training. Data were collected on each variable separately for leadership training and management training. Potential respondents were asked to list up to five training experiences from the field of leadership and up to five from management that they completed (total of 10 training experiences). Those who had more than five of either type of training were asked to choose and report on the five that

had most valuable impact in their career and life. Scored responses from each type of training (leadership and management) were combined for initial hypothesis testing. However, collecting data separately for each allowed for post hoc analyses that isolated the effects of either type of training.

Length of professional training. This will be a continuous independent variable, which expressed the summed length (in hours) of the entirety of the leader's professional training in the field of leadership and management (separately). Each leader had a separate summed length of their leadership and management training.

Country of professional training. Responses were scored based on the country of origin of the training provider. Similar to the country of formal education, three categories were used: 1) Kosova, 2) Developed Countries, and 3) Other Countries. The Developed Countries category included training experiences led by trainers from the USA, UK, Ireland, Iceland, Canada, Germany, Austria, France, Finland, Japan, Korea, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Australia. The Kosova category included training experiences led by trainers from Kosova. The Other Countries category included training experiences led by trainers from all other countries not previously listed. Categorization on this variable was based on training experience of greatest length. These three categories were represented by two dichotomous dummy codes: 0,0 = *Kosova* (reference group); 0,1 = *Developed Countries*; and 1,0 = *Other Countries*.

"Age" of professional training. *"*Age" of training was operationalized similar to age of formal education—average time distance between the completion of reported trainings and the conduct of the study (2018).

Control Variables. Among the collected variables, leaders' age, gender, and the size of the organization in which they work were treated as control variables.

Age was a continuous variable and represents the age of the leader expressed in years.

Gender was a dichotomous variable: 0 = *male* (the reference group); 1 = *female*.

Size of the organization is categorized based on the European Commission's user guide of the SME definition (2003): small (less than 50 employees), medium (less than 250) and large (more than 250). Because only organizations with 50 or more employees were recruited for data collection, a single dichotomous dummy code was used: 0 = *medium* (reference group); 1 = *large*.

Data Analyses

Data were analyzed using hierarchical linear regression analyses. This method was used to determine the statistical and practical significance of the effects of leaders' self-reported formal education (highest degree achieved, country of formal education provider, "age" of formal education, and ownership of the formal education provider) and professional training (length of professional training, country of professional training, "age" of professional training) on self-reported transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. Predictor variables were entered in the following order: control variables (Model 1), formal education variables (Model 2), and professional training variables (Model 3). Adding formal education variables, then professional training variables into an increasingly complex model, allowed for tests of incremental variance to be accounted for. Moreover, hypotheses were tested based on Model 3 results, in which all predictors and control variables were present in the model and their effects

were being controlled. Post hoc analyses were conducted using each of four transformational leadership sub-dimensions and three leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions as outcomes. Regardless of whether effects are found predicting overall transformational leadership and/or leader effective scores, I sought to explore whether any formal education or professional training characteristic variables differentially affected specific dimensions of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. While performing the post hoc analyses I used the Bonferoni correction, were the 5% significant level was divided by the number of tests – one test predicting scores on each sub-dimension. For the transformational leadership sub-dimension tests, the 5% significance level was divided by four, reflecting the 4 I sub-dimensions, while for the leadership effectiveness sub-dimension tests, the 5% was divided by three, reflecting the three leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions. Therefore, for the post hoc analyses, I used a .0125 significance threshold for tests of transformational leadership sub-dimensions, and I used a .0166 significance threshold for the tests of leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Descriptive Results

The main descriptives of the variables are shown in Table 1 and Table 2. Table 1 shows the results of the categorical variables such as gender, organization size, leader's highest degree achieved, country of origin of leader's formal education provider, and country of origin of professional training provider. Table 2 shows the results of the continuous variables such as age, "age" of the formal education degree, the length of professional training, the "age" of professional training, the average score of the transformational leadership 4 I's, and the average score of the leadership effectiveness outcomes. Table 1 shows that the majority of leaders in the sample are males who hold leadership positions in organizations with 50 or more employees and have at least one graduate degree. Moreover, the majority proportion of the leaders reported their degrees from Kosova, while their longest professional training was from developed countries. As shown in Table 2, average participant age is over 44 years. The "age" of leader's formal education had a normal distribution, which was not the case with the length and the "age" of professional training. Their distribution shown to be skewed and leptokurtoses. The average scoring on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness is over 3.00. According to Bass and Avolio (1995), scores over 3.00 are indicators that leaders are transformational. It is important to note that this study is based on self-reports because this introduces the possibility of upward bias in self-evaluations of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

The correlation matrix is shown in Table 3. Significant correlations were observed between transformational leadership scores and scores on two formal education variables—leaders' highest degree achieved and the type of school—the proportion of public vs. private formal education degrees. Specifically, leaders with graduate degrees and leaders with higher proportions of private formal education degrees scored significantly higher on transformational leadership. The only formal education or professional training predictor variable to significantly correlate with leadership effectiveness scores was leaders' highest degree achieved. Specifically, leaders with graduate degrees scored, on average, higher on leadership effectiveness. The lack of statistically significant correlation coefficients between predictors and outcome scores indicates that one should not expect a high level of determination of transformational leadership and the leadership effectiveness outcomes by leader's formal education and professional training elements. Another important observation worth noting is the low correlation level among and between the predicting variables. Almost all correlation coefficients between the predictor variables (e.g., leader age, gender, organization size, and formal education and professional training variables) were lower than .50, except for between age and "age" of formal education, which correlates above .80. This indicates that there is no risk of multicollinearity between predictors. Therefore, there was no need to remove any of the variables for further analyses.

Hypothesis Testing

The first two research questions were about the relationship of transformational leadership with a series of variables regarding leaders' formal education (Q1) and professional training (Q2). To answer these questions, hierarchical regression analyses

were used to predict averaged scores on the transformational leadership measure. The control variables (leader's age, gender, and the organization's size) were included in the first model (Model 1). The four elements of the leader's formal education (highest degree achieved, country of origin of the education provider, the ownership of the education provider (the type of school—public or private), and the leader's "age" of formal education degree) were added in the second model (Model 2). Finally, the leader's professional training elements (the total length of training, country of origin of the training provider, and the leader's "age" of professional training) were added in Model 3. The results are shown in Table 4.

As shown in Table 4, the model including demographic and organizational control variables did not significantly predict leader's transformational leadership scores ($R^2 <$ .01, $F(3, 224) = .25$, $p > .05$). Moreover, none of the individual predictors included in Model 1 showed a statistically significant relationship with transformational leadership scores. Adding the four formal education predictor variables in Model 2 significantly improved model fit ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, ΔF (5, 219) = 5.52, $p < .05$). Model 2, which included both the control variables from Model 1 and the four formal education predictors, significantly predicted transformational leadership scores ($R^2 = .12$, F (5, 219) = 3.55, $p <$ .01). Two formal education variables in Model 2 showed statistically significant relationships with transformational leadership scores. First, leaders who reported having a graduate degree reported significantly higher transformational leadership scores than leaders reporting no graduate degree. Second, leaders reporting a greater proportion of their degrees coming from private institutions reported higher transformational leadership scores. Adding in Model 3, the professional training variables did not significantly

improve the model fit ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F\ (4, 215) = 0.79$, $p > .05$), although the full set of predictors included in Model 3 significantly predicted the outcomes scores ($R^2 = .13$, $F\ (12, 215) = 2.62$, $p < .01$).

Model 3 results provide support for two hypotheses regarding leaders' formal education and transformational leadership scores. First, results regarding the relationship between highest degree achieved and transformational leadership scores continued to be statistically significant in Model 3. Leaders reporting having earned a graduate degree reported higher transformational leadership scores than leaders reporting not having earned a graduate degree. These results support H1a. Second, results regarding the proportion of degrees earned from public versus private institutions also remained statistically significant in Model 3, with leaders reporting a greater proportion of degrees earned from private institutions reporting higher transformational leadership scores. These results support H4a. Results showed that formal degree location and age of formal degree were unrelated to transformational leadership scores. These results fail to support H3a and H5a, respectively. Model 3 results showed no professional training variables to be statistically significantly related to transformational leadership. These results fail to support H2a, H3b, and H5b. Taken together, these findings provide partial support that formal education factors are related to transformational leadership scores (Q1), but have shown no support to the professional training factors in relation with the transformational leadership scores (Q2).

The same hierarchical regression approach used above was used again to predict averaged scores on the leadership effectiveness outcome measure. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 5. As shown in Table 5, Model 1 including demographic and

organizational control variables did not significantly predict the leadership effectiveness outcome scores ($R^2 < .03$, F (3, 224) = 2.06, $p > .05$). From the control predictors, only gender had a statistically significant relationship with leadership effectiveness, where females (coded by "1"), on average, scored lower on leadership effectiveness outcomes than males (coded by "0"). Adding in Model 2, the four formal education predictor variables did not significantly improve the model fit ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, ΔF (5, 219) = 2.04, $p > .05$). However, Model 2, which included both the control variables from Model 1 and the four formal education predictors, significantly predicted leadership effectiveness scores ($R^2 = .07$, F (8, 219) = 2.07, $p < .05$). Moreover, two variables in Model 2 showed statistically significant relationships with leadership effectiveness scores. First, female leaders reported significantly lower leadership effectiveness scores. Second, leaders reporting having a graduate degree reported significantly higher leadership effectiveness scores than leaders reporting no graduate degree. Adding in Model 3, the professional training variables did not significantly improve the model fit ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, ΔF (4, 215) = 0.74, $p > .05$) and no predictors remained significant in the final model. These findings fail to support any of the hypotheses related to formal education (H1b, H3c, H4b, H5c) and professional training (H2b, H3d, and H5d) predicting leadership effectiveness. These findings clearly suggest that formal education (Q3) and professional training (Q4) are unrelated to self-reported leadership effectiveness scores.

