

NORSHIDAH NORDIN

Do Academic Leaders Matters? A Study on Transformational Leadership Behavior in a Higher Learning Institution

ABSTRACT: The effects of globalization, advancement of information and communication technology, together with economic volatile situations have forced academic institutions to adapt to strategic changes, so that they could remain relevant and competitive advantages. Hence, effective and efficient leadership behavior has become more critical than ever. Previous studies showed that transformational leaders' support is seemed to be an essential factor in promoting institutional success. However, to what extend this is true, especially in the local public universities. Therefore, this study was intended to examine the nature of transformational leadership behavior and its augmentation effects as perceived by the academics in a Malaysian higher educational institution. Using a stage cluster sampling, a total of 169 academic staff from UiTM (Universiti Teknologi MARA or MARA University of Technology) in Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia participated in the study. The result revealed the academic staff perceived that their superiors exhibited a transactional leadership style rather than transformational leadership style. The study also revealed that augmentation of transformational leadership was moderate. Hence, this study has several practical implications for policy makers and academic leaders in higher learning institutions to provide leadership program, particularly in making organizational change efforts successful.

KEY WORDS: Leadership, globalization, transformational, transactional, effectiveness, extra-effort, higher learning institutions, and satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Global trends have shown that higher learning institutions need to reform their mission and to better utilise their academia, in order to meet the challenges posed to higher education in the 21st century (Wilkenson *et al.* eds., 2004). In this context, academic institutions, including Malaysia, are progressively undergoing a process of innovation and institutional reform (Sadeghi & Lope Pihie, 2012). Nevertheless, in the process of transformation, J. Ford & R. Backoff (1988) stated the critical aspects that the institutions need to handle seriously are the issues of governance, management, and functioning of the organizations.

Given this juncture, in order for the higher learning institutions to remain relevant and competitive, the Malaysian National Higher

Strategic Plan (2020) has expressed a vision to transform its academic institutions. Thus, to realize this vision, developing leadership is one of the key elements in achieving the university agenda (Sirat, Ahmad & Azman, 2012). In this sense, academic leaders such as the universities administrators, deans, academic coordinators, and even head of the programs played important roles in fostering a culture of excellence to attract the most able to motivate the existing academics. On the contrary, Morshidi Sirat, Abdul Razak Ahmad & Norzaini Azman (2012) found that identifying and developing potential leaders is often inadequate. Therefore, the leaders in the universities were often chosen by default that is neither they were trained to be leaders nor aware of performance expectations (Heuer, 2003:740).

Hence, in bringing about a change event,

About the Author: Norshidah Nordin is a Lecturer at the Faculty of Education UiTM (Universiti Teknologi MARA), Seksyen 17, 40200 Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. For academic purposes, the author can be contacted via mobile phone at: +60133373410 or via e-mail at: shidah147@gmail.com

How to cite this article? Nordin, Norshidah. (2014). "Do Academic Leaders Matters? A Study on Transformational Leadership Behavior in a Higher Learning Institution" in *EDUCARE: International Journal for Educational Studies*, Vol.7(1) August, pp.7-18. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press and UMP Purwokerto, ISSN 1979-7877. Available online also at: <http://educare-ijes.com/do-academic-leaders-matters/>

Chronicle of the article: Accepted (February 2, 2014); Revised (April 25, 2014); and Published (August 17, 2014).

Asma *et al.* noted that academic leaders need to know the values of their workforce and identify work habits which can strengthen or weaken change initiatives (cited in Nordin, 2013). Although, it is sheer from literature that leadership is the key to effective educational reform (Hofstede, 1980; Bass, 1998; and Harker & Sharma, 2000); it seems that leadership for managing transformation and change is imperative and critically needed. Besides, previous studies showed that transformational leaders' support is seemed to be an essential factor in promoting effective organization (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Bass *et al.*, 2003; and de Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2005). However, to what extend this is true, especially in the local public universities.

THE NATURE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

The original ideas of transformational and transactional leadership theory was first developed by J.M. Burns (1978) based on political scenario; and later, B.M. Bass (1985) refined this theory and introduced it into organizational context. Nevertheless, B.M. Bass (1995) and B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (1997) extended the theory of leadership that consists of transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, and augmentation effects. According to B.M. Bass (1985), transactional leadership develops from the exchange process between leaders and subordinates, wherein the leader provides reward exchanges for subordinates' performance. On the other hand, transformational leadership behaviors go beyond transactional leadership, and motivate followers to identify with the leaders' vision and sacrifice their interest for that of the group or the organization.

In addition, B.M. Bass (1985) defines the transformational leaders as one who stimulates awareness and interest in the group or organization, increases the self-assurances and confidence of individuals or groups, and attempts to move the concerns of subordinates to achievement and growth rather than existence. These leaders search for new ways of working, seek opportunities, and prefer effectiveness to efficiency (*cf* Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

B.M. Bass (1985) again described transformational leadership behavior as having the following traits in table 1.

