

Leadership and Managerial Effectiveness in Higher Education

İzlem GÖZÜKARA

Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul Arel University,
Türkoba Mahallesi, Erguvan Sokak No:26/K 34537, Tepekent – Büyükçekmece, İstanbul, Turkey,
E-mail: izlemg@arel.edu.tr

Abstract Organizational research contains a great variety of theories, models and approaches about managerial effectiveness and specifically about leadership. The present article reviews how major leadership theorists have conceptualized the characteristics of a leader, and examines the strengths and weaknesses of such concepts. The primary objective of the present review is to reveal how the current leadership theories are applied in higher education institutions. This review concludes with an academic leadership summary for educational institutions to enhance managerial effectiveness, which would also be beneficial to future research for studying relationships between specific leadership styles and effectiveness in higher education.

Key words Effective leadership, higher education, leadership, leadership theories, managerial effectiveness

DOI: 10.6007/IJARAFMS/v6-i1/1981

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v6-i1/1981>

1. Introduction

As a term, leadership proposes an image of a strong and dynamic person creating impressive realms, gaining victories, commanding armies or influencing the course of countries (Yukl, 2002). Leaders are typically considered as difference makers and "leadership is often regarded as the single most important factor in the success or failure of institutions" (Bass, 1990). Accordingly, the performance of organizations and institutions depends on leadership to a great extent (Ogawa and Scribner, 2002).

Organizational success is based on several factors such as financial and technical resources, logistics, technology and human resources. Combination of all such factors brings the achievement of goals in an organization. This, in turn, drives organizations to seek the best individuals to lead and manage this process. The organizational expectation from leaders is to possess specific characteristics that will enable positive organizational outcomes. A leader is an influential individual undertaking the leadership role. The other members are considered as followers within an organization. Leadership has significant effects on both followers and the organization.

A great diversity has emerged in the leadership research in the past decade (Northouse, 2001). Such research has resulted in extensive progress by revealing a part of the mechanisms underlying the leadership construct (Avolio *et al.*, 2009). Despite this tremendous diversity, there seems to be an agreement that transformational leadership stands out as an effective style considered essential to the organizational performance and success (Yukl, 1998) since the modern era comes with a constant state of change and survival.

Although leadership has been mostly discussed in organizational context, managerial effectiveness is of great significance also in educational setting. Therefore, the research has similarly focused on the characteristics of behavioral patterns of an effective leader, which would bring educational success and effectiveness. The research on leadership styles in educational institutions is relatively new compared to the research in the organizational context. From this perspective, the present article aims to review the mostly discussed leadership styles in the organizational literature and attempts to reveal the practices of such leadership styles especially in higher education institutions. For this purpose, this article reviews seven dominant theories of leadership in terms of effectiveness and concludes with an academic leadership summary for educational institutions.

2. Literature review. Leadership Theories and Styles

Research on the effectiveness of leadership has progressed to determine the capabilities of a leader such as abilities, competencies, knowledge and behaviors in the past decade (Spendlove, 2007). Such capabilities may be described as a group of behaviors involved in achieving the outcomes desired (Spendlove, 2007). The present article reviews seven theories/models and presents the results of leadership studies conducted in the educational context. The theories included in this review are the Tri-Dimensional Leadership Effectiveness Model and The Vroom-Yetton Decision Model as part of The Situational Theory of Leadership, The Theory of Charismatic Leadership, The Theory of Transformational Leadership, The Transactional Leadership Theory, The Full-Range Leadership Theory (FRLT), and the Four-Frame Model of Leadership as part of the Educational Leadership and Effectiveness.

2.1. The Situational Theory of Leadership

The situational theory was proposed by Hersey and Blanchard in 1969, suggesting that different situations demand different styles of leadership. Situational approaches focuses on the interaction between the leader, the follower and the situation and attempt to establish the causal relationships leading to behavioral predictability.

