

11th International Strategic Management Conference 2015

An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership

Munevver Olcum Cetin^a, F. Sehkar Fayda Kinik^b *

^aMarmara University, Istanbul, 34722, Turkey

^bIstanbul Technical University, Istanbul, 34367, Turkey

Abstract

After examining the existing studies of administration in higher education, it has been obvious that academic leadership behaviors are significantly determinative in the development of faculty. Considerable debate has emerged over the most suitable model for academic leadership: not surprisingly, one of the conceptual models dominating the literature is transformational leadership. This study proposes to investigate academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. First, this paper reviews transformational leadership as a concept in detail with its four components: Charismatic Leadership, or Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Second, the methodological details and the results of the study are explicitly discussed. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is used to measure different components of transformational leadership as a research instrument. The total field under survey consists of 100 participants including research assistants, instructors, associate professors and full professors of different state universities in Turkey. The SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) is applied to analyze the data gathered by the research instrument. In order to determine whether or not there has been any difference among the academics' perceptions of transformational leadership, with its four dimensions, according to gender, age, tenure, and education variables, non-parametric tests are used. As for the results of the study, the level of 5-point Likert scale measuring the administrators' behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership including all four dimensions is "once a while". Of the independent variables, only the education variable is specified as a significant factor affecting the academics' perceptions of transformational leadership. In other words, the level of transformational leadership attitude for the ones having bachelor's degree is indicated to be higher than the others, while the levels are indicated as similar for the ones having B.Ed. and M.A. degrees. In the dimensions of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation, the level of PhD graduates' perceptions of transformational leadership is higher than that of M.A. graduates. In the dimensions of Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration, the levels are specified to be similar between the M.A. and PhD graduates.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of the International Strategic Management Conference

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Academic Leadership, and Components of Transformational Leadership

1. Introduction

Leadership at the tertiary level has taken on an important role in the expansion of quality in higher education into the new landscape of twenty-first century. Regarding leadership in education, literature has primarily been concerned

*Corresponding author: Tel.: +90-212-232-4727 Fax: +90-212-232-1770

Email address: kinik@itu.edu.tr

with the exploration of the outcomes and consequences of different leadership styles and techniques in educational organizations. Leadership affected by organizations and cultures is a universal phenomenon in terms of its influence on individuals (Bass, 1997). The roles of both leaders and followers have become more complex and elaborate and multiple perspectives exist on how leadership is conceptualized (Stewart, 2006). A considerable amount of empirical evidence has been amassed that points to a number of positive outcomes associated with sophisticated leadership behaviors such as transformational leadership (Gregory, Moates, & Gregory, 2011). This paper is designed to analyze academic leadership behaviors from the perspective of transformational leadership and its dimensions.

2. Transformational Leadership

The word “to transform” as a term means to change the appearance or character of something completely or someone, especially so that that thing or person is improved (Cambridge Dictionary, 2015). Transformational leaders transform the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organization by fostering an environment where relationships can be formed and by establishing a climate of trust in which visions can be shared (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). Transformational leaders focus on restructuring the school by improving school conditions (Stewart, 2006). Leaders following transformational leading styles and techniques work to transform followers, creating a climate in organizations where commonly accepted and recognized values are equally shared. As a result of such an effect on followers, transformational leadership has rapidly become the approach of choice for much of the research and application of leadership theory. In many ways, transformational leadership has captured the imagination of scholars, of noted practitioners, and of students of leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

To fully conceptualize the notion of transformational leadership, a reflective examination of its inception and development is absolutely essential. In addition, a thorough investigation into the research and literature provided by leading scholars of this model is imperative to the understanding of the term (Stewart, 2006, 8). Burns defines leadership as the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers (Bailey & Axelrod, 2001).

The transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower (Burns, 1978). As a result of this, leadership is recognized as a mutual relationship that converts followers to leaders and leaders into moral agents. The concept of moral leadership is proposed as a means for leaders to take responsibility for their leadership and to aspire to satisfy the needs of the followers. Burns’ position is that leaders are neither born nor made; instead, leaders evolve from a structure of motivation, values, and goals (Stewart, 2006). Such a climate enables leaders to be transformational in organizations.

More generally, the dynamics of transformational leadership involve followers having a strong personal identification with the leader, a shared vision for the future, and the ability to work collectively for the benefit of the group (Kelloway, Barling, Kelley, Comtois, & Gatién, 2003). These dynamics help followers make a positive transformation in themselves. Transformational leadership, defined as “leader behaviors that transform and inspire followers to perform beyond expectations while transcending self-interest for the good of the organization”, has four dimensions (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009): Charismatic Leadership, or Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration.

The idea that the dimensions comprising transformational leadership affect critical organizational attitudes and outcomes is now well established in leadership literature (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1998). These dimensions function distinctively in the process of transformation. Idealized influence emphasizes trust, values, and ethics while inspirational motivation consists of leaders providing meaning and challenge to followers’ work and using inspiring messages to arouse emotions. Whereas intellectual stimulation challenges old assumptions, beliefs, and traditions, and encourages new ways of thinking, individualized consideration refers to leaders who consider the needs, abilities, and goals of followers and provide coaching and mentoring (Guay, 2013). These components of transformational leadership are explained below in detail:

2.1. *Charismatic Leadership or Idealized Influence*

Transformational leaders are role models; they are respected and admired by their followers. Followers identify

with leaders and want to emulate them. Leaders have a clear vision and sense of purpose and they are willing to take risks (Bass, 1998). Such leaders are regarded as a role model either because they exhibit certain personal characteristics or “charisma” or because they demonstrate certain moral behaviors. Such leaders are often seen as being high on morality, trust, integrity, honesty and purpose. Key indicators of this style would be: demonstrating unusual competence, celebrating followers’ achievements, addressing crises “head on”, and using power for positive gain (Kirkbride, 2006). Leaders manifest idealized influence when they make improvements in the organization’s performance by participating in risks with their followers, maintain consistency in their behavior, and are dependable (Kelloway, Barling, Kelley, Comtois, & Gatién, 2003). In this way, followers feel the trust and positive atmosphere created by the leader in organizations.

2.2. Inspirational Motivation

Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate others, generate enthusiasm and challenge people. These leaders clearly communicate expectations and they demonstrate a commitment to goals and a shared vision. Such leaders tend to be able to articulate, in an exciting and compelling manner, a vision of the future that the followers are able to accept and strive towards (Bass, 1998). Such leaders can also often succeed in elevating the expectations of followers so that they achieve more than they, or others, thought they could do. Key indicators of this style would be: presenting an optimistic and attainable view of the future, molding expectations and shapes, meaning, reducing complex matters to key issues using simple language, and creating a sense of priorities and purpose (Kirkbride, 2006).

2.3. Intellectual Stimulation

Transformational leaders actively solicit new ideas and new ways of doing things. They stimulate others to be creative and they never publicly correct or criticize others (Bass, 1998). It is a style that parents often use with their children but often is less frequent in organizations where many managers favor a “telling” approach to a questioning one. Key indicators of this style would be: re-examining assumptions, recognizing patterns that are difficult to imagine, willing to put forth or entertain seemingly foolish ideas, encouraging followers to revisit problems, and creating a “readiness” for changes in thinking (Kirkbride, 2006). Leaders display intellectual stimulation when they help their followers develop new ideas, motivating them to take alternative routes to problem solving and take a closer look at all possible solutions (Kelloway, Barling, Kelley, Comtois, & Gatién, 2003).