On the other hand, by comparing transformational leadership behavior, B.M. Bass (1985) described transactional leaders as one who prefers a leader member-exchange relationship, whereby the leader fulfils the needs of the followers in exchange for their performance meeting basic expectations. This leader has a preference for risk avoidance to allow them to achieve goals. B.M. Bass & F.J. Yammarino (1991) summarized several different types of behavior inherent in transactional leadership in table 2.

Transactional and transformational leadership are known to bring about great attention among many scholars in leadership studies. Adopting either transformational or transactional leadership behavior helps in the success for the organization effectiveness (Laojavichien, Fredendall & Cantrell, 2009). Exclusively, both transformational leadership and transactional leadership assist in predicting subordinates' satisfaction with their leaders (Bennett, 2009).

Nevertheless, there were some instances where both factors do not contribute to satisfaction to subordinates and partly provide as explanatory variables. For example, certain studies found that it is the combination of the transactional leadership's contingent rewards and the transformational leadership's care for individual needs that contribute to a dynamic and contented workforce (Chen, Beck & Amos, 2005). Another research similarly concluded that the difficult intricacy of the work and job objectives can be best monitored and administered by the transactional leadership, while the transformational leadership allows such complex process to become less daunting and more acceptable (Jansen, Vera & Crossan, 2009).

On the Transformational Leadership Behavior and Gender. Literature noted that higher education environment has only been begun to accommodate women in its classrooms, position of power, literature and language, and facilities (Ingleton, 1995). Nevertheless, R.G. Lord, C.L. De Vader & G.M. Alliger (1986) asserted that relationship of masculinity-

Table 1:
Characteristics of Transformational Leadership Behavior

Transformational Leadership Behavior	Characteristics
Charismatic behavior.	Leaders provide vision and a sense of vision, mission; instill pride and gain respect and trust.
Idealized influence.	Leaders behave as role models for their followers. They demonstrates high standards of ethical and moral conduct and avoids using power for personal gain.
Inspirational motivation.	Leaders are inspiring and motivating in the eyes of their subordinates by providing meaning and challenges to their followers' work.
Intellectual stimulations.	Leader arouses in subordinates an awareness of problems, recognition of their beliefs and values, and an awareness of their own thoughts and imagination.
Individualized consideration.	Leaders give personal attention, treat each employee individually, and coach and advise him/her.

Table 2:
Characteristics of Transactional Leadership Behavior

Transactional Leadership Behavior	Characteristics
Contingent reward.	Leaders provide reward are for good effort, good performance, and to recognize accomplishments.
Management by exception (active).	Leaders involve in monitoring subordinates and correcting actions, when necessary, to ensure that work is carried out effectively.
Management by exception (passive).	Leaders involve intervening only if standards are not deviations from acceptable performance standards.

femininity is an important personality trait in forming leadership perceptions.

Studies related leadership behaviour and gender difference were numerous (Gregory, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1997; and Anderson *et al.*, 2006). For example, a study done by S. Kawatra & V.R. Krishnan (2004) found that feminine leadership enhances people-orientation, collaboration, and team-orientation; and reduces aggressiveness, competitiveness, and results-orientation. Parallel, B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (1997) suggested that women managers, have more idealized influence, are more inspirational and individually considerate than men. Men are higher in management-by-exception and *laissez-faire* leadership, both being less pro-active styles and linked to less effective outcomes.

On the contrary, a study done by A.H. Eagly & S.J. Karau (1991) showed that male focused more on task-oriented aspects of group process than female; and women focused more on interpersonal aspects. However, A. Gregory (1990) claimed that there was no difference

between leadership style and gender. On the same note, T.W. Kent *et al.* (2010) found that men and women leaders behave as leaders in the same way. In sum, many results related to leadership style and gender were inconsistent (Karau & Eagly, 1999; and Kim & Shim, 2003). However, there were studies looked at the specific behaviours employed by male and female, particularly in a local context.

On the Transformational Leadership Behavior and its Effectiveness Leadership Outcomes.

One of the essentials elements of leadership that provides toward leadership effectiveness is the style of the leaders (Sadeghi & Lope Pihie, 2012). A leadership style is a relatively stable pattern or behavior display by leaders (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001); while guiding employees at workplace towards organizational achieving goals (Certo & Certo, 2006).