Post Hoc Analyses

To further understand formal education and professional training predictors' relations with transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, I conducted post hoc analyses predicting scores on each of the transformational leadership sub-dimensions

(the 4 I's) and the three sub-dimensions of leadership effectiveness (extra efforts, effectiveness, and satisfaction).

The same hierarchical regression strategy was used as above for all seven transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness sub-dimension outcomes.

Transformational leadership sub-dimensions. I began with models predicting averaged scores on each of the transformational leadership sub-dimensions. Results are reported in Table 6. To minimize the risk of a type I error across transformational leadership model sets, a Bonferroni correction was applied (.05/4=.0125). In Table 6, I have reported results at two significant levels (at $p < .05$ as well as at the corrected $p < .01$ level). However, I interpret below only those effects that are statistically significant at the Bonferroni corrected level. Additionally, while all model results are reported in Table 6, I interpret only the performance of individual predictors from the full model results for the sake of brevity.

For three transformational sub-dimensions (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation), only one predictor was statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level in the final model. In all three cases, I began by predicting scores on the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership. Model 1, including demographic and organizational control variables, did not significantly predict idealized influence scores ($R^2 < .01$, $F\ (3, 224) = .31$, $p > .05$). Adding formal education variables in Model 2 significantly improved model fit ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F\ (5, 219) = 3.40$, $p < .013$). Moreover, the highest graduate degree achieved remained significant even after the Bonferroni correction, while the country of the education provider and the type of school were significant at $p < .05$. First, leaders reporting having earned a graduate degree

scored higher on idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation than leaders reporting having not earned a graduate degree. Two predictors significantly predicted individual consideration scores, even at Bonferroni correction ($p < .01$), in the final model. First, leaders reporting having earned a graduate degree scored higher on individual consideration scores than leaders reporting having not earned a graduate degree. Second, leaders reporting a greater proportion of degrees earned from private institutions reported significantly higher individual consideration scores.

Leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions. Next, I tested models predicting averaged scores on each of the leadership effectiveness sub-dimensions. Results are shown in Table 7. I again used a Bonferroni correction (.05/3=.0167). Results in Table 7 are reported at both the .05 and .01 level, and all results of the model building process for predicting scores on the three leadership effectiveness are presented in Table 7. As above, I interpret only the performance of individual predictors from the full model results for the sake of brevity. Only one predictor significantly predicted scores on the extra efforts sub-dimension at the Bonferroni corrected level in the full model, which is that leaders who reported their most recent formal degree was obtained from a developed country scored significantly lower on extra efforts than leaders reporting their most recent formal degree was from Kosova. No predictors showed statistically significant effects on scores on either the effectiveness or the satisfaction sub-dimensions.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to extend the current literature on antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness by examining their relationships with leaders' formal education and professional training. Specifically, I conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression analyses in which I used specific elements of leaders' formal education and professional training to predict overall transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness outcomes and, subsequently, their subscale scores. In this chapter, I summarize these findings, describe the theoretical and practical implications of this study, and outline study limitations and future research directions.

Summary of Findings

Regression results showed two formal education variables to be significantly associated with leaders' self-reported transformational leadership scores. First, Kosovar industry leaders with graduate degrees scored significantly higher on transformational leadership. This finding, which includes data from respondents in many different sectors (education, banking, services, trade, communication, etc), is consistent with existing research conducted among nurses (Drake, 2010; Xirasagar, Samuels, & Curtin, 2006). Undergraduate programs and curricula tend to prepare people to perform their duties and tasks but pay less attention to the concept of leadership and developing leaders (Astin & Astin, 2000). In general, these results may show that graduate studies aided leaders in preparing students to lead and manage people, skills that undergraduate-level degree programs may not have.

More specifically, this finding in my data may be a function of specialized programs and curricula in leadership, particularly in transformational leadership that have been offered by the higher education institutions in Kosova (RIT Kosovo, n.d; Fakulteti Ekonomik Prishtine, 2020; World Learning, 2020**)** and other developed and transitional countries (Zgaga, Klemenčič, Komljenovič, Miklavič, Repac, & Jakačić, 2013). This is important because most of the Kosovar respondents of this research studied in these countries. Unlike traditional programs that had long been common in the region, these specialized leadership programs have emphasized seeing the 'big picture' (Clutterbuck & Megginson, 1999); working across boundaries (Colvin, 1998); and dealing with personal relationships (managing people, working in teams, focusing on customers) and developing a strategic vision (Thompson, 2000).

Second, leaders who reported a greater proportion of their degrees from private schools, on average, scored higher on transformational leadership than those with a higher proportion of their degrees from public schools. Previous studies (Ashley et al., 2014; Hanushek 1986, 1990; Wales et al., 2015) reported that private schools are superior in terms of quality learning and teaching than state schools. The findings of this study go beyond the current literature by suggesting that one way in which private schools tend to be superior is by preparing individuals to be leaders that are more transformational. The significant effect of the percentage of private school degrees on transformational leadership may be credited to some private schools in Kosova and the Balkan region utilizing innovative programming with regard to leadership, while public schools of this region have continued to use traditional curriculum structures and frameworks (Brownell, 2013). Therefore, this finding may not generalize well to leader populations across the

globe, but rather be specific to the education system in Kosova, the Balkans, Eastern Europe, and other countries with less progressive pedagogical practices. These findings, however, do highlight that innovative programming may be an advantage to transformational leadership development in such countries.

Post-hoc findings regarding formal education variables' effects on transformational leadership sub-dimension scores warrant further consideration here. First, post-hoc analyses revealed that leaders holding graduate degrees scored, on average, significantly higher than leaders not holding a graduate degree on all four transformational leadership sub-dimensions, with the largest mean difference being on the individual consideration sub-dimension. Second, leaders reporting a larger proportion of degrees from private schools on average scored higher on only one transformational leadership sub-dimension, which was also individual consideration. With regard to the latter, one possible explanation consistent with arguments presented by Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1982) and partially supported by others (Page, & Keith, 1981; Sassenrath, Croce, & Penaloza, 1984; Wolfle, 1987), is that private schools increase the students' verbal skills. Verbal and communication skills may be important to individual consideration because leaders with rich communication skills might be more successful at interacting at a deeper level and in a more sensitive manner with their followers, not only about the organization's mission and vision or the leader's daily duties and tasks, but also about the specific individual struggles and challenges. Such leaders, by communicating and interacting with their followers with a rich and individually customized vocabulary, can play the role of a personal coach. They use proper language and expressions, provide continuous follow-up and feedback, and build a strong one-on-one relationship with

followers and/or employees. They are more articulate and explain the vision of the organization in a more precise and engaging manner. Similarly, graduate program class sizes tend to be smaller, with course structures and evaluation criteria that place a greater emphasis on effective communication (e.g., in-class discussion and group projects versus lecture; essay exams versus multiple choice). Both of which may a particularly important impact on individual consideration.

Regression results showed no professional training variables to be significantly associated with transformational leadership scores. One possible explanation of these null results is that professional training is ineffective at influencing leaders' transformational leadership. However, such a conclusion is likely too harsh. This study is based only on the five most recent trainings that a leader has reported. This threshold was used to balance the need to develop a survey that executives could complete efficiently to optimize the survey response rate and measurement precision to optimize statistical conclusion validity. However, reporting on only the five most recent trainings may not have been enough to capture differences that potentially exist on transformational leadership scores. Literature finds that "transformational leadership can be learned, and it can and should be the subject of management training and development." (Bass, 1985; p. 27). However, becoming a transformational leader is a long process, and it is not something that can be achieved in a few trainings (Bass, 1985, 1990). The non-significant relationships I observed between professional training characteristics and transformational leadership may not be a result of the ineffectiveness of professional training, as a whole, at affecting individuals' transformational leadership, but rather a function of how professional training was measured and reported in this study.

Additionally, some respondents may have had difficulty recalling their five most recent professional trainings, which may have introduced measurement error. It should be relatively easy for leaders to accurately recall characteristics associated with multi-year, formal learning experiences (i.e., postsecondary degrees), but the same may not be true for professional training experiences. Professional training experiences are often much shorter, less intensive, and more frequent than are formal education degree experiences, and this may have affected the reliability among and accurate of leaders in recalling and reporting such experiences. This potential lack of precision in the measurement of professional training variables would undoubtedly introduce substantial measurement error into the data and attenuate any effects professional training might have on transformational leadership.

Regression results showed that neither any formal education or professional training variables were significantly related to overall leadership effectiveness or its sub-dimension scores, with the exception of leaders whose most recent degree was earned in a developed country, who scored significantly lower than leaders whose most recent degree was earned in Kosova on the sub-dimension of extra effort.

