The Journal of Arts Science and Technology

Comparative Analysis of Personal Life Choices and Leadership Work Styles of Unit Leaders in Business Teacher Education in Nigeria in use of Social Media

JAMES L. MORRRISON[1], GANIYU TITITLAYO OLADUNJOYE[2], F. OYEDELE[2], FEMI ADEMILUYI[2], JOSHUA S. MAMMAN[2], ISRAEL S. OGUNDELE[2]

[1]University of Delaware; [2]Kwara State University

Abstract

Based on a survey submitted to business teacher educators in 5 post-secondary educational institutions in Nigeria, unit leaders are perceived as having a capacity to lead their colleagues in their innovative efforts to enhance current instructional delivery systems. In this regard, personal lifestyle choices of unit leaders in terms of using social media and technology are generally perceived as being assimilated into their work styles and priorities for their programs. Business teacher educators perceive their unit leaders as being receptive to their ideas, willing to work with them on innovative endeavors, and exhibiting a participatory leadership work style. A discrepancy between unit leaders' personal preferences towards aspects of social media and current awareness of these preferences by business teacher educators themselves may be an inhibiting factor in advancing social media use in the classroom. This discrepancy may be evident in other teacher training programs throughout the continent of Africa, resulting in social media currently being marginally implemented. Addressing this discrepancy may result in accelerating the integration of social media use in the classroom.

Keywords: educational leadership, business teacher education, instructional innovation, Social media in education

Corresponding author: James L. Morrison: jlm@udel.edu

Introduction

In business teacher education in Nigeria, the leadership exhibited by unit leaders is important to the success of inspiring faculty to achieve to their fullest potential. It is viewed as extremely noteworthy for the improvement of individual and institutional performance. One of the priorities in Nigeria is the upgrading of teacher preparatory programs by introducing new strategies to attract undergraduate students with great potential to contribute to society as informed and skilled teachers in the classroom upon graduation, but also retaining inspiring teacher educators as role models. Our intention here is to focus on the capacity of current unit leaders or chairpersons of business teacher preparatory programs to lead their faculty in introducing innovative strategies using social media to enhance the effectiveness of their teaching.

Conceptual Framework for Study

A few scholars conceptualize leadership as a characteristic or conduct, while other researchers consider it from the relational perspective (Northouse, 2010). In this regard, some see leadership as a process by which a leader influences a team of colleagues to attain a collective objective (Davies, Hides & Casey, 2001). From this perspective, leadership is depicted as a person enlisting the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. Thus, leadership is the act of getting another person to accomplish something you need to get done but cannot be accomplished alone.

The present study considers leadership to be a process through which a Head of Department (HOD) influences faculty subordinates to accomplish common objectives. The thinking behind leadership as a process is that to be effective, there needs to be connections and contacts between the Head of Department and a variety of subordinates in their department. In this study, for example, both the Head of Department and business teacher educators are both part of a process whereby both are considered integral parts of leadership (Hollander, 1992)

Therefore, this approach promotes leadership as an interactive process in which the leader is not confined to one person who is nominated or appointed by others but rather a role that may be assumed by each and every member of the team at some point (Simkins, 2005). The reliance upon influence implies the way leaders affect their subordinates/colleagues. Leadership occurs in teams, which means that

the group is the setting in which actual leadership takes place. It is the team format that enables leadership to actually evolve (Dimmock, & Walker, 2005). The inclusion of team collaboration also has the potential to decrease the chance of unethical leadership behaviour towards subordinates (Northouse, 2010). It is also argued by Northouse that a joint effort by both leaders and subordinates is likely to result in the achievement of a common goal. Different theorists and researchers broadly link leadership to a clearly delineated vision, organizational values, institutional culture and change. (Gunter, 2001).

The field of "educational leadership research involves analyzing the concept of leadership itself, the types and styles of leadership and their relevance to educational settings" (Briggs and Coleman, 2007, pg 27). Leadership is seen in two dimensions per Ribbins and Gunter (2002); namely, (1) research related to process – "what individual leaders do . . . why they do it . . . and with what outcomes;" and (2) the research related to leadership development – "who leaders are, why and by whom they are shaped into what they are, and how they become leaders." The present study is situated within the first category, and it addresses what individual leaders do in terms of the process they follow.