Theories in transformational leadership, in particular, have highlighted the importance of leadership being able to cooperate with the leader towards collective goals and personal

involvement in the job (Burns, 1978; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; and Bass, 1995). Accordingly, identifying leader's abilities to promote positive attitudes and behavior towards job and the organization may be of great importance to the effective functioning of the organizations (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

Hence, transformational leadership behavior has been judged to be important because of its connection with effective leaders. In this context, F. Molero *et al.* (2007) stated that one of the main predictions of the model of B.M. Bass (1985 and 1998) is termed as *augmentation effect*. T.A. Judge & R.F. Piccolo (2004) suggested that augmentation is something to amplify or extend.

Nonetheless, literature showed that this effect of transformational leadership increases the explanatory capacity of transactional leadership to predict followers' satisfaction and achievement (Waldman, Bass & Yammarino, 1990; Avolio & Howell, 1992; and Jansen, Vera & Crossan, 2009). B.M. Bass (1998) quoted also that transactions are at the base of transformations. In fact, transactional leadership results in followers meeting expectations, upon which their end of the bargain is fulfilled and they are rewarded accordingly.

On the other hand, transformational leadership is required so that it could motivate employees to move beyond expectations. Therefore, without the foundation of transactional leadership, transformational effects may not be possible (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In sum, B.M. Bass *et al.* (2003) suggested that transformational leaders are expected to enhance the performance capacity of their followers by setting higher expectations and generating a greater willingness to address more difficult challenges. Transactional contingent reward leadership should also relate positively to performance in that such leaders clarify expectations and recognize achievements that positively contribute to higher levels of effort and performance.

Given this juncture, leaders who employ in transformational behavior could produce many positive outcomes. Indeed, empirical evidence has suggested that the positive effect of transformational leadership on effectiveness

and performance is connected to outcomes that most organizations, individuals, and leaders probably would value (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; and Burke *et al.*, 2006).

Hence, in this study, the augmentation effects of transformational leadership was proposed by B.M. Bass (1995), which are individual extra effort, job satisfaction, and perceived unit effectiveness. Extra effort is related to extra roles made by the subordinates to fulfill a task or goal, because of the leadership behavior of their superior. Extra effort means going beyond expectation, where subordinates are willing to do more than the expectations set by the superiors. The element of unit effectiveness means the capability of the superior in executing their tasks and leading the subordinates to meet the goal of the division. The subordinate perceived that their leaders as effective to them and to the unit as well. Job satisfaction represents subordinates satisfaction towards their superior in approaching their day to day job.

B.M. Bass (1995) explained that the dimensions involved in measuring job satisfaction are the methods used in leading and working with subordinates in a satisfactory manner. Literature showed that there were strong correlations between scores on *transformational leadership and extra effort* (Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995); and *performance evaluations* (Hater & Bass, 1988). Besides, transformational leadership appears to produce higher performance *at the group* (Sosik, Avolio & Kahai, 1997); and *organization or business unit* (Howell & Avolio, 1993) levels as well. As a result of these positive effects, transformational leaders should be rated as more effective by others in a position to observe their behavior.

A study done by F. Molero *et al.* (2007) revealed a positive relationship between transformational leadership and augmentation effects. However, R.P. Vecchio, J.E. Justin & C.L. Pearce (2008) carried out a study and collected samples from 179 high school teachers and their principals were examined with hierarchical regression analysis. Augmentation analysis indicated that transactional leadership had a stronger role in explaining unique criterion variance beyond the contribution of transformational

leadership, than did transformational leadership relative to transactional leadership.

Having much said about transformational leadership and its impact of organizational effectiveness and outcomes, conversely, little is known about preparing effective academic leadership in the contexts of higher educational institutions (Bolman & Deal, 1992). Besides, according to P. Trivellas & D. Dargenidou (2009), leadership in higher learning settings is problematic due to dual systems, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, the unclear goals and other special properties of normative and professional organizations.

Nevertheless, academic leaders and departments play important roles in the success of institutions of higher education (Coats, 2000). Nonetheless, literature on leadership at higher educational institution is relatively small (Bass, 1995), particularly in Malaysian higher education institutions (Lo, Ramayah & de Run, 2010). Therefore, this study was intended to investigate the nature of leadership behavior exhibited by the superior as perceived by the academic staff in a higher learning institution.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY AND METHODS

The objectives of the study were four-folds, namely to determine: (1) leadership behavior exhibit among the superior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM or *Universiti Teknologi MARA* in Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia; (2) the differences between leadership behavior and gender; (3) the level effective leadership outcomes or augmentation effect of leadership behavior on academic staff of UiTM; and (4) the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership behavior on leadership outcomes.

This study employed a survey method using cross sectional research design. A self report questionnaire was used to gather information related to the objectives of the study. This study was based on a conceptual framework that combines part of the adapted theory of transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985). The perceived leadership behavior is reflected in the transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985). An instrument called the

Multifactor Leadership style Questionnaire (MLQ-5x form) was developed from B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (1997); and used in the study.