First, the overall lack of significant effects on leader effectiveness scores may be due to the fact of self-reporting bias. Humans tend to be biased when self-appraising. Some authors argue that even when respondents are doing their best to be forthright and insightful, their self-reports are subject to various sources of inaccuracy and the tendency of self-enhancement and self-presentation (Robins, & John, 1997; Sedikides, & Strube, 1995). Leaders are no exception. The descriptives of this study support this statement. Leaders' scores on leadership effectiveness were high. The average score was 3.23 (on a

0-4 Likert scale), with a small standard deviation (0.50). The high scores and a relatively low variability suggest that leaders' self-reported leadership effectiveness was biased. Note that leaders also self-reported transformational leadership scores, and this issue may have also affected relationships with transformational leadership scores too.

As noted above, the one significant difference found regarding leadership effectiveness was between those who received their most recent degree from Kosova and developed countries on the sub-dimension of extra effort. This finding was unexpected. Mendonca and Kanungo (1996) found that performance techniques and practices developed in the U.S. might not be successful in the developing country's context. Their findings shed light on the experiences and challenges that some leaders face upon their return from their studies in foreign countries. The cultural and curriculum components that the Kosovar leaders experienced during their studies in foreign countries could have affected "negatively" their confidence and, thus, their self-ratings on leadership effectiveness and, more specifically, extra effort sub-dimension ratings.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

A fundamental purpose of this study was to examine potential antecedents to transformational leadership. The set of potential antecedents examined here was characteristics of leaders' formal education and professional training. Results of this study contribute to the existing theory on transformational leadership in multiple ways.

First, this study looks at education and training characteristics that have not been previously studied with regard to transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, such as: highest degree achieved, country of formal education and training provider, "age" of formal education and training, and the type of school. Even more, this

study explored the impact of the education and training characteristics on the sub-dimensions of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. Thus, this builds on the existing literature to provide a more comprehensive analysis of potential antecedents for transformational leadership.

Second, the results of this research have shed light on the potential effects of educational curricula on transformational leadership. While I tested a more superficial dichotomization between public and private education, different trends between public and private institutions in Kosova speaks to a deeper explanation. That is, while public institutions have generally maintained traditional curricula, private institutions have adopted with greater frequency innovative and leadership-based curriculums. Thus, findings may offer deeper implications for designing program curricula to develop transformational leadership.

Third, these findings suggest that leaders can benefit, in terms of greater transformational leadership, from completing a graduate degree. In addition, findings suggest that organizations can benefit from providing current and future leaders the support to pursue graduate degrees with employment benefits such as tuition reimbursement in exchange for continuing their job at the company for a certain period of time after their graduation.

Fourth, this study reconfirms Bass's (1985) arguments that transformational leadership can be learned and developed and should be part of education programs and curriculums, preferably, at all levels of education. Furthermore, this study finds that innovative programs and curriculums are key in preparing leaders to be more transformational.

This is the first study about the transformational leadership in Kosova and in the Balkans. I expect that this is a modest, but still a significant, practical contribution to different audiences. The potential beneficiaries of these results will be scholars of the leadership field, educational policy makers, organization leaders and managers, and business associations. Findings of this study may not generalize well at the global scale, but they may be well applied to the education system in Kosova and other countries with less progressive pedagogical practices, where by applying more innovative programs and curriculums they could contribute to transformational leadership development in a more effective way in these countries and regions.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study has multiple limitations. One limitation of this study is the use of self-reported measures of transformational leadership and the leadership effectiveness outcomes. Self-reporting biases are always a concern, and respondents may have inflated responses, even if unintentionally (Mills, 2009; Robins, & John, 1997; Shahin, & Wright, 2004). Analyzing descriptive statistics of the variables of this research show that the mean of total scores for both transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness were on the higher end of ranges for each variable, indicating some possible inflation of the scorings during the leader's self-rating. Most people, especially leaders, believe that they are "better than average" (BTA) on a diverse spectrum of personal characteristics, ranging from physical attractiveness to leadership abilities, this belief causes them to bias their self-reporting scores favorably (Taylor & Armor, 1996).

Another major limitation to this research was that the results were based only on the five most recent trainings that the leaders were able to remember and report. As a

practical consideration for optimizing response rates among high-level leaders for this study, the professional training reporting section was kept brief (hence, the five most recent). However, this approach likely lacked the precision or comprehensiveness needed to differentiate respondents on either outcome. Additionally, it is possible that respondents had difficulty accurately recalling and reporting on training experiences, especially if those training happened long ago. Taken together, future research using other-reports of transformational leadership and leader effectiveness, as well as more reliability measures of professional training characteristics is needed to better determine the effects of formal education and professional training on leadership outcomes.

This study focused only on transformational leadership (four sub-dimensions) and leadership effectiveness (three sub-dimensions). This partial approach did not capture the full range of leadership and is a limitation of this study. As Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1997) advocate, to understand transformational leadership you should also know and understand well the downsides and limits of transactional leadership and passive avoidance "leadership," dimensions that this study did not cover. Therefore, future research incorporates all dimensions and sub-dimensions and check the elements of leaders' formal education and professional training as possible antecedents of the full range of leadership.

Conclusion

This study adds to the empirical evidence of the potential antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. The findings of this study have filled a theoretical gap about transformational leadership—they go beyond the current literature state. They have revealed that some elements of the leader's education, such as leaders'

graduate degree, the type of schooling (private or public), and the origin of the education provider, have a significant impact on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness and these elements could be potential antecedents of this type of leadership. In fact, results of this study have exposed that the real potential antecedents of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness are innovative leadership-centered programs and curriculums, and not, by default, the graduate degree or the type school. These results will help the decision makers at the organizational, national, and regional level in Kosova, the Balkans, and other emerging societies to design, structure, and develop adequate programs and curriculums if they intend to cultivate and foster more effective and transformational leaders.

Tables

Table 1
Descriptives of categorical variables

	N	Groups	Respondents	%
Gender	*252*	Male	191	75.80
		Female	61	24.20
Organization Size	252	50 – 250	159	63.10
		250 >	93	36.90
Leader's highest degree achieved	*252*	Grad. Degree	179	71.00
		No Grad. Degree	73	29.00
Country of origin of leader's formal education	248	Devlp. Countr.	69	27.82
		Other Countr.	57	22.98
		Kosova	122	49.20
Country of origin of profesional training provider	234	Devlp. Countr.	99	42.49
		Other Coutr.	45	19.31
		Kosova	89	38.20

Note. The dichotomos variables were coded: Gender (Female = 1, Male = 0); Organization Size (Large =1, Medium = 0); Highest degee achieved (Grad = 1, no-Grad = 0); Country of formal education and/or prof. training (Devel. Count. = 1, Kosova and other count = 0); Type of School (Public = 1, Private = 0).

Table 2

Descriptives of the continuous variables

	N	Mean	*SD*	Skewness	*SE*	Kurtosis	*SE*
Age	252	44.8	11.51	0.11	0.15	-0.84	0.31
"Age" of Formal Education	251	18.14	10.42	0.58	0.15	-0.39	0.31
Length of Prof. Training	252	164.65	212.19	2.66	0.15	8.85	0.31
"Age" of Prof.Training	241	4.32	5.34	2.25	0.16	6.97	0.31
Transformational Leadership (4Is)	252	3.14	0.44	-0.81	0.15	1.34	0.31
Leadership Effectiveness	252	3.23	0.5	-0.68	0.15	0.65	0.31

Table 3

Correlations and Cronbach Alpha

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age	1.00													
2. Gender	-0.10	1.00												
3. Organization_size	-0.04	0.01	1.00											
4. Highest (grad) degree achieved	0.13*	-0.03	-0.04	1.00										
5. Formal educ. degree at devel. count.	-0.29**	0.11	0.01	0.23**	1.00									
6. Formal educ. degree at other count.	0.18**	-0.09	0.02	0.16*	-0.33**	1.00								
7. "Age" of formal education	0.84**	-0.09	-0.04	-0.12	-0.20**	0.09	1.00							
8. Type of school (public vs private)	0.33**	-0.04	0.06	-0.06	-0.25**	0.01	0.39**	1.00						
9. Length of professional training	0.19**	-0.09	-0.05	0.10	0.04	0.09	0.13*	0.11	1.00					
10. "Age" of professional training	0.43**	-0.16*	-0.08	0.10	-0.12	-0.04	0.43**	0.18**	0.27**	1.00				
11. Prof. training at developed countries	0.12	-0.12	-0.03	0.26**	0.26**	0.17**	0.13*	-0.03	0.20**	0.14*	1.00			
12. Prof. training at other countries	-0.05	-0.01	0.27**	-0.14*	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.00	-0.19**	-0.13	-0.41**	1.00		
13. Transformational Leadership (4Is)	0.04	-0.04	-0.03	0.29**	-0.01	0.11	-0.03	-0.15*	0.03	0.04	0.14*	0.00	1.00	(0.91)
14. Leadership Effectiveness	0.05	-0.10	-0.03	0.19**	-0.07	0.07	-0.01	-0.07	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.03	0.68**	1.00 (0.91)