2.4. Individualized Consideration

Transformational leaders pay attention to the needs and the potential for developing others. These leaders establish a supportive climate where individual differences are respected. Interactions with followers are encouraged and the leaders are aware of individual concerns (Bass, 1998). When managers are asked to relate the behaviors exhibited by their best leader to date the majority list some form of this style at the top of their list. Key indicators of this style would be: recognizing differences among people in their strengths and weaknesses, likes and dislikes; being an “active” listener, assigning projects based on individual ability and needs, encouraging a two-way exchange of views and promoting self-development (Kirkbride, 2006). The individualized consideration component of transformational leadership also underscores the necessity of altruism if leadership is to be anything more than authoritarian control (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996).

3. Methodology

In this part, research design, study group, data collection tool, data collection, and data analysis of this study will be explained in detail.

2.1. Research Design

The research design of this study is specified as quantitative data collection including descriptive survey model in order to find out academics’ perception of administrators’ leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership.

2.2. Study Group

The study group here used is selected from instructors, research assistants, associate professors, and full professors working in different state universities of Istanbul/Turkey in the 2014-2015 Academic Year. Purposeful conventional sampling is used to specify the participants. Among the specified groups, random selection is used to apply the questionnaire.

2.3. Data Collection Tool

In this study, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is used to measure different components of transformational leadership as a research instrument including 21 items in addition to independent variables such as gender, age, tenure, and education level. The questionnaire form has the feature of measuring the four dimensions of transformational leadership: Charismatic Leadership, or Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration with the help of specific items. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) including 21 items has such a delivery of dimensions of transformational leadership that Idealized Influence is measured by the items of 6., 8., 11., 13., and 15.; Inspirational Motivation by the items of 1., 5., 9., 12., 16., and 20.; Intellectual Stimulation by the items of 2., 3., 10., 17., 19.; Individualized Consideration by the items of 4., 7., 14., 18., 21. The questionnaire has a structure of the 5-point Likert scale with the options of “not at all”, “sometimes”, “once a while”, “fairly often”, and “always”.

2.4. Data Collection

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is applied to 100 participants including instructors, research assistants, associate professors, and full professors working in different state universities of Istanbul/Turkey at the place and time specified before.

2.5. Data Analysis

So as to analyze the data obtained from the participants from universities, the SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) is used. In order to determine whether or not there has been any difference among the academics' perceptions of transformational leadership, with its four dimensions, according to gender, age, tenure, and education variables, non-parametric tests are used.

4. Findings and Comments

The demographic variables of the study are investigated at first in order to analyze independent variables. From descriptive statistics for the variables examined, it can be inferred that male employees answer 29% of the questionnaires, whereas female employees respond to 71% of the questionnaires. 6% of the questionnaires are gathered from employees aged between 20 and 25, 42% questionnaires from employees aged between 26 and 30, and 25% of the questionnaires from employees aged between 31 and 35. Employees aged between 36 and 40 respond 8% of the questionnaires. 19% of respondents are 41 and over. 28% of employees respond to the questionnaire have work experience up to 5 years, 31% of them between 6 and 10 years and 19% of them between 11 years and 15. 10% of participants have the work experience of between 16 and 20 years. 12% of employees have been working for 21 years and over. Finally, 36% of employees responding to the questionnaire have a bachelor's degree (B.Ed.) and 47% of academics have a master's degree (M.A.) while 17% of respondents have a PhD.

After analyzing the demographic variables, factor analysis is applied to the data gathered from the participants. As stated before, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) including 21 items has such a delivery of dimensions of transformational leadership that Idealized Influence is measured by the items of 6., 8., 11., 13., and 15.; Inspirational Motivation by the items of 1., 5., 9., 12., 16., and 20.; Intellectual Stimulation by the items of 2., 3., 10., 17., 19.; Individualized Consideration by the items of 4., 7., 14., 18., 21. As the questionnaire has the structure of the 5-point Likert scale, each statement is calculated through the average of the interval values of scale using “not at all” between (1,00-1,80), “sometimes” between (1,81-2,60), “once a while” between (2,61-3,40), “fairly often” between (3,41-4,20) and “always” between (4,21-5,00). Basic statistical tests are used in this study in order to analyze factors

specified as the four dimensions of transformational leadership. Results are shown in Table 1 through the data of sample size (N), arithmetic mean (M), and standard deviation (SD).