The instrument consisted of 45 items which measured the full-range of leadership styles and behaviors, namely Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, and Augmentation Effect among the Subordinates. The leaders' behaviors depicted in each item were measured using 5-point scale, where 4 = "frequently, if not always"; 3 = "fairly often"; 2 = "sometimes"; 1 = "once in a while"; and 0 = "not at all". The MLQ is strongly predictive of leader performance (Bass, 1995).

The constructs of effective leadership outcomes in this study were measured using augmentation effects towards leadership behavior of the superior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of Technology) in Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. The augmentation effects were individual extra effort, job satisfaction, and leader effectiveness. Sample items for each respective subscale would be, "Uses method of leadership that is satisfying" and "Gets me to more than I expected to do", is effective in meeting my job-related needs.

The samples were drawn from the academics of UiTM from main and branch campuses of the Malaysian peninsula. Hence, using R.V. Krejcie & D.W. Morgan (1970)'s table, a sample size of 357 was determined. However, a total of 169 academics participated in this study. These academic staffs consist of 36% males and 64% females from difference disciplines. The mean age of the respondents was 38 years old.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Objective 1: Analysis on the perceived leadership behavior exhibit by the superior of UiTM. Table 3 displays the transformational leadership behavior of the superior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of Technology) in Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. The overall mean scores showed that the academic staff of UiTM perceived that their superior exhibit a moderate transformational leadership behavior ($M = 2.15$, $SD = 1.11$).

Table 3:
Perceived Transformational Leadership Behavior Exhibit by the Superior of UiTM

Transformational Leadership	Mean	SD (Standard Deviation)
• Idealized influenced (attributed):		
1. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her	1.99	1.219
2. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group	2.05	1.231
3. Acts in ways that builds my respect	2.19	1.158
4. Displays a sense of power	2.50	1.049
Average mean scores	2.18	1.16
• Idealized influenced (behavior):		
1. Talks about him/her most important values and beliefs	2.11	1.134
2. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	2.22	1.093
3. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	2.45	1.163
4. Emphasize the importance of having collective sense of mission	2.27	1.091
Average mean scores	2.26	1.12
• Inspirational motivation:		
1. Talks optimistically about the future	2.50	1.004
2. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	2.50	1.080
3. Articulates a compelling vision of the future	2.44	1.061
4. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	2.45	1.014
Average mean score	2.47	1.03
• Intellectual stimulation:		
1. Re-examine critical assumptions to questions whether they are appropriate	1.87	.988
2. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems	2.22	1.050
3. Gets me a look at problems from many different angles	2.02	1.132
4. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	1.46	1.219
Average mean score	1.89	1.09
• Individual consideration:		
1. Spends time teaching and coaching	2.02	1.205
2. Treats me as individual rather than just a member of a group	1.95	1.182
3. Considers me as having differing needs, abilities and aspirations from others	1.88	1.127
4. Helps me to develop my strengths	2.04	1.172
Average mean score	1.97	1.17
Overall average mean scores	2.15	1.11

Mean indicator: low = 0 – 1.33; moderate = 1.34 – 2.67; and high = 2.68 – 4.00.

The result showed that all the components in transformational leadership were moderate. However, the finding revealed that among the five dimensions of transformational leadership behavior, inspirational motivation had the highest mean score (M = 2.47, SD = 1.03); followed by idealized influenced behavior (M = 2.26, SD = 1.12); idealized influenced behavior (M = 2.18, SD = 1.16); and the least mean score intellectual stimulation (M = 1.89, SD = 1.09).

This finding, as showed in table 3, suggests that the academic staff of UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of

Technology) perceived that their superior to some extend are inspiring and motivating, providing meaning and challenges to their followers' work. However, on the other end, they perceived that their leaders were lacked of innovation and creativity in leading their subordinates.

Further analysis was carried out to examine the nature of transactional leadership behavior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM as shown in table 4.

Table 4 demonstrates the transactional leadership behavior of the superior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM

Table 4:
Perceived Transactional Leadership Behavior Exhibit by the Superior of UiTM

Transactional Leadership Behavior	Mean	SD (Standard Deviation)
• Contingent reward:		
1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my effort	1.90	1.052
2. Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	2.24	1.074
3. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	2.14	1.109
4. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectation	2.27	1.187
Average mean score	2.13	1.105
• Management by exception (active):		
1. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	1.98	1.160
2. Concentrate his/her full attention on dealing with mistake, complaints and failures	2.37	1.135
3. Keep tracks of all mistake	2.26	1.131
4. Directs my attention towards failures to meet standard	2.33	1.078
Average mean score	2.23	1.12
• Management by exception (passive):		
1. Fails to interfere until problems become serious	1.50	1.130
2. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action	1.50	1.256
3. Shows that he /she is firm believe in 'if it isn't broke, don't fix it	1.51	1.169
4. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action	2.19	1.158
Average mean score	1.52	1.17
Overall mean scores	2.28	1.13

Mean indicator: low = 0 – 1.33; moderate = 1.34 – 2.67; and high = 2.68 – 4.00.