The first of the well-known models within this approach is the Tri-Dimensional Leadership Effectiveness Model (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). This model proposes that relationship behavior, task behavior and group's readiness are situationally correlated. The basis of this model is the leader-follower interaction. Such interaction is formed by the followers' levels of maturity, ability and readiness combined with the leader's level of support (Hampton, Summer and Weber, 1987). According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), the basis of situational leadership is the interaction among the degree to which a leader provides guidance as task behavior, the degree to which a leader provides socioeconomic support and the degree to which a follower is ready to conduct a particular task or function. Like some of the other scholars (Fiedler, 1967; Blake and Mouton, 1964), Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (1996) underlined that one style of leadership could not fit all situations. This suggests that leaders can be effective if they modify their leadership behaviors in line with the readiness degree of their followers. The situational leadership model includes a third dimension in addition to task and relationship behaviors, which is called effectiveness. The task behavior refers to the degree to which a leader is likely to formulate and describe the roles of members involved in his/her group, whereas the relationship behavior refers to the degree to which a leader is likely to persevere personal relationships between him/herself and his/her group members. The effectiveness refers to the appropriateness of a leader to a particular situation and involves understanding the readiness or maturity level of his/her followers for a particular task.

The second one is Vroom-Yetton Decision Model (Vroom and Yetton, 1973) based on the expectancy theory proposed by Vroom (1964). This is a motivation theory, suggesting that motivation is the mechanism underlying choices, and an individual behaves or makes choices based on the desirability of the outcome. This suggests that leaders should provide followers with an environment that they understand and think effort, performance, satisfaction and outcome are causally related. In other words, an environment consisting of expectancies should be created in organizations to motive employees to perform (Hampton, Summer and Webber, 1987). As part of the situational leadership theory, Vroom developed a decision model with Yetton (1973), which was later expanded in collaboration with Jago (1988), assessing when and how to include employees in decision-making process. This model assumes that participation increases the acceptance of a decision, while acceptance enhances commitment and effectiveness. To achieve this, the authors provided a tree system that includes three leadership styles and five different decision procedures. The leadership styles are autocratic, consultative and group-based. The autocratic leader is basically a dictator who only expects his/her followers to obey. The consultative leader consults with his/her team and makes decision alone. The group-based leader tries to reach a consensus agreement with his/her team and decision accepted by the team is the final decision. Of the five different decision processes, two are autocratic, two are consultative and one is group-based. The most important components of this model are decision quality and decision acceptance.

The Vroom-Yetton model, also known as Vroom-Yetto-Jago model, assumes that problems may possess more than one solution that is acceptable. Although rare, when there is only a single solution and

the group acceptance or support is not necessary for such solution, any of the proposed styles can be used to reach an acceptable solution (Baker, 1996). However, the process of decision-making is highly complicated and dynamic in most cases. Another essential component of this decision model is the matter of time against participation. According to the literature, autocratic leadership can provide faster solutions, whereas other leadership styles are usually associated with more qualitative solutions. Briefly, the process of decision-making is affected by the decision quality, the group acceptance of the decision and the time that is needed to reach the decision (Baker, 1996). The Vroom-Yetton model, however, is not able to identify the differences occurring in particular situations, which is considered a significant weakness. Furthermore, the original model does not take time constraints, the follower information level and absence of physical closeness into account. Despite such weak points, the study by Vroom and Jago (1988) reported a 62% success for the Vroom-Yetton model (Yukl, 1998).

After many revisions, Blanchard (2007) introduced the second situational leadership theory called SLT-II. This new version contains a modified interaction between the behavior of a leader and the developmental level of a follower. Although the two underlying constructs (readiness/maturity) are the same but referred to as follower competence and commitment, the additive nature of these constructs are not emphasized in SLT-II. According to Thompson and Vecchio (2009), SLT-II provides a clearer approach to determine an optimal leadership style for followers with full development; however, such optimal style is likely not to be predicted by competence and commitment in some situations.

2.2. The Theory of Charismatic Leadership

The charismatic leadership theory was developed by House in 1976 based on the work by Weber (1947). The term charisma was first used by Weber (1947), referring to a type of influence that is based on follower perceptions built by a leader through unique characteristics (Yukl, 1993). However, House (1976) was the first that used this term in the organizational context and called organizational charisma, defined as “an extraordinary relationship between an individual (leader) and others (followers) based on shared deeply-held ideological values” (House, 1976). The author then developed the Neo-Charismatic Leadership Paradigm (NLP) to address the way of leaders to be successful in achieving extraordinary outcomes when the situation is critical and to build stunning followership (House and Aditya, 1997). According to this theory, a charismatic leader has five types of behavior, goal articulation, role modeling, image modeling, high expectations and confidence in followers. Although this theory received negative criticisms due to the scope of action limited to the interaction between the leader and the follower, the author demonstrated that charismatic leaders are equipped with persistent skills of communication, which impact the beliefs of the followers in various contexts, regardless of the context being a nation or an organization (Fiol, Harris and House, 1999). These five behaviors were later identified as three behavioral dimensions of charismatic leaders by Kim, Danserau and Kim (2002) based on correlations, which are called vision-related behavior, personal behavior and empowering behavior. The five behaviors of charismatic leaders and the charisma concept were used by the theorists of transformational leadership as part of idealized influence, which is one of the core behavioral patterns providing effective leadership (Antonakis and House, 2002). As well, the constructs vision and charisma are shared by both charismatic leadership and transformational leadership theories with the difference lying in the organizational environment that is included in the charismatic theory.