Literature Review

Early researchers within the academic field of leadership studies that emerged in the 1980s identified two discrete leadership workstyles at the end of a single spectrum labeled transactional and transformational leadership. The inference has been that individuals with leadership responsibility generally adopt a leadership style between these two domains, thus reflecting a hybrid version by blending elements of each into a preferred style.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership Theoretical Paradigms

Downton (1973) initially characterized two leadership workstyles that are transactional or transformational in his research on political leadership. Transactional leadership refers to an individual who concentrates on getting tasks done by using positional power and influence (Northouse, 2010). This theory is based upon the path-goal theoretical framework whereby incentives are relied upon for getting workers to perform efficiently (Grosso, 2008). The transactional leader revolves

around an exchange relationship, in which subordinates' obedience is exchanged for anticipated financial rewards (Nguni, Sleegers & Denessen, 2006). In contrast, according to Burns (2007), the transformational leader inspires subordinates towards a shared vision by encouraging teamwork and self-actualization on part of followers. It is perceived as a process that increases the moral and inspiration levels among the leader and subordinates and involves feelings, principles, moralities, norms and greater purpose (Northouse, 2010). Transformational leadership is depicted by Burns (1978) as going beyond the value-for-exchange model that relies on extrinsic forms of motivation, such as job perks, to get people to perform. Based on this fundamental research, it was concluded that transformational and transactional leadership are at opposite ends of a leadership continuum.

Some researchers argued that effective leadership requires more than just a transactional activity to enhance followers' satisfaction within their jobs (House, 1971; Burns, 2007). In this regard, Burns (2007) argues that the outcomes from a transformational workstyle generally target ethical results; whereas, Bass and Avolio (2004) contended that a transactional workstyle could result in a positive, as well as a destructive effort (Grosso, 2008). The transformational leader encourages subordinates to perform better in comparison to their expectations (or what they even thought possible) and inspires them to sacrifice their personal interests for the good of the group or institution. Furthermore, transformational leadership aims to develop subordinates for the intention of change and improved performance, while at the same time attending to the goals of the leader, team and its members, and the institution. (Bass & Avolio, 2004). On the other hand, the transactional leader desires to sustain the status quo since order and the stability of the organization are priorities (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Being in control is the central characteristic of the workstyle of a transactional leader, with the leader and follower having two distinct and clearly defined different roles.

In terms of workstyle, in transformational leadership, the leader engages with followers to develop them into leaders, and this is reflective of a bottoms-up approach (whereby followers influence their leader) (Bass & Avolio, 2004). According to Bass and Riggio (2006) and Gill (2006), the following four dimensions of transformational leadership are:

1. *Charismatic Leadership or Idealized Influence*: Transformational leaders become role models for their subordinates (Nguni, Sleegers & Denessen, 2006). In terms of workstyle, these leaders give importance to subordinates' needs rather than their own, develop and practice higher ethical and moral

principles, and do not use authority for their benefit (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Such charismatic or idealized leaders influence others by earning respect by having confidence in their subordinates to achieve the communicated goals, which increases the possibility of subordinates internalizing and realizing these goals (Levine, 2000).

2. *Inspirational Motivation*: In terms of workstyle, these leaders evoke the spirit of the group, communicate clear expectations which subordinates are ready to fulfill and exhibit dedication to a collective vision (Bass and Riggio, 2006). The leader is perceived as being well-informed, enlightened and responsive to arising issues and puts subordinates in more control by supporting them to meet mutually agreed upon goals (Levine, 2000). Bass (1990) maintains that an inspirational leader might not always be charismatic; however, the workstyle gives considerable attention to the personal development of followers (Levine, 2000).
3. *Intellectual Stimulation*: The workstyle of the leader attempts to enhance innovation and creativity among followers through encouraging questioning and critical reflection (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Therefore, subordinates are encouraged to challenge their own viewpoint and morals along with the leader's and the organization's philosophy (Northouse, 2010). Moreover, a participative approach to finding the solution is adopted. Creative ideas from the followers are welcomed, even if these ideas oppose the leader's views (Bass and Avolio, 1994). It is appreciated if subordinates adopt different approaches and resolve problems in their own way (Northouse, 2010).
4. *Individualized Consideration*: The workstyle of the leader here focuses upon subordinates' success and development to their highest level by means of performing the role of a mentor (Avolio, 1999). Here the leader acknowledges the personal differences of followers in terms of current competencies and aspirations. The leader creates an encouraging environment for the growth and development of followers through maintaining two-way communication, tailoring their contact with subordinates, listening to others carefully, and delegating tasks. (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