(Universiti Teknologi MARA or MARA University of Technology). The findings showed that all dimensions in the transactional components mean scores were moderate. However, the result illustrates that dimension of management by exception (active) has the highest mean score (M = 2.23, SD = 1.12). On the other hand, the least mean score was management by exception passive (M = 1.52, SD = 1.17).

This result suggests that the respondents perceived that their leaders watch closely for mistakes, take corrective action before the subordinates make severe error to happen (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; and Northouse, 2007). This study also supports the study done by Amir Sadeghi & Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie (2012). Nevertheless, the overall mean score showed that academic staff of UiTM perceived that their leaders were slightly more towards transactional leadership behavior (M = 2.28, SD = 1.13) as compared to transformational leadership behavior (M =

2.15, SD = 1.11). In other words, this study reflects that the respondents perceived that their leaders clarify followers' responsibilities, performances objectives, and their tasks must be completed (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005).

Objective 2: Analysis on the differences between leadership behavior and gender. Based on the independent t-test shown in table 5, there was no significant differences in leadership behavior base on respondents' place of hometown; where transformational leaders (t = .892, p = 0.374) and transactional leaders (t = -.1298, p = .196). Therefore, the result indicates that gender, i.e. whether the females or males, do not show any significant effect on leadership behavior. This study is parallel to research done by A. Gregory (1990).

Objective 3: Analysis on the level of effective leadership outcomes among the academic staff. Table 6 showed the distribution of mean scores for leadership outcomes (augmentation effects) towards the leadership style of respondents' immediate superior. In term of augmentation

Table 5:
Independent t-test between Leadership Behavior and Gender

	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Transformational:						
Male	61	2.2572	.83105	.892	166	.374
Female	107	2.1417	.79285			
Transaction:						
Male	61	2.2062	.52538	-1.298	166	.196
Female	107	2.32207	.56363			

Table 6:
The Level of Effective Leadership Outcomes

Augmentation Effects by	Mean	SD (Standard Deviation)
Extra effort by subordinates:		
1. Gets me to more than I expected to do	1.97	1.150
2. Heightens my desire to succeed	2.11	1.148
3. Increases my willingness to try harder	2.17	1.130
Average mean score	2.08	1.13
Superior effectiveness:		
1. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs?	2.16	1.046
2. Is effective in representing me to higher authority?	1.87	1.183
3. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements?	2.35	1.083
4. Leads group that is effective	2.23	1.158
Average mean score	2.15	1.116
Subordinate satisfaction:		
1. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying	2.15	1.168
2. Works with me in satisfactory way	2.26	1.108
Average mean scores	2.20	1.138

Mean indicators: low = 0 – 1.33; moderate = 1.34 – 2.67; and high = 2.68 – 4.00.

effect by extra effort by subordinates, the result depicts that the overall mean score were average (M = 2.08, SD = 1.13). The highest mean score in this dimension was item number 3, “Increases my willingness to try harder” (M = 2.17, SD = 1.130). In term of augmentation effect by superior effectiveness, the finding showed that the overall scores was moderate (M = 2.15, SD = 1.116). The highest mean score in this dimension state as superior is effective in meeting organizational requirements (M = 2.35, SD = 1.083).

Nevertheless, the overall mean scores for subordinates also showed a moderate value (M = 2.20, SD = 1.138). The highest mean score in this dimension stated that “Superior works with me in satisfactory way” (M = 2.26, SD = 1.108). Hence, overall finding depict that mean scores on all the augmentation effects, namely: *extra effort* (M = 2.08, SD = 01.13);

leaders’ effectiveness (M = 2.15, SD = 1.116); and *satisfaction* (M = 2.20, SD = 0.1.138) were at moderate level.

The findings are consistent with the study done by Amir Sadeghi & Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie (2012). The result suggests that the leadership behavior exhibited by the superior of UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of Technology) have not reached the specifications of ideal leaders.

Objective 4: Analysis on the relationship between leadership behaviors on leadership outcomes. Table 7 shows the value of correlation coefficient between leadership behavior and effective leadership outcomes which were extra effort, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction. The results showed that there was a positive and high relationships between *extra effort* (r = 0.807, p = 0.00); *effectiveness* (r = 0.853); *satisfaction* (r = 0.833, p = 0.00) on

Table 7:
Correlation Coefficient between Leadership Behavior and Leadership Outcomes

	Leadership Behavior	p-value
Extra effort	0.807	0.00
Leaders effectiveness	0.853	0.00
Subordinate satisfaction	0.833	0.00

leadership behavior.