2.3. The Theory of Transformational Leadership

The transformational leadership theory started with the work of Burns (1978), expanded by Bass (1985), and then supported by the studies of Kark and Shamir (2002), Conger and Kanungo (1998) and many others (Antonakis and House, 2002). The transformational leadership concept of Burns (1978) was turned into a more practical theory by Bass (1985). Later in 1998, Bass and Avolio identified five behavioral patterns of a transformational leadership, which are idealized influence (attributed charisma), idealized influence (behavioral charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Antonakis and House, 2002).

Idealized influence refers to role modeling and trust building, driving followers to respect and admire the leader (Bass *et al.*, 2003). Inspirational motivation is providing an applicable and clear vision, motivating

and inspiring followers to find meaning in working to achieve goals both at individual and organizational levels (Bass, 1985). Intellectual stimulation refers to creativity promotion by challenging and changing the followers' way of thinking to solve problems (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Individualized consideration is the genuine concern and respect for the talents and needs of every individual (Judge and Piccolo, 2004).

Transformational leadership has some similarities to charismatic leadership as it includes charisma, stimulation and inspiration to define the characteristics of a leader. For instance, idealized influence and inspirational motivation are also collectively called as charisma. Yet, these two leadership theories are different basically due to the sociological element of charismatic leadership, which was originated in the work of Weber (1947). Transformational leadership theory was argued to ignore organizational environment as an important component for effective leadership, but Bass (1998) showed the evidence that the model is valid in various situations and crisis in particular since transformational leaders stand against the status quo (Antonakis and House, 2002). Another major argument to this theory is that transformational leaders are not able to have the followers satisfy specific outcomes, which is considered as a characteristic of transactional leaders. These criticisms and arguments were responded by Bass and Avolio (1994, 1997) by developing the Full-Range Leadership Theory, which will be discussed in the following sections of the article.

2.4. The Transactional Leadership Theory

The transactional leadership theory was proposed by Burns in 1978. This theory is based on the relationship between a leader and a follower, and such relationship relies on exchanges or contingent rewards established by the leader for success recognition (Whittington, 2004). The theory of Burns (1978) was later expanded by Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1997), resulting in three key dimensions of transactional leaders, contingent reward, active management by exception and passive management by exception. Contingent reward refers to the constructive interaction between a leader and a follower, in which performance determines the reward. The leader explains the roles and expectations provide required resources and successful performance leads to reward. Active management by exception refers to the interaction in which the leader observes the performance of the follower and makes corrections throughout the process. Passive management by exception refers to the interaction in which the leader intervenes only when there are mistakes or the standards are not met (Antonakis and House, 2002).

The major argument to this leadership theory is its limited motivational source for creative followers. Followers may keep their focus on success when the goals are set before; however, this may also drive followers not to put any more efforts since there would be no rewards (Bryant, 2003).

2.5. The Full-Range Leadership Theory

The Full-Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) was developed by Bass and Avolio (1994) to increase leader effectiveness. This theory suggests three categorizations of leadership behaviors as transformational, transactional, non-leadership (laissez-faire) characterized by nine distinct factors as five transformational (idealized influence-attributed, idealized influence-behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration), three transactional (contingent reward, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception) and one laissez-faire (Table 2).

Table 2. Full-Range Leadership Theory (Bass and Avolio, 1997)

Leadership Style	Leadership Scales
Transformational Leadership	1. Idealized Influence (attributed) 2. Idealized Influence (behavior) 3. Inspirational Motivation 4. Intellectual Stimulation 5. Individualized Consideration
Transactional Leadership	6. Contingent Reward 7. Active Management by Exception 8. Passive Management by Exception
Laissez-Faire	9. Laissez-Faire

Bass and Avolio (1997) demonstrated that transformational and contingent reward factors and effectiveness are strongly positively correlated, whereas there is a negative or none correlation between the controlling actions of transactional leadership and laissez-faire and effectiveness. Transformational leadership style has been also shown to be more effective than transactional leadership style as well as positively correlated with organizational performance (Benjamin, 2006).