Note. N = 234-252, *p <.05. **p <.001

Table 3a

Correlations and Cronbach Alpha

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
1 Age	1.00																					
2 Gender	-0.10	1.00																				
3 Organization_size	-0.04	0.01	1.00																			
4 Highest (grad) degree achieved	0.13*	-0.03	-0.04	1.00																		
5 Formal educ. degree at devel. count.	-0.22**	0.11	0.01	.233**	1.00																	
6 Formal educ. degree at other count.	0.18**	-0.09	0.02	.155*	-0.33**	1.00																
7 "Age" of formal education	0.84**	-0.09	-0.04	-0.12	-0.20**	0.09	1.00															
8 Type of school (public vs private)	0.33**	-0.04	0.06	-0.06	-0.25	0.01	0.39**	1.00														
9 Length of professional training	0.19**	-0.09	-0.05	0.10	0.04	0.09	0.13*	0.11	1.00													
10 "Age" of professional training	0.43**	-0.16*	-0.08	0.10	-0.12	-0.04	0.43**	0.18**	0.27**	1.00												
11 Prof. training at developed countries	0.12	-0.12	-0.03	0.26**	0.26**	0.17**	0.13*	-0.03	0.20**	0.14*	1.00											
12 Prof. training at other countries	-0.05	-0.01	0.27**	-0.15*	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.00	-0.19**	-0.13	-.41**	1.00										
13 Transformational Leadership (4Is) Avg	0.04	-0.04	-0.02	0.29**	-0.01	0.11	-0.03	-0.15*	0.03	0.04	0.14*	0.00	1.00	(0.91)								
14 TL. Idealized_Infl	0.07	-0.05	0.01	0.21**	-0.10	0.06	0.02	-0.10	0.02	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.86**	1.00	(0.92)							
15 TL. nspirational_Motiv	-0.04	-0.08	-0.07	0.20**	-0.08	0.08	-0.09	-0.11	0.04	0.05	0.08	-0.02	0.82**	0.71**	1.00	(0.92)						
16 TL. Intelectual_Stimul	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.27**	0.03	0.08	-0.02	-0.10	0.04	0.03	0.19**	-0.07	0.82**	0.59**	0.58**	1.00	(0.92)					
17 TL. Individual_Consid	0.08	0.03	-0.02	0.28**	0.08	0.11	0.01	-0.17**	0.01	-0.01	0.14*	0.03	0.79**	0.57**	-0.45**	0.54**	1.00	(0.93)				
18 Leadership Effectiveness Avg	0.05	-0.10	-0.03	0.19**	-0.07	0.07	-0.01	-0.07	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.68**	0.63**	0.64**	0.55**	0.44**	1.00	(0.91)			
19 Extra_Effort	-0.02	-0.12	-0.06	0.11	-0.13*	0.06	-0.06	-0.06	0.02	0.05	-0.03	0.08	0.51**	0.48**	0.50**	0.42**	0.31**	0.84**	1.00	(0.92)		
20 Effectiveness	0.05	-0.08	-0.05	0.20**	0.01	0.06	-0.01	-0.06	0.00	0.08	0.11	-0.04	0.66**	0.62**	0.59**	0.54**	0.44**	0.87**	0.64**	1.00	(0.91)	
21 Satisfaction	0.09	-0.06	0.04	0.17**	-0.06	0.06	0.04	-0.06	0.00	0.06	0.10	0.02	0.57**	0.51**	0.55**	0.46**	0.38**	0.84**	0.52**	0.60**	1.00	(0.92)

Note. N = 234-252, *p <.05. **p <.001

Table 4

Hierarchical Regression Predicting Transformational Leadership

	Transformational Leadership					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	*β*	*SE*	*β*	*SE*	*β*	*SE*
Constant	3.19	0.12	3.30	0.16	3.27	0.16
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	-0.04	0.07	-0.03	0.06	-0.02	0.06
Organization_size	-0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.05	-0.03	0.06
Highest (grad) degree achieved			0.29**	0.07**	0.28**	0.07**
Formal educ. degree at devel. count.			-0.10	0.07	-0.14	0.08
Formal educ. degree at other count.			0.02	0.07	-0.02	0.08
"Age" of formal education			0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Type of school (public vs private)			-0.28**	0.10**	-0.27**	0.10**
Length of professional training					0.00	0.00
"Age" of professional training					0.00	0.01
Prof. training at developed countries					0.11	0.07
Prof. training at other countries					0.11	0.08
R^2	0.01		0.12**		0.13	
F	0.25		3.55**		2.62**	
Δ*R*	0.01		0.11**		0.01	
Δ*F*	0.25		5.52**		0.79	

Note. N = 252, *p <.05. **p <.001. The dichotomos variables were coded: Gender (Female = 1, Male = 0); Organization Size (Large =1, Medium = 0); Highest degee achieved (Grad = 1, no-Grad = 0); Country of formal education and/or prof. training (Devel. Count. = 1, Kosova and other count = 0); Type of School (Public = 1, Private = 0).

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression Predicting Leadership Effectiveness

	Leadership Effectiveness					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Constant	3.24	0.14	3.28	0.19	3.25	0.19
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	-0.18	0.08	-0.17	0.08	-0.15	0.08
Organization_size	-0.04	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.07
Highest (grad) degree achieved			0.18*	0.08*	0.17	0.09
Formal educ. degree at devel. count.			-0.14	0.08	-0.16	0.09
Formal educ. degree at other count.			-0.01	0.09	-0.02	0.09
"Age" of formal education			0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Type of school (public vs private)			-0.18	0.12	-0.17	0.12
Length of professional training					0.00	0.00
"Age" of professional training					0.01	0.01
Prof. training at developed countries					0.08	0.08
Prof. training at other countries					0.11	0.10
R^2	0.03		0.07		0.08	
F	2.06		2.07*		1.61	
ΔR	0.03		0.04		0.01	
ΔF	2.06		2.04		0.74	

Note. N = 228, *p <.05. **p <.001. The dichotomos variables were coded: Gender (Female = 1, Male = 0); Organization Size (Large =1, Medium = 0); Highest degee achieved (Grad = 1, no-Grad = 0); Country of formal education and/or prof. training (Devel. Count. = 1, Kosova and other count = 0); Type of School (Public = 1, Private = 0).

Table 6

Post Hoc Analyses - Hierarchical Regression Predicting the four Is of Transformational Leadership

	Transformational Leadership four Is																					
	Idealize Influence						Inspirational Motivation						Intelectual Stimulation						Individual Consideration					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Intercept	3.13	0.13	3.31	0.18	3.28	0.18	3.74	0.15	3.82	0.20	3.80	0.20	3.08	0.14	3.17	0.19	3.13	0.19	2.81	0.16	2.91	0.22	2.86	0.22
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	-0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.16	0.08	-0.14	0.08	-0.12	0.08	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.08	-0.02	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09
Organization_size	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.07	-0.11	0.07	-0.09	0.07	-0.10	0.07	-0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	-0.02	0.08	0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.08
Highest (grad) degree achieved			0.25**	0.08**	0.25**	0.08**			0.26**	0.09**	0.24**	0.09**			0.30**	0.09**	0.27**	0.09**			0.34**	0.10**	0.35**	0.10**
Formal educ. degree at devel. count.			-.19*	0.08*	-.22**	0.09*			-0.19*	0.09*	-.22*	0.10*			-0.53	0.09	-0.10	0.09			0.05	0.10	0.00	0.10
Formal educ. degree at other count.			-0.05	0.08	-0.08	0.09			0.00	0.09	-0.03	0.10			0.01	0.09	-0.03	0.09			0.11	0.10	0.06	0.10
"Age" of formal education			0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01			0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01			0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01			0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Type of school (public vs private)			-0.26*	0.16*	-0.26*	0.12*			-0.21	0.13	-0.20	0.13			-0.24	0.12	-0.22	0.12			-.42**	0.14**	-.42**	0.14**
Length of professional training					0.00	0.00					0.00	0.00					0.00	0.00					0.00	0.00
"Age" of professional training					0.00	0.01					0.00	0.01					0.00	0.01					-0.01	0.01
Prof. training at developed countries					0.08	0.08					0.10	0.09					0.16	0.08					0.10	0.09
Prof. training at other countries					0.15	0.09					0.10	0.10			-0.61	0.34	0.03	0.10					0.15	0.11
R^2	0.00		0.08**		0.09		0.03		0.10**		0.11		0.00		0.08**		0.09		0.01		0.13**		0.14	
F	0.31		2.24*		1.75		2.55		2.94**		2.15		0.11		2.28*		1.85		0.46		3.95**		2.85**	
ΔR	0.00		0.07**		0.01		0.03		0.06**		0.01		0.00		0.08**		0.02		0.01		0.12**		0.01	
ΔF	0.31		3.4**		0.77		2.55		3.11*		0.60		0.11		3.58*		0.99		0.46		6.01**		0.70	

Note. N = 223, *p < .05. **p < .0125 (**is a Banferoni correction, as a result of division of the p value by the four I's). The dichotomos variables were coded: Gender (Female = 1, Male = 0); Organization Size (Large =1, Medium = 0); Highest degee achieved (Grad = 1, no-Grad = 0); Country of formal education and/or prof. training (Devel. Count. = 1, Kosova and other count = 0); Type of School (Public = 1, Private = 0).