Alternate Leadership Workstyles

The present study prefers the classification of Northouse's (2010), which is more widely used, as it aligns better with the focus and conceptual framework of the

study. In establishing the framework for this study, characteristics attributed to the following models for workstyles were incorporated into the data gathering instrument used in the study:

1. *Autocratic Work Style:* Richard Daft (2015) describes autocratic leadership as a process to centralize authority for generating personal power by controlling the actions and behaviors of those in an organization. This work style is reflective of transactional leadership whereby coercion is an integral part of getting others to perform.
2. *Contingent Reward/Pacesetter*: In this model there is an exchange relationship between the leader and their subordinates where particular compensation is provided to the subordinates for their loyalty (Northouse, 2010). This workstyle is also attributed to a transactional workstyle of a leader. In this regard, the transactional leader becomes a pacesetter by contracting with subordinates in which specific targets and the incentives for reaching these targets are identified. (Nguni, Sleegers & Denessen, 2006).
3. *Participative Leadership.* A leader who adopts this form relies on work teams for accomplishing organizational goals. The workstyle adopted here involves subordinates buying into the process of being active for building work relationships that are positive and constructive in nature. Building consensus is an integral part of teamwork (Bass, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). This workstyle is indicative of transformational leadership whereby inspiration among workers primarily comes from both colleagues in the workplace with the leader acting as a servant to the team.
4. *Visionary/Charismatic Leadership.* Burns (1978) describes this workstyle as a leader who is futuristic and can mobilize others to achieve a shared vision. This workstyle is based upon inspiring others to a cause whereby followers are motivated to work beyond their expectations to achieve something greater than what is currently apparent. This workstyle is reflective of transformational leadership whereby leadership is demonstrated at all levels of employment.
5. *Coaching/Servant Leadership:* In this model, the leader takes the position of acting as a servant for followers. Robert Greenleaf (1977) depicts this workstyle whereby the leader acts as a teacher by coaching others to perform better.
6. *Laissez-Faire Leadership*: This is characterized as non-leadership or absence of leadership, "as the French phrase [laissez-faire] implies, the laissez-faire leader takes a 'hands-off, let-things-ride' approach" (Northouse, 2010). Using this

workstyle, the leader is reluctant to make decisions, is not present when his/her help is required, is unable to follow up when requested and is less interested in supporting subordinates to fulfil their needs (Bass & Avolio, 1989 & 1994).

Leadership Within an Educational Context

Current research suggests that the leadership workstyle selected by educational administrators is dependent on societal values, organizational culture and general patterns of behavior. For example, Dastoor, Suwannachin and Golding (2003) in the context of Thailand at the university level investigated the relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction through the transformational and transactional leadership theoretical paradigm. The findings highlight that a transformational leadership style results in a stronger relationship with the faculty's self-perceived job satisfaction, and the transactional leadership style comparatively has a lesser degree association with faculty job satisfaction.

Grosso (2008) states that the workstyles of leaders will likely vary even in different parts of the same societal context, such as an educational institution. For example, Stumpf (2003) examined chairperson's workstyle and faculty satisfaction in North Carolina (United States) at the university level utilizing the same leadership theoretical transaction-transformational theoretical paradigm. Stumpf found that the use of a transformational leadership style results in a significantly positive relationship with faculty members' job satisfaction. However, a reliance upon a contingent reward process associated with the transactional leadership style also at times results in a stronger positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction, especially when compared to management-by-exception. Therefore, aspects of both a transactional or a transformational leadership styles may have merit for inspiring BTEs to become more productive. The question here is which leadership style is more relevant to the personal and professional workstyles of current unit leaders in business teacher preparatory programs in Nigeria.