This study is in line with the research carried out by T.A. Judge & R.F. Piccolo (2004). The result suggests that augmentation effects of transformational leadership tend to provide ultimate satisfaction, foster inspiration, and excitement to put extra effort among subordinates.

This study was intended to investigate the nature of leadership behavior of the superior as perceived by the academic staff of UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of Technology). The finding suggested that the respondents perceived their superiors as showing moderate transformational and transactional leadership behavior. Nonetheless, it is indeed empirically proven that leadership does matter. In fact, some characteristic of transformational leadership, such as idealizes influence (charisma), individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation were moderately exhibited among the superior academic leaders in UiTM.

This finding suggests that academic leaders of UiTM have the tendency to elevate the desires of followers for achievement and self-development, while also promoting the development of groups and organizations (Bass & Avolio, 1997). However, the result showed that these academic leaders were lacking in intellectual stimulating and individual consideration. Therefore, B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (1997) suggested again that one of the ways to obtain effective transformational leadership behavior is to train them early in their careers and provide retaining at the later career stages.

Another interesting scenario is, that the data revealed, that the mean score of transactional leadership style was slightly higher than the mean score of transformational leadership style indicating

that the academic staff perceived that their superiors exhibited a transactional leadership style rather than transformational leadership style. Therefore, it can be inferred that the leaders were perceived more as motivating followers primarily with management by exception (active) and contingent-reward based exchanges. In this sense, the leaders were perceived to be task-oriented rather than developing a closer relationship between leaders and followers.

Subsequently, U.D. Jogulu (2010) asserted that the emergence of transactional leadership in the Malaysian context underscores the acceptance of a paternalistic style of a leader-subordinate relationship which is culture-specific. In this sense, the managers feel comfortable in leading in a transactional manner by being more directive or setting clear limits and expectations to their followers because of the identified societal value of "paternalism". This contention supports other empirical studies of S.G. Redding (1990) and A. Abdullah (2001), where paternalistic leadership is perceived positively.

Nevertheless, it is indeed interesting to find that academics of UiTM perceived leadership behavior of their superior have profound impact on effective leadership outcome, namely: *extra effort*, *effectiveness*, and *satisfaction*. This finding is consistent with previous studies, for examples from J.M. Howell & B.J. Avolio (1993); T.A. Judge & R.F. Piccolo (2004); and F. Molero *et al.* (2007).

On that note, it is suggested that exhibiting both transactional and transformational is equally important because both types of leadership behavior somewhat have significant impact on leadership outcomes. In fact, B.M. Bass (1985) claimed that transformational leadership does not detract from transactional, rather it builds on it, broadening the effects of the leaders on effort and performance.

CONCLUSION

Hence, based from the findings, several conclusions could be highlighted as below:

First, the academic staff perceived that their superior exhibit both moderate transformational and transactional leadership behavior. However, the mean score showed that the academic leader portray a more transactional leadership behavior as compared to transformational leadership. *Second*, the levels of augmentation effects of leadership behavior were moderate on extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction of the academic staff. *Third*, there was no significant differences between leadership behavior and gender. *Fourth*, there were significant relationships between leadership behavior on leadership outcomes.

Thus, the findings of this study have several practical implications to the academic leaders, deans, and managers of higher learning institutions.

First, given the role in public educational institutions which include governance issues and political sensitivity, many public academic leaders appear to be mere conduits for external requirements rather than providers of a sense of direction and purpose for staff. Hence, there is a critical need for strong academic leaderships that could set its mission, values, direction, and maintain a clear focus on the goal, especially to make the change efforts successful. In this line, transformational leadership behavior is useful, because of their ability to assist group members to realign their personal values according to their transformational leader's vision and goals, which creates strong values of internalization, cooperation, and congruence among followers (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Shamir, 1995; Beer & Nohria, 2000; and Jung & Avolio, 2000).

Second, the result of this study indicated that in generating both systems wide change and alteration of subordinates performance and satisfaction, the organization need both transformational and transactional leadership style. Thus, in this context, transformational and transactional style as proposed by B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (1997) could be used in relation to ability and willingness

of subordinates to perform the assigned tasks. Besides, academic leaders also need leadership skills and abilities to lead towards academic and research excellence. To this end, UiTM (*Universiti Teknologi MARA* or MARA University of Technology) or any other organizations in Malaysia need to provide training and on the job experiences as part of their effort to develop their academic leaders and managers.

One of the training courses that could be considered is leadership development program. The goal of the program is to prepare and encourage leaders to act more effectively in the leadership situations they face. Besides, the leadership program should help the participants becomes more intellectually stimulated, inspire motivation, individual considerations and charisma. This nature of leadership development program is very much needed by organizations in order to compete in a turbulent and uncertain environment.