Table 7

Post Hoc Analyses - Hierarchical Regression Predicting the Leadership Effectiveness outcomes

	Leadership Effectiveness Outcomes																	
	Extra Affort						Effectiveness						Satisfaction					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)		b (SE)	
Intercept	3.41	0.16	3.52	0.22	3.49	0.22	3.22	0.15	3.11	0.21	3.09	0.21	3.08	0.17	3.20	0.23	3.16	0.24
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	-0.24**	0.09**	-.22*	0.09*	-.20*	0.09*	-0.16	0.09	-0.15	0.09	-0.14	0.09	-0.15	0.10	-0.14	0.10	-0.11	0.10
Organization_size	-0.08	0.08	-0.07	0.08	-0.11	0.08	-0.08	0.08	-0.07	0.08	-0.07	0.08	0.03	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.03	0.09
Highest (grad) degree achieved			0.15	0.10	0.16	0.10			0.18	0.09	0.14	0.10			0.22*	0.10*	0.19	0.11
Formal educ. degree at devel. count.			-.26**	0.10**	-.27**	0.18**			-0.03	0.09	-0.04	0.10			-0.14	0.10	-0.16	0.11
Formal educ. degree at other count.			-0.05	0.10	-0.06	0.11			0.00	0.09	0.00	0.10			0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.11
"Age" of formal education			0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01			-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01			0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Type of school (public vs private)			-0.15	0.14	-0.15	0.14			-0.10	0.14	-0.09	0.14			-0.30	0.15	-0.28	0.15
Length of professional training					0.00	0.00					0.00	0.00					0.00	0.00
"Age" of professional training					0.01	0.01					0.01	0.01					0.01	0.01
Prof. training at developed countries					0.03	0.10					0.08	0.09					0.12	0.10
Prof. training at other countries					0.20	0.12					0.03	0.11					0.11	0.12
R^2	0.03		0.07		0.09		0.02		0.05		0.06		0.02		0.06		0.08	
F	2.60		2.13*		1.73		1.58		1.53		1.22		1.50		1.84		1.50	
ΔR	0.03		0.04		0.02		0.02		0.03		0.01		0.02		0.04		0.01	
ΔF	2.60		1.82		0.93		1.58		1.48		0.63		1.50		2.02		0.80	

Note. N = 223, *p < .05. **p < .0125 (**is a Banferoni correction, as a result of division of the p value by the four I's). The dichotomos variables were coded: Gender (Female = 1, Male = 0); Organization Size (Large =1, Medium = 0); Highest degee achieved (Grad = 1, no-Grad = 0); Country of formal education and/or prof. training (Devel. Count. = 1, Kosova and other count = 0); Type of School (Public = 1, Private = 0).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

THE HIERACHICAL REGRESSION MODELS:

Set of models predicting transformational leadership (TL)

Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables • Age • Gender • Organization size	• Highest (grad) degree achieved • Formal educ. Degree at devel. count. • Formal educ. Degree at other. count. • "Age" of formal education • Type of school (pub vs_priv)	• Length of professional training (total hours) • "Age" of professional training • Prof. training at developed countries • Prof. training at developed countries

Set of models predicting leadership effectiveness (LEFF)

Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables • Age • Gender • Organization size	• Highest (grad) degree achieved • Formal educ. Degree at devel. count. • Formal educ. Degree at other. count. • "Age" of formal education • Type of school (pub vs_priv)	• Length of professional training (total hours) • "Age" of professional training • Prof. training at developed countries Prof. training at developed

Note: Analog to these models were calculated the sub-dimensions of both transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

APPENDIX 2

Data Collection Procedure Timeline

DRAFT SAMPLE of DATA COLLECTION PLAN							
LEAD 900							
PhD data collection plan							
Phase 1: Identification and Consent							
Phase 2: Data Collection							
Phase 3: Data Screening and Cleaning							
Phase 4: Data Analysing							
TASKS	**START**	**END**	**DAYS**	**20-Jul**	**21-Jul**	**22-Jul**	**23-Jul**
Phase 1: Identification & Consent							
Identify Organizations	20-Jul	23-Jul	3				
First Contact-Send information and as	20-Aug	20-Aug	0				
Second contact	24-Aug	29-Aug	5				
Final contact	29-Aug	3-Sep	5				
Phase 2: Data Collection							
Data Collection	20-Jul	3-Sep	45				
Phase 3: Data Screening and Cleaning							
Data Screening and Cleaning	4-Sep	10-Sep	6				
Phase 4: Data Analysing							
Data analysing	21-Aug	TBD					
TOTAL DAYS							

APPENDIX 3

A sample of the list of organizations with the contact details

	Name	Location	Sector	Contact Person	Tel	Email
2	Banka Ekonomike		Banking	Fatos Krasniqi	049/733 314	fatos.krasniqi@bekonomike.com
3	Banka Kombetare Tregtare	Prishtine	Banking	Abdurrahman Balkiz - Azra Gorica (ass)	+383 (0) 38 666 666	abalkiz@bkt.com.al agorica@bkt.com.al
4	BKT	Prishtine	Banking		038-666-666	
5	BPB Bank	Prishtine	Banking	Arton Celina	038 620 620	arton.celina@bpbbank.com
6	BQK	Prishtine	Banking	Dep Mardh Jasht	038 222 055 107	info@bqk-kos.org
7	FINCA International	Prishtine	Banking	Florin Lila	038/226-722	florin.lila@finca.org
8	NLB Prishtina	Prishtine	Banking	Albert Lumezi	038 240 230 100	albert.lumezi@nlb-kos.com
9	ProCredit Bank	Prishtine	Banking	Ilir Aliu	038 555 555 / 049 555 555	ialiu@procreditbank-kos.com
10	Raiffasein	Prishtine	Banking		038 222 222 344	info@reiffeisen.al
11	TEB	Prishtine	Banking	Orcun Ozdemir	038 230 123	info@teb-kos.com
12	Dardafon Net (Z Mobile)	Prishtine	Communication	Milot Gjikolli; Blerim Devolli	37745600 006	milot.gjikolli@zmobileonline.com
13	Dukagjini	Peje	Communication		039 433 093	info@dukagjinigroup.com
14	INFRAKOS.SHA (P)	F.Kosove	Communication	Agron Thaci	505	agthaqi@hotmail.com
15	IPKO Telecommunication L.L.C.	Prishtine	Communication	Bujar Musa, Robert Erzin; Arta Koka	38649700 004	robert.erzin@ipko.com
16	Klan	Prishtine	Communication	Baton Haxhiu	045 321 456 / 045 321 457	info@klankosova.tv
17	KohaGroup	Prishtine	Communication	Flaka Surroi	038 249 105	info@koha.net
18	KTV	Prishtine	Communication	Flaka Surroi	038 554 431	info@kohavision.tv
19	Kujtesa Net	Peje	Communication	Fiton Peja	038 400 400	fiton.peja@kujtesa.com
20	POSTA E KOSOVES.SHA (L)	Prishtinë	Communication	Xhevdet Smakiqi	38138224 065	xhevdet.smakiqi@ptkonline.com
21	RTK	Prishtine	Communication	Mentor Shala	038 230 102	post@rtklive.com
22	RTV21	Prishtine	Communication		038 55 00 88	info@rtv21.tv
23	T7	Prishtine	Communication	Berat Buzhalla	038 767 677	info@televizioni7.com
24	TELEKOMI I KOSOVES.SHA (P)	Prishtinë	Communication	Kiqina	37744801 010 38138544 456	konline.com;
25	Akademia e Kosoves per Siguri	Vushtrri	Education	Ismail Smakiqi -	028/590 - 070;	info.aksp@rks-gov.net;
26	Akademia Evolucion	Prishtine	Education		038 558 600, 44 396 030	info@akademiaevolucion.com
27	AMERICAN UNIVERSITY in	Prishtinë	Education	Bekim Kosumi	0038138 518 542 0038138	info@aukonline.org ,www.aukonline.org
28	Fakulteti I Studimeve Islame	Prishtine	Education		038 243 887	fakulteti.92@gmail.com
29	Koegji FAMA	Prishtine	Education		038 602405; 222 212; 044	kolegji.fama@gmail.com
30	Kolegji AAB	F.Kosove	Education	drejtues; Gezim Shabani -	038 600 005;	ilir.tafa@aab-edu.net; ino@aab-edu.net;
31	Kolegji AUK	Prishtine	Education	Richard S. Lukaj	038 66 00 00	info@auk.org
32	Kolegji Biznesi	Prishtine	Education	Shyqeri Kabashi	038 500 878; 044 500878; 049 500878	info@kolegjibiznesi.com
33	Kolegji Dardania	Prishtine	Education	Ismet GASHI	038 247 587; 044 636 359	info@kolegjidardania.com
34	Kolegji ESLG	Prishtine	Education	Visar Hoxha	044 302 627; 044 159 867	info@eukos.org
35	Kolegji GLOBUS	Prishtine	Education	Nazmi Mustafa	045 505190	info@kolegjiglobus.com