Research Methodology

This study attempts to examine the leadership and corresponding work styles of current chairpersons/directors of business teacher preparatory programs in Nigeria. The outcomes of this study will provide insight into the capacity that current chair-

persons/directors (unit leaders) of business teacher preparatory program have for leading change in their institutions. By determining how business teacher educators (BTE) perceive the capacity of current chairpersons/directors to lead their departments, steps may be undertaken to address current issues, if any, for the purpose of creating an environment conducive to designing strategies to enhance the learning of undergraduates. The focus of the study is upon finding answers to three research questions

- RQ I: What are the primary characteristics that describe the personal/social (non-work) personality of the program leader?
- RQ2: What are the primary characteristics that describe the work personality of the program leader?
- RQ3: How do faculty perceive the capacity of their chair/director to lead innovation in terms of classroom instruction? What percentage?

Significance of the Research Area

This is a different approach to research previously conducted on leadership effectiveness, especially in the field of business teacher education at the post-secondary level. In the literature reviewed above, leadership is very important to establishing an environment for change and experimentation. In this regard, enhancing teacher productivity in schools throughout Nigeria is a continual goal of business education administrators. Using an innovative research approach, the attempt here is to gain insight into the personality of the unit head in terms of personal interests and how they may impact upon work styles and corresponding leadership roles in their units. Since perceptions of their unit heads by BTEs reflect on how relationships build or falter, they reflect reality. Therefore, the outcomes of this study will provide insight as to how and why chairpersons/directors relate to business teacher educators, what are current instructional priorities, and what is the current capacity of unit leaders and current BTEs to initiate innovative approaches to their instruction for enhancing effectiveness. The study was designed as an exploratory analysis of current perceptions of business teacher educators regarding the kind of working environment that is in place and led by current chairpersons/directors. In other words, is the leadership style of unit heads as perceived by BTEs reflective of their personal life style choices? If so, how do they compare/impact in terms of laying the foundation for leading instructional innovation?

Study Sample

Business teacher educators from 5 States in Nigeria were initially contacted for participation in the study. Included in the sample were 140 business teacher educators of which, 30 were situated in a university; 70, in a college of education; and 40, in polytechnics. The nomenclature for each classification of educational institution used in this study is that provided by the Ministry of Education in Nigeria.

Data Collection Methodology

Based on the six leadership workstyles identified and described in the literature review above, a data gathering instrument was designed. In this regard, the survey instrument was part of a pilot study consisting of 15 business teachers in preparatory programs at the university level. Revisions were made as a result of this pilot study. As a result of the trial run when designing the survey, the data gathering instrument was deemed to be valid based on the content. In this regard, the survey resulted in data on identifying personal life choices of chairpersons/directors, current interests and priorities of chairpersons/directors, and general work style of program administrators. The attempt here was to compare the personal and professional work profiles of the unit head of the BTE program in Nigeria for gaining some insight as to why unit heads act the way they currently do. In this regard, one segment to the questionnaire included questions about leadership style, work priorities, and innovative capacity. Data were collected between January 2016 and February 2016.

Data Analysis

Frequency tables were generated using Version 21 of the IBM SPSS statistical software. Frequency counts were computed along with percentage responses by each item on the survey.

Missing counts were noted in the statistical analysis. In this regard, valid percentages were referenced for analysis purposes.

Demographics. Of the 140 questionnaires distributed to business teacher educators, a total of 117 were returned, representing an overall return rate of 83 percent. Of those 117 survey instruments returned, 34 (or 20 percent) were received from

business teacher educators in polytechnic; 65 (or 55 percent), from colleges of education; and 18 (or 15 percent), from universities.