Table 1: Results of Factor Analysis

| <i>Factor</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Sh_x</i> |
|------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Idealized Influence | 100 | 1,20 | 4,80 | 3,00 | 0,85 | 0,08 |
| Inspirational Motivation | 100 | 1,00 | 5,00 | 2,80 | 0,98 | 0,10 |
| Intellectual Stimulation | 100 | 1,00 | 9,40 | 2,99 | 1,11 | 0,11 |
| Individualized Consideration | 100 | 1,00 | 4,80 | 2,72 | 0,97 | 0,10 |

As noted in Table 1, the arithmetic mean of Idealized Influence is 3,00 and the level of frequency of this dimension is “once a while” ($M=3,00$ $SD=0,85$); the arithmetic mean of Inspirational Motivation is 2,80 and its frequency level is “once a while” ($M=2,80$ $SD=0,98$); the arithmetic mean of Intellectual Stimulation is 2,99 and the level of frequency of this dimension is “once a while” ($M=2,99$ $SD=1,115$). The arithmetic mean of Individualized Consideration is 2,72 and its frequency level is also “once a while” ($M=2,72$ $SD=0,97$). For all the dimensions of transformational leadership, it can be implied that the participants’ perception level of their administrators’ transformational leadership behavior is “once a while”.

As for tests of significance; gender, age, tenure, and education level are tested to determine whether or not they influence the findings significantly. The Mann-Whitney U test is used to compare differences between gender and factors; accordingly, no significant difference is indicated. For the demographic variable "age", the Kruskal-Wallis H test is used to determine if there are any significant differences. The results suggest that there is no significant difference between participants’ ages and administrators’ transformational leadership behaviors ($p>0,05$). Therefore, age doesn't influence participants’ perception of transformational leadership behaviors. The Kruskal-Wallis H test is again used to determine if there are any significant differences between tenure and dimensions of transformational leadership. The findings are clear enough to claim that there is no significant difference ($p>0,05$). Thus, it is suggestible to say that tenure does not affect the academics’ perception of their administrators’ transformational leadership behaviors.

Table 2: Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of Education

| Factor | Education | N | X_{order} | X² | Sd | p |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Idealized Influence | B.Ed. | 36 | 55,82 | 6,90 | 2 | ,032 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 42,65 | | | |
| | PhD | 17 | 60,94 | | | |
| | Total | 100 | | | | |
| Inspirational Motivation | B.Ed. | 36 | 55,75 | 7,34 | 2 | ,026 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 42,45 | | | |
| | PhD | 17 | 61,65 | | | |
| | Total | 100 | | | | |
| Intellectual Stimulation | B.Ed. | 36 | 59,53 | 7,39 | 2 | ,025 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 42,41 | | | |
| | PhD | 17 | 53,74 | | | |
| | Total | 100 | | | | |
| Individualized Consideration | B.Ed. | 36 | 59,28 | 8,22 | 2 | ,016 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 41,77 | | | |
| | PhD | 17 | 56,06 | | | |
| | Total | 100 | | | | |

However, as seen in Table 2, when the Kruskal-Wallis H test is used to determine if there is a significant difference between education level of the participants and the dimensions of transformational leadership, the results indicate that in the dimension of Idealized Influence, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is calculated as significant because of the education level of the participants ($p = 0,032$; $X^2 = 6,90$); in the dimension of Inspirational Motivation, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is significant ($p = 0,026$; $X^2 = 7,34$); in the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation, the p-value is calculated ($p < 0,05$) as significant ($p = 0,025$; $X^2 = 7,39$); in the dimension of Individualized Consideration, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is statistically specified as significant ($p = 0,016$; $X^2 = 8,22$). As a result of these significant differences found out between the education level of the participants and the dimensions of transformational leadership, the Mann-Whitney U test is used to interpret the differences in subcategories of education between the dimensions of transformational leadership (see Table 3).