APPENDIX 4
Study Variables

Instruments / Variables		Nr. Variables	Variables	Scales	Items	Computed
MLQ 5X-Short Dependent variables	Transformational Leadership	1/4	Transformational Leadership 4Is TL	0 – 4 0 = not at all 4 = frequently, always	20	Average across items
		1/3	Leadership Effectiveness	0 – 4	9	Average across items
		2/7				
Demographic questionnaire Independent variables	Formal Education	1	Highest degree achieved	1 = graduate 0 = non-graduate		Ratio of degrees/sum of (0,1) across degrees
		2	Country of formal education provider	0 = Kosovar 1 = Develop.country 0 = Other countries		Ratio of degrees/sum of (0,1) across degrees
		1	The “age” of formal education	Years		Time distance of the highest degree completed from the research date (2018)
		2	Ownership of formal education provider (type of school—public or private)	1 = public 0 = private		Ratio of degrees/sum of (0,1) across degrees
	Professional training	1		Hours		Sum of hours

			Length of professional training			
		1	The “age” of professional training	Years		The mean of time distance of professional training from the date of research (2018)
		2	Country of professional training provider	0 = Kosova (ref.gr) 1 = Develop. countr. 0 = Other countries		Ratio of degrees/sum of (0,1) across degrees
Control variables		1	Age	Years		Nr. of years of each respondent as reported
		1	Gender	0 = male 1 = female		0 or 1
		1	Size of the Organization	0 = medium 1 = large		0 or 1

APPENDIX 5

A sample MLQ 5X-Short Items and Scoring

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

16.	I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	0	1	2	(3)	4
17.	I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."	0	(1)	2	3	4
18.	I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group	0	1	(2)	3	4
19.	I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group	0	1	2	(3)	4
20.	I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action	0	(1)	2	3	4
21.	I act in ways that build others' respect for me	0	1	2	3	(4)
22.	I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures	0	1	(2)	3	4
23.	I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	0	1	2	3	(4)
24.	I keep track of all mistakes	0	1	2	(3)	4
25.	I display a sense of power and confidence	0	1	2	3	(4)
26.	I articulate a compelling vision of the future	0	1	2	3	(4)
27.	I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards	0	1	(2)	3	4
28.	I avoid making decisions	0	(1)	2	3	4
29.	I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others	0	1	2	(3)	4
30.	I get others to look at problems from many different angles	0	(1)	2	3	4
31.	I help others to develop their strengths	0	1	(2)	3	4
32.	I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	0	1	2	(3)	4
33.	I delay responding to urgent questions	(0)	1	2	3	4
34.	I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission	0	1	2	(3)	4
35.	I express satisfaction when others meet expectations	0	1	2	(3)	4
36.	I express confidence that goals will be achieved	0	1	2	3	(4)
37.	I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs	0	1	2	3	(4)
38.	I use methods of leadership that are satisfying	0	1	2	(3)	4
39.	I get others to do more than they expected to do	0	1	2	(3)	4
40.	I am effective in representing others to higher authority	0	1	2	3	(4)
41.	I work with others in a satisfactory way	0	1	2	(3)	4
42.	I heighten others' desire to succeed	0	1	2	(3)	4
43.	I am effective in meeting organizational requirements	0	1	2	3	(4)
44.	I increase others' willingness to try harder	0	1	(2)	3	4
45.	I lead a group that is effective	0	1	2	(3)	4

Scoring the MLQ

Directions: Match the rating number (0-4) with the appropriate question. Then, add the column for each question and divide by the number of items to calculate an average for each subscale.

Behaviors:

Idealized Influence (attributed)

	Your score
#10	4
#18	4
#21	4
#25	3
	3.25

Idealized Influence (behavior)

	Your score
#6	3
#14	4
#23	4
#34	3
	3.5

Inspirational Motivation

	Your score
#9	4
#13	4
#26	4
#36	4
	3.75

Intellectual Stimulation

	Your score
#2	3
#8	3
#30	1
#32	3
	2.5

Individualized Consideration

	Your score
#15	2
#19	2
#29	2
#31	3
	2.5

Contingent Reward

	Your score
#1	3
#11	3
#16	3
#35	3
	3

Management by exception-Active

	Your score
#4	2
#22	2
#24	2
#27	3
	2.25

Management by exception-Passive

	Your score
#3	2
#12	1
#17	1
#20	1
	1.25

Laissez-Faire Leadership

	Your score
#5	2
#7	0
#28	1
#33	0
	.75

Outcomes:

Extra Effort

	Your score
#39	2
#42	2
#44	2
	2.166

Effectiveness

	Your score
#37	4
#40	4
#43	4
#45	3
	3.75

Satisfaction

	Your score
#38	3
#41	3
	3

APPENDIX 6

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Madam/Sir

Thank you in advance for participating in this survey! Please answer each questions as accurately as possible.

1. ***The name of the organization/institution you are working for:***

   _____

2. ***What is your job/position/title in the organization?***

   _____

3. ***Are you the Chief Executive Officer or equivalent of the organization? Yes ____; No ____***

a. ***If not, please specify your job/position/title in the organization?***

   _____

   _____

4. ***What sector your company/organization belongs to? (Please circle one of them):***

   a. Education b. Production c. Banking d. Trade e. Services f. Communication

5. ***What is your age (_____ years)***

6. ***What is your gender? F _____; M _____.***

7. ***What level/degree of formal education have you completed/earned?***

   If you have more than one major/degree please write them.

Education level/Degree	High School (HE)	Two Years College Professional Diploma (UPD)	BA	Executive Master degree (EM)	Master (MA)	PhD/ Doctoral
What field/major/concentration?						
When (years, from – to)? Month & year of Degree	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year	_____; _____ _____; _____ Month Year
Public (P) or Private (Pv)?						
Where (Country & City)?						

Country of origin of the education provider?						

8. Do you have any professional training? Yes ___; No ___.

(If yes, please write the five most important once?).

Training field	Topic/subject/themes That contributed the most to your career. (list five of them)	When (year)?	Where (country)?	How long (training)? (Hours)
Leadership: This includes developing mission/vision /core values, team building, trust/communication, motivation, etc.)	1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____	1._____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____ 5._____	1._____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____ 5._____	1._____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____ 5._____

Management: This includes planning, finance, audit, sales, marketing, HR, accounting, etc.	1. _____ _____ 2. _____ _____ 3._____ _____ 4._____ _____ 5. _____ _____	1._____ _____ 2._____ _____ 3._____ _____ 4._____ _____ 5._____ _____	1._____ _____ 2._____ _____ 3._____ _____ 4._____ _____ 5._____ _____	1._____ _____ 2._____ _____ 3._____ _____ 4._____ _____ 5._____ _____

Note: Please use the attached blank sheet if you need more space?

APPENDIX 7

Examples of Computation of Scorings of Formal Education and Professional Training Responses

FORMAL EDUCATION

EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE LEADERS' FORMAL EDUCATION

Coding:	Country of education provider:								
	1- USA, UK, Canada, Germany, Austria, France, Finland, Japan, Ireland, Sweden, Danmark, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlandz, Switzerland, Australia								
	0-All athers								
	Ownership of education provider								
	1- Public								
	0 - Private								
							2018		
Participant	Formal Degree	Education Institution	Country of education Provide	Number of degrees	Degrees care	Year	How many year ago	Public/Private	Quality of Education (1-7)
	High School	Prishtina High School	Kosova	1	0	1991	27	1	2
	University Professional Diploma	Peja Commerce School	Kosova	1	0	1994	24	1	2
	Bachelor's degree	American University of Kosov	USA	1	1	2000	18	1	4
	Executive Master	Sheffild University Thessaloniki	UK	1	1	2002	16	1	5
	Master's degree	Viena University	Austria	1	1	2005	13	1	4
	Ph.D.	Viena University	Austria	1	1	2016	2	1	5
	Total			6	3		100	6	22
	Mean						16.67		3.67
	SD						5.12		1.50
Participant	Formal Degree	Education Institution	Origin Country of Provider	Number of degrees	Degrees care	Year	How many year ago	Public/Private	Quality of Education (1-7)
	High School	Tirana High School	Albania	1	0	1989	29	1	5
	University Professional Diploma	Tirana Agra School	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Bachelor's degree	Faculty of Economics Rome	Italy	1	1	1993	25	1	5
	Executive Master	/	/	/	0	/	/	/	/
	Master's degree	New York University	Check Republic	1	0	2009	9	0	4
	Ph.D.	School of Business Milano	Italy	1	1	2015	3	1	5
	Total			4	2		66	3	19
	Mean						16.5		4.75
	SD						2.83		0.00
Participant	Formal Degree	Education Institution	Origin Country of Provider	Number of degrees	Degrees care	Year	How many year ago	Public/Private	Quality of Education (1-7)
	High School	Peja High School	Slovenia	1	0	1980	38	1	6
	University Professional Diploma	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Bachelor's degree	University of Zagreb	Croatia	1	0	1985	33	1	5
	Executive Master	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Master's degree	University of Zagreb	Croatia	1	0	1995	23	1	6
	Ph.D.	Ljubjana University	Slovenia	1	0	2006	12	1	5
	Total			4	0		106	4	22
	Mean						26.50		5.5
	SD						3.54		0.71