Personal Personality/Social Preferences of Chairperson/Director. In terms of having some insight as to the personal interests of their chairs when away from their institutions and work, the two most frequent non-work activities of unit heads of BTE programs were using social media (n=27) and reading a good book (n=25) (Table 1). In this regard, as indicated in Table 1, 23.1 percent of unit heads of BTE programs are perceived as noticeably using social media when off the job and 21.4 percent, reading a good book. However, 45.3 percent of those survey did not know their unit head well enough to identify the interests of their unit heads when away from the role at their institution.

Table 1: Perceptions by BTE of Unit Head Preferences When Not at Work

Personal Interests	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Use social media to connect with friends	27	22.9	23.1
Read a good book	25	21.2	21.4
Do physical fitness training	2	1.7	1.7
Go to sporting events	4	3.4	3.4
Attend charitable events	5	4.2	4.3
Do not know	53	44.9	45.3
Other	1	.8	.9
Total	**117**	**99.2**	**100.0**
Missing	1	.8	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

In terms of how the kind of behavior exhibited by their unit heads when away from their work responsibilities, the three most frequently perceived personality traits of their chairs are telling stories (n=30), listening/being quiet (n=26) and telling jokes (n=20) (Table 2). In this regard, 26.3 percent of the sample perceive their unit head in personal social settings as being humorous. At the same time, another 22.8 percent are being perceived as somewhat quiet in social settings whereas 17.5 percent of unit heads were being perceived as being storytellers when interacting with others. Only 14.4 percent of those surveyed were unable to identify a particular personality of their unit heads when attending non-work social events.

Similarly, in terms of personal shopping preferences of their unit heads, the two

Table 2: Perceptions by BTE of Unit Head Personality at Non-Work Social Events

Social Personality	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Tells Jokes/very humorous	30	25.4	26.3
Is very quiet/listens mostly	26	22.0	22.8
Tells stories	20	16.9	17.5
Likely to enter debate	12	10.2	10.5
Likely not to engage in any serious conversation	6	5.1	5.3
Do not know	17	14.4	14.9
Other	3	2.5	2.6
Total	**114**	**96.6**	**100.0**
Missing	4	3.4	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

most frequent retailers preferred were technology stores (n=40) and bookstores (n=39) (Table 3). These findings reflect the personal preferences of unit heads as perceived by BTE in Table 1 whereby use of social media and reading a good book are frequent choices of unit heads when outside of work responsibilities at their institutions. In this regard, 36.4 percent of unit heads were perceived by BTE as preferring to visit retailers of technology with another 35.5 percent, choosing bookstores. Going to sport retailers was a distant third with only 9.3 percent indicating this alternative of shopping for their unit heads.

Table 3: Perceptions by BTE of Personal Shopping Preferences of Unit Head

Retailer of Choice	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Technology store	40	33.9	36.4
BookstoreSporting store	3911	33.19.3	35.510.0
Investment brokerMusic store	81	6.8.8	7.3.9
Other	11	9.3	9.9
Total	**110**	**93.2**	**100.0**
Missing	8	6.8	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

The three most frequent preferences related to entertainment away from the job are attending a sporting event (n=25), attending to home needs (n-20), and traveling (n=19) (Table 4). In this regard, for their entertainment, 21.6 percent perceive their unit heads as preferring to attend a sporting event; 17.2 percent, attending to home needs as a measure of entertainment; and 16.4 percent, traveling. On the other head, 38.8 percent of the respondents did not know their unit head well enough to indicate how they perceived their personal entertaining preferences.

Table 4: Perceptions by BTE of Personal Entertainment Preferences of Unit Head

Entertainment Preferences	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Attending a sporting event	25	21.2	21.6
Attending to home improvement/maintenance	20	16.9	17.2
Traveling	19	16.1	16.4
Attending the theatre/live	1	.8	.9
Going to an amusement park	2	1.7	1.7
Attending a concert	5	4.2	4.3
Going to dinner with friends	4	3.4	3.4
Do not know	38	32.2	32.8
Other	2	1.7	1.7
Total	116	98.3	100.0
Missing	2	1.7	
Total	118	100.0	

Workplace Personality of Unit Heads. In terms of the primary work style of unit heads, 55.3 percent of the respondents (n= 63) perceived their unit heads of demonstrating openness especially to new ideas from others (Table 5). Another 25.4 percent (n=29) indicated that their unit heads tended to be more agreeable when reacting to the views of others. In this regard, only 6.8 percent of unit heads (n=8) were perceived at work as being impulsive with another .8 percent (n=1) as being a traditionalist.