However, according to Yukl (1999), individualized consideration and inspirational behavior are overlapping constructs, leading to a strong argument to this theory. Additionally, Beyer (1999) and Yukl (1999) stated that the obscure use of some concepts from the full-range theory such as charisma, transformation and vision results in confusion.

2.6. Four-Frame Model of Leadership

Regarding leadership, styles can be described as the leaders' approaches to guide their followers. Leaders use such styles to carry out tasks and assignments in a successful manner. The situation, the leader or the assignment in question gives rise to different styles of leadership. The literature on leadership involves a great number of organizational theories; however, the research on educational setting, specifically on higher education has commonly focused on the Four-Frame-Model of Leadership proposed by Bolman and Deal (1991). According to Bolman and Deal (1991), individuals do not use a single frame in all cases, but they usually tend toward one or two frames of action. The four frames suggested by Bolman and Deal (1991) are to categorize the perspectives and behaviors of leaders regarding their styles of leadership.

The structural frame is related to rules, responsibilities and policies, focusing on structure, environment and strategy and suggesting that problem arises when structure does not fit the situation. This frame takes its origin from sociology. The human resource frame is related to participation, support and information sharing, focusing on the interaction between the needs of individuals and the organization. This frame takes its origin from psychology. The political frame is related to power and interest distribution with persuasion, negotiation and coercion, focusing on the disagreement among various groups and interests for limited resources, and suggesting that problem arises when the power becomes concentrated in the wrong places or distributed too extensively. This frame takes its origin from political science. The symbolic frame is related to inspiration, impression and rituals, focusing on symbols to acquire attention as if an organization is a stage and suggesting that problem arises when symbols lose their meaning and potency. To Bolman and Deal (1991), such styles have an influence on the follower productivity.

Briefly, four frames in this leadership model are considered different instruments that can be utilized to understand the leadership skills required by a situation (Trees, 2006). These frames have been also used in several studies on leadership effectiveness among various populations (Borden, 2000; Cantu, 1997).

3. Leadership Research in Education

Table 3 presents the studies investigating different leadership styles in the educational context in chronological order.

Table 3. Academic Leadership Research

Year	Author	Leadership Theory/ Model	Type of Organization	Findings
1987	Vecchio	Situational Leadership	High schools	Support only for followers with low levels of readiness/maturity. The situational theory may not be very useful in predicting others' attitudes and performance.
1989	Bensimon	Four-Frame Model	Colleges in USA	Most of the college presidents are not effective in using multiple frames.
1996	Lowe <i>et al.</i>	Full-Range Leadership	Meta-analysis	Active and passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership were negatively or inconsistently associated with the respective outcomes

Year	Author	Leadership Theory/ Model	Type of Organization	Findings
1997	Fernandez, & Vecchio	Situational Leadership	Universities	No evidence to support the situational theory.
1997	Leithwood & Jantzi	Transformational Leadership	A large school system in Canada	Significant effect of transformational leadership practices on extraordinary commitment levels
1997	Cantu	Four-Frame Model	Masters and Doctoral Institutions in Public Colleges and Universities	The primarily used frame is the human resource frame, followed by the structural, political and symbolic frames.
1998	Masson	Full-Range Leadership	Community colleges in America	Equal effect of predicting perceived leadership effectiveness for both transformational leadership and the combined idealized influence, individualized consideration, contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership
1998	Bethel	Four-Frame Model	Bible colleges	Statistically significant relationship between the structural frame and the external organizational effectiveness domain, the human resource frame and the academic domain and the symbolic frame and the external organizational effectiveness domain
2000	Leithwood & Jantzi	Transformational Leadership	Large school district in Canada	Strong significant effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions, and moderately significant total effects on student engagement
2000	Day <i>et al.</i>	Transformational Leadership	Primary, secondary and special schools in UK	Positive effect of transformational leadership on productivity
2000	Borden	Four-Frame Model	Campus directors of state universities and community colleges in Florida, USA	The primarily used frame is the human resource frame
2000	Russel	Four-Frame Model	Academic deans in community colleges in USA	The primarily used frame is the human resource frame
2002	Silins <i>et al.</i>	Transformational Leadership	High schools in Australia	Positive effect of transformational leadership on organizational learning
2002	Meyer <i>et al.</i>	Full-Range Leadership	Meta-analysis	Strong correlation between affective commitment and transformational leadership
2003	Webb	Full-Range Leadership	Member colleges and universities in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) in America	Negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership and leadership effectiveness Combined idealize influence, individualized consideration and transactional contingent reward significantly predict the perceived leadership effectiveness
2005	Leithwood & Jantzi	Transformational Leadership	Review of Transformational School Leadership Research 1996–2005	Significant, primarily indirect effects of transformational leadership on both student success and engagement
2006	Casimir <i>et al.</i>	Full-Range Leadership	Australian and Chinese followers	Positive effect of transformational and contingent reward dimensions on job performance
2010	Tipple	Situational Leadership	Online adjunct faculties	Relevance of theory in distant education context due to broad-range changes on various aspects.
2010	Moolenaar <i>et</i>	Transformational	Elementary schools in	Positive impact of transformational leadership