PROFESIONAL TRAINING

Coding:	1= USA, UK, Canada, Germany, Austria, France, Finland, Japan, Ireland, Sweden, Danmark, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Switzerland, Australia						
	0 = All others						
LEADERSHIP	**Direction: Describe up to five of the most relevant/important professional training experiences you've had in the field of LEADERSHIP**						
	Leadership -- this includes developing mission/vision/core values, team building,	**When (year)?**	**ow long ago (20**	**professionals/educators from (cou**	**Coding**	**h of training (approximate total h**	**Brief description of training**
Participant: A	1	2018	0	USA	1	20	Core Values
	2	2016	2	Kosova	0	50	Mission & Vision
	3	2014	4	Albania	0	30	Team Cohesion
	4	2011	7	Germany	1	10	Team Building
	5	2010	8	Slovenia	0	20	Strategic Planing
	Total		21		2	130	
	Mean		7			26	
	Standard Deviation		7.48			15.17	
Participant: B	1	2018	0	Kosova	0	50	Trust
	2	2010	8	Finland	1	20	Mission & Vision
	3	2005	13	Croatia	0	10	Team Cohesion
	4	1998	20	Spain	1	100	Team Building
	5	1999	19	Sweden	1	100	Communication
	Total		60		3	280	
	Mean		12			56	
	Standard Deviation		8.28			42.78	
Participant: C	1	2017	1	Albaina	0	100	Strategic Planing
	2	2001	17	Turkey	0	50	Trust
	3	2000	18	Bulgaria	0	50	Decision Making
	4	1999	19	Croatia	0	45	Team Building
	5	1998	20	Poland	0	30	Team bonding
	Total		75		0	275	
	Mean		15			55	
	Standard Deviation		7.91			26.46	

MANAGEMENT	Direction: Describe up to five of the most relevant/important professional training experiences you've had in field of MANAGEMENT						
	Management - this includes Planning, finance, Audit, Sales, Marketing, HR, Accounting , etc.	When (year)?	How long ago (2018-d	by professionals/educators from (country)?		Length of training (approximate total hour:	Brief description of training
Participant: A	1	2018	0	USA	1	20	Planning
	2	2016	2	Kosova	0	50	Finance
	3	2014	4	Albania	0	30	Audit
	4	2011	7	Germany	1	10	Sales
	5	2010	8	Slovenia	0	20	Marketing
	Total		21		2	130	
	Mean		7			26	
	SD		7.48			15.17	
Participant: B	1	2018	0	Macedonia	0	50	HR
	2	2010	8	Finland	1	20	Sales
	3	2005	13	Croatia	0	10	Sales
	4	1998	20	Austria	1	100	Finance
	5	1999	19	Japan	1	100	Accounting
	Total		60		3	280	
	Mean		12			56	
	SD		8.28			42.78	
Participant: C	1	2017	1	Hungary	0	100	Marketing
	2	2001	17	Turkey	0	50	Sales
	3	2000	18	Bulgaria	0	50	HR
	4	1999	19	Croatia	0	45	Marketing
	5	1998	20	Slovenia	0	30	Planning
	Total		75		0	275	
	Mean		15			55	
	SD		7.91			26.46	

REFERENCES

Anderson, T. (1992). *Transforming Leadership: New Skills for an Extraordinary Future*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press, Inc.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14,* 261–295.

Ashley, D.L., Mcloughlin, C., Aslam, M., Engel, J., Wales, J., Rawal, S., Betley, R., Kingnon, G., Nicolai, S., & Rose, P.(2014). *The role and impact of private schools in developing countries: a rigorous review of the evidence. Education Rigorous Literature Review.* London: Department for International Development. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system /uploads/attachment_data/file/439702/private-schools-full-report.pdf

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change.* Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J. (1994). The "natural": Some antecedents to transformational leadership. *International Journal of Public Administration, 17*, 1559-1581.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: building the vital forces in organizations.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 199-218.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and sampler set*. (3rd ed.) Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (Vol. 2). Boston: JAI.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 72,* 441-462.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D., & Einstein, W. O. (1988). Transformational Leadership in a Management Game Simulation: Impacting the bottom line. *Group and Organization Management*, *13*, 59-80.

Bahrick, H. P. (1979). Maintenance of knowledge: Questions about memory we forgot to ask. *Journal of Experiment Psychology, 108,* 296-308.

Baketa, N. (2013). *European Integration of Higher Education and Research in the Western Balkans. Overview of Higher Education and Research Systems in the Western Balkans. Country report: Kosovo.* Retrieved from http://www.herdata.org/public/HE_and_ Research in Kosovo _FINAL.pdf

Barbuto, J. E. (1997). Taking the charisma out of transformational leadership. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12,* 689–697.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, K.E. (1996). Effects of Transformational Leadership Training on Attitudinal and Financial Outcomes: A Field Experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 827-832.

Bartlett, J., Kotrlik, J., & Higgins, Ch. (2001). Organizational research; determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 19*, 43-50.

Basic Education Coalition. 2004. Iraq: Education in post-conflict. Washington, DC: BEC. Available at: www.basiced.org/images/ iraq.pdf

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1988). The Inspirational Processes of Leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, *7*, 21-31.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 19-31.

Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 463–478.

Bass, B. M. (1995). Transformational leadership: Looking at other possible antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 4,* 293-297.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*, 130-139.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership. *Journal European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8,* 9-32.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing Transformational Leadership: 1992 and Beyond. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 43-50.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In Chemers, M. M., & Ayman, R. (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions,* 49–80. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire: Rater form (5X-Short)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development - Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J., & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and content. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 53−73.

Bono, J.E., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 901–910.

Brownell (2013). *A Testing Time for Private Schools in Eastern Europe.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/16/world/europe/a-testing-time-for-private-schools-in-eastern-europe.html

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations.* Newbury Park, Sage.

Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 232-245.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen. J.S. (1993). Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 468-78.

Cacioppe, R. (2000). Creating spirit at work: re-visioning organization development and leadership – Part I, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*, *48-54.*

Carless, S.A. (1998). Discriminant validity of transformational leadership as measured by MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71,* 353-368.

Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1995). Institutionalization of organizational ethics through transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 14,* 829-838.

Casimir, G., & Waldman, D. (2006). Trust and the relationship between leadership and follower performance: Opening the black box in Australia and China, *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies, 12*, 68-84.

Clutterbuck, D., & Megginson, D. (1999). Mentoring Executives and Directors. Butterworth-Heinemann. Linacre House, Jordan Hill, Oxford OX2 8DP.

Colvin, G. (1998). Revenge of the Nerds. *Fortune*, *137,* 223-224.

Collin, A. (1997). Learning and Development, in I. Beardwell & L. Holden (eds.), *Human Resource Management: a contemporary perspective.* London: Pitman.

Coleman, J., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). Cognitive outcomes in public and private schools. *Sociology of Education, 55*, 65–76.

Connaughton, S., Lawrence, F., & Ruben, B. (2003). Leadership development as a systematic and multidisciplinary enterprise. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*, 46-51.

Creswell, W.J. (2014). *Research Design.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cuckovic, B. (2006). *The role of leadership and governance in changing institutional behavior* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org /9402/a7e8c5 bccbc38bd0c5cc bb68c2cd 96581f4c.pdf?ga=2.208287890. 1495719077.1587842800-1924590230.15738 39003

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Dionne, S., Yammarino, F., Atwater, L., & Spangler, W. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *17,* 177-193.

Doh, J. P. (2013). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educator's academy *of management learning & education, 2,* 54-67.

Drake, D. (2010). *The relationship of transformational leadership and level of education among nurse administrators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/ docview/748178212?pq-origsite=gscholar

Dubrin, A.J. (2001). Career-related correlates of self-discipline. *Psychological Report, 89,* 107-110.

Dumi, A,, Dede, G., & S'eche, S. (2013). Leadership is a crucial factor in Albanian public administration. The Empirical analyze in Albanian public policy and human resources management. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 3*, 217-225.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 445*, 735-744.

Elmuti, D., Adebe, M., & Nicolosi, M. (2005). An overview of strategic alliances between universities and corporations. *The Journal of Work Place Learning, 17,* 115-129.

Elmuti, D., Minnis, W., & Abebe, M. (2005). Does education have a role in developing leadership skills? *Management Decision*, *43,* 1018-1031.

Fakulteti Ekonomik Prishtine. (2020). *Trajnimi per menaxhim projektesh.* Retrieved from https://ekonomiku.uni-pr.edu/Lajmet/thirje-e-hapur--trajnim-per-menaxhim-projektesh-me.aspx

Farr, M. J. (1987). *The long-term retention of knowledge and skills: A cognitive and instructional approach*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Garrow, V., Devine, M., Hirsh, W., & Holbeche, L. (2000). *Strategic alliances: Getting the people bit right.* Horsham. Roffey Park Institute.

Garcia-Rivera, R., B., Mendoza-Martinez, A., & Ramirez-Baron, C.M. (2013). The impact of transformational leadership in burnout of nurses and doctors in a public hospital of Mexico. *American Journal of Health Sciences. 4,* 1-12.

Geiger, R. L. (1986). *Private sectors in higher education: Structure, function, and change in eight countries.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

García-Morales, V., Jiménez-Barrionuevo, M., & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, L. (2012). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. *Journal of Business Research, 65*, 1040-1050.

Goddard, J. T. (2003). *Punoj për të ardhmen (To work with an eye to the future): Towards the preparation and professional development of educational leaders in post-conflict Kosovo*. Roundtable presentation at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, November 6–9, Portland, OR.

Goddard, J. T. (2005). *Empire and education: The challenge of teaching and learning in a time of war.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, May 28–31, London, Ontario.