Although the results are encouraging, the present study also has some limitations. This study has focused on only one organization that is UiTM. It is important to take into consideration that UiTM, in its own way, is unique from other learning institutions in terms of its vision, mission, structure, communication systems, and management style. Besides, the study has only focused on academic staff. Thus, a larger sample of employees would have allowed for more accurate results and increase confidence and generalizability.

References

- Abdullah, A. (2001). *Understanding the Malaysian Workforce: Guidelines for Managers*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.
- Anderson, N. *et al.* (2006). "A Construct-Driven Investigation of Gender Differences in a Leadership-Role Assessment Center" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, pp.555-566.
- Avolio, B.J. & J.M. Howell. (1992). "The Impact of Leader Behavior and Leader-Follower Personality Match on Satisfaction and Unit Performance" in K.E. Clark, M.B. Clark & D.R. Campbell [eds]. *Impact of Leadership*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, pp.225-236.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond*

- Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1995). "Theory of Transformational Leadership" in *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, pp.463-478.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Individual, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bass, B.M. & B.J. Avolio. (1997). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B.M. & F.J. Yammarino. (1991). "Congruence of Self and Others' Leadership Ratings of Naval Officers for Understanding Successful Performance" in *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 40, pp.437-454.
- Bass, B.M. et al. (2003). "Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.88(2), pp.207-218.
- Beer, M. & N. Nohria. (2000). "Cracking: The Code of Change" in *Harvard Business Review*, 78, pp.133-141.
- Bennett, T. (2009). "The Relationship between the Subordinate's Perception of the Leadership Style of it Managers and the Subordinate's Perceptions of Manager's Ability to Inspire Extra Effort, to be Effective and to Enhance Satisfaction with Management" in *Proceedings of the Academy of Strategy Management*, Vol.8(1).
- Bolman, L.G. & T.E. Deal. (1992). "Leading and Managing: Effects of Context, Culture, and Gender" in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, pp.314-329.
- Burke, C.S. et al. (2006). "What Types of Leadership Behaviors are Functional in Teams? A Meta-Analysis" in *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, pp.288-307.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bycio, P., R.D. Hackett & J.S. Allen. (1995). "Further Assessments of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, pp.468-478.
- Certo, S.C. & S.T. Certo. (2006). *Modern Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc., 10th edition.
- Chen, H., S. Beck & L. Amos. (2005). "Leadership Styles and Nursing Faculty Job Satisfaction in Taiwan" in *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Vol.4, No.37, pp.374-380.
- Coats, L.T. (2000). "Interpersonal Behavior and the Community College Department Chairperson" in *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24, pp.773-783.
- de Cremer, D. & D. van Knippenberg. (2005). "The Effect of Leader's Self-Sacrifice on Cooperation: Trust and Identification Mediating Charismatic Leadership Effects" in *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26, pp.355-369.
- Dirks, Kurt T. & Donald L. Ferrin. (2002). "Trust in Leadership: Meta-Analytic Findings and Implications for Research and Practice" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.87(4), August, pp.611-628.
- Eagly, A.H. & S.J. Karau. (1991). "Gender and Emergence of Leaders: A Meta Analysis" in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, pp.685-710.
- Eagly, A.H. & M.C. Johannesen-Schmidt. (2001). "The Leadership Styles of Women and Men" in *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, pp.781-797.
- Epitropaki, O. & R. Martin. (2005). "The Moderating Role of Individual Differences in the Relation between Transformational/Transactional Leadership Perceptions and Organizational Identification" in *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp.569-589.
- Ford, J. & R. Backoff. (1988). "Organizational Change in and out of Dualities and Paradox" in R. Quinn & K. Cameron [eds]. *Paradox and Transformation*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, pp.81.121.
- Gregory, A. (1990). "Three Theoretical Perspectives Concerning Women in Management" in *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, pp.257-266.
- Harker, M. & B. Sharma. (2000). "Leadership and the Company Turnaround Process" in *Leadership & Organisational Development Journal*, 21(1). Available [online] also at: <http://www-devel.emerald-library.com/brev/02221ae1.htm> [accessed in Shah Alam, Malaysia: January 18, 2014].
- Hater, J.J. & B.M. Bass. (1988). "Superiors' Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, pp.695-702.
- Heuer, J.J. (2003). "Succession Planning for Key Administrators at Ivy-Plus Universities" in *Dissertations Abstract International*, 64(3), p.740.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J.M. & B.J. Avolio. (1993). "Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Locus of Control, and Support for Innovation: Key Predictors of Consolidated Business-Unit Performance" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, pp.891-902.
- Ingleton, C. (1995). "Gender and Learning: Does Emotion Make a Difference?" in *Higher Education*, 30, pp.232-335.
- Jansen, J., D. Vera & M. Crossan. (2009). "Strategic Leadership for Exploration and Exploitation: The Moderating Role of Environmental Dynamism" in *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.20, pp.5-18.
- Jogulu, U.D. (2010). "Culturally-Linked Leadership Styles" in *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol.31(8), pp.705-719.
- Judge, T.A. & R.F. Piccolo. (2004). "Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.89(5), pp.755-768.
- Jung, D. & B. Avolio. (2000). "Opening the Black Box: An Experimental Investigation of the Mediating Effects of Trust and Value Congruence on Transformational and Transactional Leadership" in *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp.949-964.
- Karau, S.J. & A.H. Eagly. (1999). "Invited Reaction: Gender, Social Roles, and the Emergence of Leaders" in *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10, pp.321-327.
- Kawatra S. & V.R. Krishnan. (2004). "Impact of Gender and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Culture" in *NMIMS Management Review*, Vol.16(1 & 2), pp.1-6.
- Kent, T.W. et al. (2010). "Gender Differences and