Table 3: The Mann-Whitney U test Results of Differences in B.Ed. and M.A. between the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership

| Factor | Education | N | X_{order} | ST | U | Z | P |
|------------------------------|-----------|----|-------------|---------|--------|-------|------|
| Idealized Influence | B.Ed. | 36 | 48,21 | 1735,50 | 622,50 | -2,06 | ,039 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 37,24 | 1750,50 | | | |
| | Total | 83 | | | | | |
| Inspirational Motivation | B.Ed. | 36 | 48,25 | 1737,00 | 621,00 | -2,07 | ,038 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 37,21 | 1749,00 | | | |
| | Total | 83 | | | | | |
| Intellectual Stimulation | B.Ed. | 36 | 49,86 | 1795,00 | 563,00 | -2,61 | ,009 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 35,98 | 1691,00 | | | |
| | Total | 83 | | | | | |
| Individualized Consideration | B.Ed. | 36 | 50,28 | 1810,00 | 548,00 | -2,75 | ,006 |
| | M.A. | 47 | 35,66 | 1676,00 | | | |
| | Total | 83 | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 3, in the dimension of Idealized Influence, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is significant between the participants having B.Ed. and M.A. in favor of B.Ed. graduates ($p = 0,039$; $U = 622,50$); in the dimension of Inspirational Motivation, the p-value ($p < 0,01$) is significant in favor of B.Ed. graduates ($p = 0,038$; $U = 621,00$); in the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation, the p-value ($p < 0,01$) is significant in favor of B.Ed. graduates ($p = 0,009$; $U = 563,00$); and in the dimension of Individualized Consideration, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is significant in favor of B.Ed. graduates ($p = 0,006$; $U = 548,00$). That is to say, the participants having the bachelor's degree (B.Ed.) are influenced more than the participants having M.A. by their administrators' transformational leadership behaviors in all dimensions of transformational leadership.

Table 4: The Mann-Whitney U test Results of Differences in B.Ed. and PhD between the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership

| Factor | Education | N | X_{order} | ST | U | Z | P |
|------------------------------|-----------|----|-------------|---------|--------|-------|------|
| Idealized Influence | B.Ed. | 36 | 26,11 | 940,00 | 274,00 | -0,61 | ,541 |
| | PhD | 17 | 28,88 | 491,00 | | | |
| | Total | 53 | | | | | |
| Inspirational Motivation | B.Ed. | 36 | 26,00 | 936,00 | 270,00 | -0,69 | ,492 |
| | PhD | 17 | 29,12 | 495,00 | | | |
| | Total | 53 | | | | | |
| Intellectual Stimulation | B.Ed. | 36 | 28,17 | 1014,00 | 264,00 | -0,80 | ,421 |
| | PhD | 17 | 24,53 | 417,00 | | | |
| | Total | 53 | | | | | |
| Individualized Consideration | B.Ed. | 36 | 27,50 | 990,00 | 288,00 | -0,34 | ,731 |
| | PhD | 17 | 25,94 | 441,00 | | | |
| | Total | 53 | | | | | |

Moreover, the Mann-Whitney U test is also used to interpret the differences in B.Ed. and PhD graduates between the dimensions of transformational leadership (see Table 4). According to the results of differences in B.Ed. and PhD graduates between the dimensions of transformational leadership, no statistically significant difference is specified. In other words, the levels are indicated as similar for the ones having B.Ed. and M.A. degrees.