Table 5: Perceptions of BTE of the Work Personality of the Unit Head

Work Traits	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Openness – willingness to embrace new experience quickly	63	53.4	55.3
Agreeableness – react to views of othersImpulsive – act immediately upon new ideas	298	24.66.8	25.47.0
Extraversion – willingness to engage with others	2	1.7	1.8
Cautious – enter new experiences slowly and carefully	9	7.6	7.9
Traditionalist – draw strength by keeping to past experience	1	.8	.9
Other	2	1.7	1.8
Total	**114**	**96.6**	**100.0**
Missing	4	3.4	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

When engaging others in the department, 70 BTEs or 59.8 percent of survey respondents perceived their unit head as very willing to accept the advice of others with another 36 or 30.8 percent, a tendency to collaborate with others (Table 6). These perceptions related to two workstyle characteristics indicate that approximately 90 percent of the survey respondents perceived a working personality of their unit heads reflecting an environment that builds teamwork and collaborative relationships for getting things done.

In terms of the thought process utilized by their unit heads, a majority (n=60) of the respondents perceived their program leaders as adopting a logical thinking approach when making decisions. This represents 52.6 percent of the study sample (Table 7). Another 14.4 percent of the respondents (n=17) perceived their unit heads as being very practical in their approach to handling department routines. However, there were 17 respondents or 14.4 percent who were unable to categorize the thought process used by the unit heads.

Table 6: Perceptions of BTE of Primary Workstyle of Unit Head for Engaging Others in Department

Work Style for Engaging Others	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Accept advice of others	70	59.3	59.8
Collaborates with othersDoes it himself/herself	365	30.54.2	30.84.3
Make enemies along the way	2	1.7	1.7
Sets the agenda/leads with decisiveness	4	3.4	3.4
Total	**117**	**99.2**	**100.0**
Missing	1	.8	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

Table 7: Perceived Thinking Process of Unit Head

Thinking Process	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Logically	60	50.8	52.6
Practically	17	14.4	14.9
Philosophically	13	11.0	11.4
Abstractly	5	4.2	4.4
Artistically	1	.8	.9
Do not know	17	14.4	14.9
Other	1	.8	.9
Total	**114**	**96.6**	**100.0**
Missing	4	3.4	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

In terms of leadership style being observed by BTEs, the most frequent reported workstyle reflected that of participatory in nature. In this regard, 59 or 50.4 percent of the respondents perceived their leader as being actively engaged in seeking advice of others throughout the workday. Another 19.7 percent or 23 respondents perceived their unit heads as being visionary in scope. Only 9 or 7.7 percent perceived their unit heads as being autocratic (Table 8).

Table 8: Generally Observed Leadership Style of Unit Head

Leadership Style	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Participatory – actively engages others for input	59	50.0	50.4
Visionary – very creative/lots of new ideas	23	19.5	19.7
Pacesetter – sets the example/tone for expectations	13	11.0	11.1
Coaching others – teaches others how to perform better	11	9.3	9.4
Autocratic – tend to make decisions arbitrarily	9	7.6	7.7
Other	2	1.7	1.7
Total	**117**	**99.2**	**100.0**
System	1	.8	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

Environment for Innovation. When asked about their personal reaction of their unit heads when they personally offer an innovative idea, 66 or 56.9 percent of the respondents indicated a personal sensation of confidence that the unit head would take them seriously (Table 9). Another 37 or 31.9 percent exhibited a feeling of being at ease during the initiation phase of their innovative idea. Only 12 respondents or about 10 percent of the respondents indicated they felt awkward (n=6), intimidated (n=4) or anxious (n=2) at that moment of proposing an innovative idea.