- Transformational Leadership Behaviour: Do Both German Men and Women Lead in the Same Way?" in *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol.6(1).
- Kim, H. & S. Shim. (2003). "Gender-Based Approach to the Understanding of Leadership Roles among Retail Managers" in *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14, pp.321-342.
- Krejcie, R.V. & D.W. Morgan. (1970). "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities" in *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Available [online] also at: <http://www.kenpro.org/sample-size-determination-using-krejcie-and-morgan-table/> [accessed in Shah Alam, Malaysia: January 18, 2014].
- Laojavichien, T., L. Fredendall & R. Cantrell. (2009). "The Effects of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Quality Improvement" in *The Quality Management Journal*, Vol.16(2), pp.7-24.
- Lo, M.C., T. Ramayah & Cyril de Run. (2010). "Does Transformational Leadership Style Foster Commitment to Change? The Case of Higher Education in Malaysia" in *Procedia Social and Behavior Sciences*, 2, pp.5384-5388.
- Lord, R.G., C.L. De Vader & G.M. Alliger. (1986). "A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, pp.402-410.
- Lowe, K.B., K.G. Kroeck & N. Sivasubramaniam. (1996). "Effectiveness Correlates of Transformation and Transactional Leadership: A Meta Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature" in *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, pp.385-425.
- Molero, F. et al. (2007). "Relations and Effects of Transformational Leadership: A Comparative Analysis with Traditional Leadership Styles" in *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, Vol.10(2), pp.358-368.
- Nordin, Norshidah. (2013). "Transformational Leadership Behaviour and its Effectiveness Outcomes in a Higher Learning Institution" in *WCIK E-Journal of Integration Knowledge*. E-ISSN 2289-5973. Available [online] also at: <http://worldconferences.net> [accessed in Shah Alam, Malaysia: January 18, 2014].
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 4th edition.
- Redding, S.G. (1990). *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Sadeghi, Amir & Zaidatul Akmaliah Lope Pihie. (2012). "Transformational Leadership and its Predictive Effects on Leadership Effectiveness" in *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol.3(7), April.
- Shamir, B. (1995). "Social Distance and Charisma: Theoretical Notes and an Exploratory Study" in *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, pp.381-394.
- Shamir, B., R.J. House & M.B. Arthur. (1993). "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory" in *Organizational Science*, 4, pp.577-594.
- Sirat, Morshidi, Abdul Razak Ahmad & Norzaini Azman. (2012). "University Leadership in Crisis: The Need for Effective Leadership Positioning in Malaysia" in *Higher Education Policy*, 25(4), pp.511-529.
- Sosik, J.J., B.J. Avolio & S.S. Kahai. (1997). "Effects of Leadership Style and Anonymity on Group Potency and Effectiveness in a Group Decision Support System Environment" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, pp.89-103.
- Trivellas, P. & D. Dargenidou. (2009). "Leadership and Service Quality in Higher Education: The Case of Technological Educational Institute of Larissa" in *International Journal of Quality and Services Sciences*, Vol.1(3), pp.294-310.
- Vecchio, R.P., J.E. Justin & C.L. Pearce. (2008). "The Utility of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Predicting Performance and Satisfaction within a Path-Goal Theory Framework" in *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol.81, pp.71-82.
- Waldman, D.A., B.M. Bass & F.J. Yammarino. (1990). "Adding to Contingent Reward Behavior: The Augmenting Effect of Charismatic Leadership" in *Group & Organization Studies*, 15.
- Wilkenson, A.C. et al. [eds]. (2004). *Performance Management of Academic Staff in South African Higher Education: A Developmental Research Project*. Bloemfontein: Centre for Higher Education Studies and Development, University of the Free State.