Table 5: The Mann-Whitney U test Results of Differences in M.A. and PhD between the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership

| Factor | Education | N | X_{order} | ST | U | Z | P |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Idealized Influence | M.Ed. | 47 | 29,40 | 1382,00 | 254,00 | -2,22 | ,026 |
| | PhD | 17 | 41,06 | 698,00 | | | |
| | Total | 64 | | | | | |
| Inspirational Motivation | M.Ed. | 47 | 29,23 | 1374,00 | 246,00 | -2,34 | ,019 |
| | PhD | 17 | 41,53 | 706,00 | | | |
| | Total | 64 | | | | | |
| Intellectual Stimulation | M.Ed. | 47 | 30,44 | 1430,50 | 302,50 | -1,48 | ,139 |
| | PhD | 17 | 38,21 | 649,50 | | | |
| | Total | 64 | | | | | |
| Individualized Consideration | M.Ed. | 47 | 30,11 | 1415,00 | 287,00 | -1,72 | ,086 |
| | PhD | 17 | 39,12 | 665,00 | | | |
| | Total | 64 | | | | | |

As seen in Table 5, in the dimension of Idealized Influence, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is significant between the participants having M.A. and PhD in favor of PhD graduates ($p = ,026$; $U = 254,00$); in the dimension of Inspirational Motivation, the p-value ($p < 0,05$) is significant in favor of PhD graduates ($p = ,019$; $U = 246,00$); nonetheless, in the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation, the p-value ($p = ,139$) and in the dimension of Individualized Consideration, the p-value ($p = ,086$) are indicated as similar. In other words, in the dimensions of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation, the level of PhD graduates' perceptions of transformational leadership is higher than M.A. graduates. In the dimensions of Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration, the levels are specified to be similar between the M.A. and PhD graduates.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

In recent years, several studies have been conducted on academic leadership in higher education (Bryman & Lilley, 2009; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Kelloway, Barling & Helleur, 2000). These studies have confirmed what many department heads know from personal experience; academic leadership is complex and demanding, with substantial stress, high burnout and high turnover (Brown and Moshavi, 2002). Moreover, the selection of ideal academic leaders has become a problem due to the lack of competent candidates. Those who are not satisfactorily prepared for this complex job are filling more and more administrative positions. In addition, department heads are usually not chosen based solely on their leadership knowledge, skills or abilities. Very few academic chairpersons possess the entire catalogue of leadership traits that the experts suggest exemplary leaders should have (Tahir, Abdullah, Ali, & Daud, 2014). Most are chosen because of their intellect, research abilities and renown in their specific field (Gilley, 2003). However, these qualities do not necessarily equate to effective leadership and the wisdom that effective leadership requires (Bass, 1990).

More generally, the dynamics of transformational leadership involve followers having a strong personal identification with the leader, a shared vision for the future, and working collectively for the benefit of the group (Kelloway, Barling, Kelley, Comtois, & Gatién, 2003). From this point of view, the study clearly reveals the perception of transformational leadership on academics. As for the results of the study; the level of 5-point Likert scale measuring the administrators' behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership including all four dimensions is "once a while". Of the independent variables, only the variable of education level is specified as a

significant factor affecting the academics' perceptions of transformational leadership. The perception level of transformational leadership attitude for the ones having bachelor's degree is indicated as higher than the others, while the levels of perception are indicated as similar for the ones having B.Ed. and M.A. degrees. In the dimensions of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation, the level of PhD graduates' perceptions of transformational leadership is higher than M.A. graduates. In the dimensions of Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration, the levels are specified to be similar between the M.A. and PhD graduates.

In the dimension of Idealized Influence, transformational leaders are role models; they are respected and admired by their followers. Leaders have a clear vision and sense of purpose and they are willing to take risks. Moreover, in the dimension of Inspirational Motivation, transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate others, generate enthusiasm and challenge people. These leaders clearly communicate expectations and they demonstrate a commitment to goals and a shared vision (Bass, 1998). In this research, it is found out that PhD graduates perceive their administrators' Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation higher than M.A. graduates, consistent with the results of some previous research made by Kirkpatrick & Locke in 1996. In other words, as the education level of academics gets higher, their need for a charismatic leader and the leader's effort to motivate them is felt more. Obviously, their expectation of charisma and motivation from the leader becomes much clearer as their education level gets higher.