Table 9: Personal Sensation to Reactions to New Ideas by Unit Head

Personal Feelings	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Confident	66	55.9	56.9
At ease	37	31.4	31.9
Awkward	6	5.1	5.2
Intimidated	4	3.4	3.4
Anxious	2	1.7	1.7
Other	1	.8	.9
Total	**116**	**98.3**	**100.0**
System	2	1.7	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

Using a specific list of possible innovative instructional activities to become an integral part of BTE programs, the use of blended instructional formats and social media were those most frequently identified for possible development. In this regard, 37 or 32.7 percent of the respondents perceived their unit heads as instituting blended instructional formats as a priority with 31 or 27.4 percent, enhancing social media in the classroom as an instructional tool. Only 4 respondents perceived distant online education as a priority of their unit heads currently. However, 24 or 21.2 percent of the respondents could not identify any from the list as a priority of their unit heads (Table 10).

Table 10: Instructional Priorities of Unit Head

Instructional Priorities	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**
Instituting blended instructional formats	37	31.4	32.7
Enhancing the use of social media in instructional formats	31	26.3	27.4
Advancing community related learning activities/outside of classroom	13	11.0	11.5
Integrating distance online instructional formats	4	3.4	3.5
None of the above	24	20.3	21.2
Other	4	3.4	3.5
Total	**113**	**95.8**	**100.0**
System	5	4.2	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

When asked about their perceptions of the creative capacity of BTEs in their unit, 39 or 35.3 percent of the respondents indicated that getting daily routines and tasks done was what their unit was best at doing. However, a close 38 or 32.8 percent perceived creative potential of their peers, especially when they propose creative approaches to instructional issues. Another 22 or 19.0 percent perceived their colleagues being creative when they interact with one another, especially when integrating new technology into the classroom. Only 9 or 7.8 percent perceived BTEs maintaining the status quo in terms of the instructional methodology (Table 11).

Table 11: Perceived Creativity Potential of BTE

BTE Best When . . .	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Getting tasks done	39	33.1	35.3
Exploring creative approaches to instructional issues	38	32.2	32.8
Encouraging co-workers to adapt new technology to their instruction	22	18.6	19.0
Maintaining the status quo in their instructional methodology	9	7.6	7.8
Finding common ground when there is conflict	5	4.2	4.3
Other	3	2.5	1.7
Total	**116**	**98.3**	**100.0**
System	2	1.7	
Total	**118**	**100.0**	

Conclusion

It may be concluded that the personal life choices of unit heads are somewhat reflective of their interests at work as a professional BTE. For example, their personal preference for using social media is perhaps reflective of their priorities at work whereby, the use of technology and adopting innovative formats for delivering instruction in their unit are of primary interest to them. Therefore, in answering Research Question #1 relating to identifying personal characteristics of unit leaders, the three that appear to be most frequently mentioned are using social media, reading a good book, and shopping at retailers specializing in selling technology. In addition, a considerable number of unit heads are perceived during non-work social events as having personalities that reflect storytelling, humor, but also good listening skills. However, it may also be concluded that a considerable number of BTEs are not familiar with their unit leader's personal lifestyle and their preferences when

away from the job. *This lack of awareness here appears to reflect some degree of distance between BTEs and their unit heads and could have an effect in generating trusted relationships, especially when proposing new instructional approaches.*

It may be concluded that workstyle preferences reaffirm the personal life choices of unit heads, as perceived by BTEs. In this regard, the personal life choices appear to be somewhat reflected in the workstyle adopted by the unit leader. Therefore, in answering Research Question #2 relating to work style characteristics of the unit leader, the three that are most frequently mentioned are being open-minded, willing to accept ideas of others, and utilizing a pragmatic but logical thought process when completing daily routines. The specific leadership style most perceived by BTEs was that of participatory whereby individuals feel that they are part of the decision-making process in their unit. Again, these workplace characteristics appear to be reflective of previously identified personal life choices of unit leaders, especially as related to building relationships by means of social media, reading a good book which can help in refining a logical thought process, and being a good listener which is helpful when engaging others.