Goddard, J. T. (2006). *The role of educational leaders in professional development.* Keynote address at the International Conference on Professional Development in Education, April 9–12, Bečići, Montenegro.

Goddard, T. (2007). The Professional Development Needs of Educational Leaders in Post-Conflict Kosovo. *The Educational Forum, 71,* 200-2010.

Groves, R., & Fowler, F. (2007). *Survey Methodology.* Hoboken, New Jersey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hanushek, E. A. (1986). The economics of schooling: Production and efficiency in the public schools. *Journal of Economic Literature, 25,* 1141-1177.

Hanushek, E. A. (1990). *Issues in the public-private split of educational provision.* Unpublished manuscript. University of Rochester, New York.

Hanushek, E. A., & Wosmann, L. (2007). *The Role of Education Quality in Economic Growth.* Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/ 7154/ %20wps4122.%20pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Hassan, A. R., Fuwad, A. B., & Rauf, I. A. (2010). Pre-training motivation and the effectiveness of transformational leadership training: An experiment. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 9*, 1-8.

Higbee, K. L. (1977). *Your memory: How it works and how to improve it*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hisar, F., & Karadag, A. (2010). Determining the professional behavior of nurse executives. *International Journal of Nursing Practice, 16,* 335-341.

Hoffman, A. (2017). *Hybrid organization.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hoffman, J.B., Bynum, H. B., Piccolo, F.R., & Sutton, W.A. (2011). Person-organization value congruence: how transformational leaders influence work group effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal, 54,* 779-796.

Hung, T.H. (2015). Is leadership innate or learned? Implications for leadership development. *Hue University Journal of Science, 113,* 65-72.

Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 751-765.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755-768.

Jung, D.D., Chow, W.Ch., & Wu, A. (2003). The Role of Transformational Leadership in

Enhancing Organizational Innovation: Hypotheses and Some Preliminary Findings. *The Leadership Quarterly 14,* 525-544.

Kacaniku, I. (2014). *Brief situation analysis of the education sector in Kosovo.* Retrieved from http://kfos.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/brief-situation-analysis-.pdf

Kasunic, M. (2005). *Designing an Effective Survey,* Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburg.

Kelmendi, F. (2017). *Testing, testing: How Kosovo fared in its first international assessment of students.* Retrieved from https://blogs.worldbank.org/education/testing-testing-how-kosovo-fared-its-first-international-assessment-students

Kelloway, E.K., Barling, J., & Helleur, J. (2000). Enhancing transformational leadership: the roles of training and feedback. *The Leadership and Organizational Development, 2,* 145-159.

Kelloway, E.K., & Barling, J. (2000). What we have learned about developing transformational leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 2,* 355-362.

Kelly, A. L., Wicker, L. T., & Gerkin, D.R. (2014). The Relationship of Training and Education to Leadership Practices in Frontline Nurse Leaders. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, *44,* 158-163.

Khan, M., & Afzal, H. (2011). High level of education builds up strong relationship between organizational culture and organization performance in Pakistan, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*, 1387-1400.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 36-51.

Koontz, H., & Donnell, C. (1993). *Introduction to management.* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Kosovo Education and Employment Network – "KEEN" (2019). *Teacher Professional Development in Kosovo.* Retrieved from http://www.keenks.net/site/assets/files/1467/zhvillimi_profesional_i_mesimdhenesve_ne_kosove_eng.pdf

Lacerenza, N. Ch., Reyes, L. D., Marlow, L. Sh., Joseph, L. D., & Salas, E. (2017). Leadership Training Design, Delivery, and Implementation: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 12,* 1686-1718.

Likaj, R. (2016). *Continuing professional development for vocational teachers and trainers in Kosovo.* Retrieved from https://www.etf.europa.eu/sites/default/files/m/484071ED B588DA0CC1257FCD005FB852_CPD%20Kosovo.pdf

Lopez, C. (2013). *Personality and Leadership in Counselor Educators: The Big Five Factors, Transformational Leadership, and Transactional Leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). The Patton College of Education of Ohio University. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=ohiou1375727746&disposition=inline

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *1*, 130-149.

Mason, C. Griffin, M., & Parker, Sh. (2014). Transformational leadership development: Connecting psychological and behavioral change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 35,* 174-194.

Menguc, B., Auh, S., & Shih, E. (2007). Transformational leadership and market orientation: Implications for the implementation of competitive strategies and business unit performance. *Journal of Business Research, 60,* 314-321.

Mendonca, M., & Kanungo, R.N. (1996). Impact of culture on performance management in developing countries, *International Journal of Manpower*, *17*, 65-75.

Mills, B. L. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 3*, 22-38.

Mind Garden (2019). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Retrieved from https://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire

Mora, J. G. (2001). Governance and management in the new university. Tertiary Education and Management, 7(2), 95–110.

Ng, W.H.Th., & Feldman, C. D. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? *Personnel Psychology, 62,* 89–134.

OECD. (2012). *Public and Private Schools: How Management and Funding Relate to their Socio-economic Profile?* OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pisa/50110750.pdf

OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 results.* Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/pisa/publicaations/pisa-2018-results.htm

Parry, K.W., & Sinha, P. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International, 8,* 165-183.

Page, E.B., & Keith, T.Y. (1981). Effects of U.S. private schools A technical analysis of two recent claims. *Educational Researcher, 10,* 7-17.

Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*, 259-298.

RIT Kosovo (n.d). Master of Science Degree – Strategic Foresight and Innovation. Retrieved from https://kosovo.rit.edu/programs/master-of-science-degree.html

Robins, R. W., & John, O. P. (1997). Effects of visual perspective and narcissism on self-perception: Is seeing believing? Psychological Science, *8,* 37-42.

Robins, R. W., & Beer, J. S. (2001). Positive illusions about the self: Short-term benefits and long-term costs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *80*, 340–352.

Rubin, S. R., Munz C. D, & Bommer, H. W. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *48*, 845-858.

Sassenrath, J., Croce, M., & Penaloza, M. (1984). Private and Public School Students: Longitudinal Achievement Differences? *American Educational Research Journal, 21*, 557-563. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1162915

Schwartz, J., Bersin, J., & Pelster, B. (2014). Human Capital Trends 2014 Survey. Retrieved from http://dupress.com/articles/human-capitaltrends-2014-survey-top-10-findings/

Semb, G. B., & Ellis, J. A. (1994). Knowledge taught in school: What is remembered? Review of *Educational Research, 64*, 253-286.

Semb, G. B., Ellis, J. A., & Montague, W. E. (1990). Long-term memory for knowledge taught in school. (Tech. Rep. No. NPRDC TR-91-1). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Sedikides, C., & Strube, M. J. (1995). The multiply motivated self. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *21*, 1330-1335.

Shahin, A. I., & Wright, P. L. (2004). Leadership in the context of culture: An Egyptian perspective. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25,* 499-511.

Sosik, J. J. (2006). *Leading with character: Stories of valor and virtue and the principles they teach.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Sosik, J. J., Potosky, D., & Jung, D. I. (2002). Adaptive Self-regulation: Meeting Others' Expectations of Leadership and Performance. *Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 211-232.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, *103*, 193–210.

Thomas, H., & Feldman, D. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? *Personnel Psychology, 62,* 89–134.

Thompson, M. (2000). *The Competitiveness Challenge: The bottom line benefits of Strategic Human Resource Management.* London: The UK Aerospace People Management Audit 2000. SBAC (Society of British Aerospace Companies)/DTI.

The United Nations. (2018). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2018.* Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/publication/ WESP2018_Full_Web-1.pdf

Titte, S., Bing, H., Joseph, K., & Bruce, K. (2015). Post hoc analyses: After the facts. *Transplantation,* 99, 17-20.

USAID. (2019). *Transformation Leadership Program Scholarships and Partnerships*. Retrieved from: https://www.usaid.gov/kosovo/fact-sheets/transformational-leadership-program-scholarships-and-partnerships

Vlasceanu, L., & Purser, L. (2002) *Regional University Network on Governance and Management of Higher Education in South East Europe: from Words to Action*, Bucharest: UNESCO – CEPES Papers on Higher Education.

Wales, J., Aslam, M., Hine, S., Tawal, S., & Wild, L. (2015). *The role and impact of philanthropic and religious schools in developing countries: a rigorous review of the evidence. Education Rigorous Literature Review.* London: Department for International Development. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/ government /uploads/system/uploads/attachment

Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9,* 55–84.

Wolfle, L. (1987). Enduring Cognitive Effects of Public and Private Schools. *Educational Researcher, 16*, 5-11.

World Learning. (2020). Transformation Leadership Program Scholarships and Partnerships. Retrieved from: https://www.worldlearning.org/program/kosovo-transformational-leadership-program-scholarships-partnerships/

Xirasagar, S., Samuels, M.E., & Curtin, T.F. (2006). Management training of physician executives, their leadership style, and care management performance: An empirical study. *The American Journal of Managed Care, 12*, 101-108.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management, 15,* 251-289.

Yukl, G. (1999a). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, *10*, 285-305.

Yukl, G. (1999b). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational, 8,* 33-48.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education

Zgaga, P., Klemenčič, M., Komljenovič, J., Miklavič, K., Repac, I., & Jakačić, V. (2013). *Higher education in the Western Balkans: reforms, developments, trends. Center for Education Policy Studies.* Ljubljana. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/17169137.pdf