In the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation, transformational leaders actively solicit new ideas and new ways of doing things. They stimulate others to be creative and they never publicly correct or criticize others. Additionally, in the dimension of Individualized Consideration, transformational leaders pay attention to the needs and the potential for developing others. These leaders establish a supportive climate where individual differences are respected. Interactions with followers are encouraged and the leaders are aware of individual concerns (Bass, 1998). In this research, academics' perceptions of transformational leadership in terms of developing creativity and a supportive climate are similar between the M.A. and PhD graduates because the levels are specified to be similar (Kelloway, Barling & Helleur, 2000). In other words, as the education level of academics gets higher, their need for intellectual stimulation and individual consideration becomes similar to one another.

In conclusion, within Transformational Leadership Framework, the four dimensions gain importance in the administration of higher education. Therefore, if leaders of higher education are planning to transform their organizations, they should be respected and admired by followers as they have a clear vision and sense of purpose. It is highly suggested that followers should be motivated through demonstrating a commitment to goals and a shared vision; moreover, creativity should be encouraged for the issues occurred in organizations as well as individual differences of followers should be respected.

References

- Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J. (2009), "Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp. 421-49.
- Bailey, J. & Axelrod, R. H. (2001). "Leadership lessons from Mount Rushmore: An interview with James MacGregor Burns", *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 113-127. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00066-2
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications*. 3rd ed. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1997). "Does Transactional-Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries?", *American Psychologist Association*, Vol.52, No.2:130-139.
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

- Bass, B.M. & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. ISBN 0–8058–4761–8. (e-book).
- Bryman, A., and S. Lilley. (2009). “Leadership Researchers on Leadership in Higher Education”, *Leadership* 5 (3): 331–346.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Brown, F. W. & D. Moshavi. (2002). “Herding Academic Cats: Faculty Reactions Transformational and Contingent Reward Leadership by Department Chairs”, *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8: 79–92.
- Cambridge Dictionary (2015). <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary>
- Gilley, D. (2003). *Bedside Manner and Effective Academic Administrative Leadership*. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 124: 95–102.
- Guay, R. P. (2013). “The relationship between leader fit and transformational leadership”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 28 Iss 1 pp. 55 – 73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941311298869>
- Gregory, B.T., Moates, K.N., & Gregory, S.T. (2011). “An exploration of perspective taking as an antecedent of transformational leadership behavior”, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32 Iss 8 pp. 807 – 816. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731111183748>
- Kanungo, R.N. & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions in Leadership*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Kelloway, E.K., Barling, J., Kelley, E., Comtois, J., & Gatién, B. (2003). Remote transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 24 Iss 3 pp. 163 – 171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730310469589>
- Kelloway, E.K., Barling, J. & Helleur, J. (2000). “Enhancing transformational leadership: the roles of training and feedback”, *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 145-9.
- Kirkbride, P. (2006). “Developing transformational leaders: the full range leadership model in action”, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 38 Iss 1 pp. 23 – 32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00197850610646016>
- 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*, Vol. 81, pp. 36-51.
- Koh, W.L., Steers, R.M. & Terborg, J.R. (1995). “The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 319-33.
- Stewart, J. (2006). “Transformational Leadership: An Evolving Concept Examined through the Works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood”, *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, Issue #54, June 26.
- Stone, A.G., Robert F. Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). “Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus”, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 25 Iss.4 pp. 349 – 361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730410538671>
- Tahir, L., Abdullah, T., Ali, F., & Daud, K. (2014). “Academics transformational leadership: an investigation of heads of department leadership behaviours in Malaysian public universities”, *Educational Studies*, 40:5, 473-495, DOI: 10.1080/03055698.2014.932272