In terms of spurring innovation as noted in Research Question #3, it may be concluded that unit leaders are being perceived as having considerable capacity to work with BTEs to implement instructional approaches quite different from the past. It may be concluded that unit leaders are perceived as being receptive to new considering innovative ideas from BTEs, and similarly have great interest in promoting blended forms of instruction and enhancing the use of social media as an instructional tool. It may also be concluded that the current working environment is conducive to supporting innovative efforts whereby BTEs feel confident in proposing new ideas as well as working collaboratively with their peers. Therefore, it may be concluded that there is considerable capacity on the part of both unit leaders and program BTEs to initiate change in current programs. This situation may also be reflective of other teacher training programs throughout the continent of Africa. Building more awareness of personal preferences in regards to utilization of social media between unit leaders and business teacher educators may result in accelerating the integration of social media in the classroom.

Recommendations

To assist the process of becoming more innovative, it may be helpful if the unit leaders could connect to a greater degree with BTEs in their unit on a personal

level. With the BTEs indicating that they know very little about their unit leader' personal interests and preferences, it may be helpful for unit leaders to exhibit or display their desires more openly in an effort to generate a personal bond between themselves and their colleagues. This may be an element beneath the surface that enhance the leadership effectiveness of unit leaders. When attempting to promote innovation, working in teams collaboratively may provide an avenue for driving success. This strategy may result in developing the necessary trust and respect of each other as change can become stressful. It appears that there is already in place a feeling among constituencies that unit leaders are generally open and willing to work with subordinates. *However, taking the next step for reaffirming confidence in one another by enhancing a personal connection among each BTE in that unit may make a difference in the degree of success achieved for instituting innovative instructional approaches for delivering teacher training at post-secondary institutions*.

References

Bass B.M. and Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. (2nd edition). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994) Introduction, in Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (eds.) *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (2004) *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set*. 3rd ed. Menlo Park. Mind Garden, Inc.

Briggs, A.R.J. and Coleman, M. (2007) Introduction, in Briggs, A.R.J. and Coleman, M. (eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. 2nd ed. London: Paul Chapman.

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

Burns, J. (2007) *Analyses of Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction of College Faculty*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, North-central University.

Daft, Richard L. (2015). *The Leadership Experience (6th Edition).* Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Davies, J., Hides, M.T. and Casey, S. (2001) 'Leadership in Higher Education'. *Journal of Total Quality Management & Business Excellence,* 12 (7), 1025-1030. 222

Dastoor, B., Suwannachin, K. and Golding, A. (2003) *Transformational Leadership and Cultural Values in Thailand: Faculty Perceptions of University Administrators*. Clearwater: Academy of International Business Southeast.

Dimmock, C. and Walker, A. (2005) *Educational Leadership: Culture and Diversity.* London: Sage.

Downton, J.V. Jr. (1973) *Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process*. New York: The Free Press.

Gill, R. (2006) *Theory and Practice of Leadership.* London: SAGE Publications.

Grosso, F.A. (2008) *Motivating Faculty through Transformational Leadership: A Study of the Relationship between Presidential Leadership Behaviours and Faculty Behaviours*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, The Catholic University of America, Department of Education.

Gunter, H.M. (2001) *Leaders and Leadership in Education.* London: Paul Chapman.

Greenleaf, Robert (1977) *Servant Leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hollander, E.P. (1992) Leadership, Followership, Self, and Others. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3 (1), 43–54.

Levine, M.F. (2000) *The Importance of Leadership: An Investigation of Presidential Style at Fifty National Universities*, unpublished dissertation for the doctor of philosophy program, University of North Texas, College of Education.

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P. and Denessen, E. (2006) 'Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian Case'. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 17 (2), 145–177.

Northouse, P.G. (2010) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.

Ribbins, P. and Gunter, H.M. (2002) 'Mapping Leadership Studies in Education: Towards a Topology of Knowledge Domains'. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30 (4), 359–386.

Simkins, T. (2005) 'Leadership in Education: 'What Works' or 'What Makes Sense'? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 33 (1), 9–26.

Stumpf, M.N. (2003) *The Relationship of Perceived Leadership Styles of North Carolina County Extension Directors' to Job Satisfaction of County Extension Professionals*, unpublished dissertation for the Doctor of Education Program, North Carolina State University, Adult and Community College. 248