Year	Author	Leadership Theory/ Model	Type of Organization	Findings
	<i>al.</i>	Leadership	Netherlands	on the innovative atmosphere of schools.
2010	Sypawka	Four-Frame Model	Community college deans in North Carolina, USA	The primarily used frame is the human resource frame
2013	Bo	Transformational Leadership	Universities in China	Significant and positive influence of transformational leadership on employee organizational commitment
2014	Al-Husseini & Elbeltagi	Transformational Leadership	Public and private higher education institutions in Iraq	Significant effect of transformational leadership on innovation, resulting in increased goal-directed behaviors of followers and organizational change and trust.
2014	Bakar & Mahmood	Transformational Leadership	Public universities in Malaysia	Significant and positive impact of transformational leadership on performance

4. Conclusions

Three approaches of leadership have been commonly used to examine leadership in higher educational research. The first one, traits approach is based on the charismatic theory of Weber (1947) and concentrates on the leaders' personality and characteristics. According to Weber (1978), charismatic leaders are "supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities". The second one, behavior approach is concerned with task and people as two primary behavior categories (Mouton & Blake, 1984). However, this approach fails to provide which behaviors are appropriate for different situations and simply ignores circumstances and contingencies (Yukl, 2010). The third one, situational approach focuses on situational factors and contingencies. Fiedler's (1967) contingency model tries to explain leadership by using three main components as task structure, leader position power and leader-member relationship, whereas the theory of Vroom and Yetton (1973) focuses on the behaviors of a leader during the process of making decisions. According to Middlehurst (1993), the approaches of traits and behaviors provide limited explanation of leadership, while the situational approach offers a better insight as it deals with the environmental factors that are related to university staff, students and academics.

The management literature on higher education clearly shows that the behaviors of an academic leader have significant effects on faculty and university development (Çetin and Kınık, 2015). There is an ongoing debate regarding the most effective and appropriate leadership style in academic environment, and it is not surprising that the dominant theory in the literature is transformational leadership theory.

In the educational context, academic leadership has been examined in many recent studies (Bryman and Lilley, 2009; Kelloway *et al.*, 2000). Such studies revealed that academic leadership is highly complicated and demanding, and associated with considerable amount of stress and high levels of burnout (Brown and Moshavi, 2002).

The literature review conducted in the present article demonstrates that prior studies have mostly focused on transformational and transactional styles and the four frame model. As seen in Table 3, previous studies could not establish any evidence supporting the situational theory. On the contrary, transformational leadership has often been related with positive outcomes such as organizational learning, leadership effectiveness, commitment and engagement. Likewise, four-frame model of leadership has also gained attention and produced positive outcomes to a certain extent. The prior research shows that this model is more common among academic leaders in the Western countries.

In conclusion, it is not very likely for academic presidents to have all leadership characteristics specified in a wide range of leadership theories. In the academic world, presidents are usually selected due to their research abilities, intellect and credibility in their specializations (Gilley, 2003). Nevertheless, these may not correspond to an effective leadership and the required insight of an effective leader (Bass, 1990). Therefore, higher education institutions may closely follow the progress in academic leadership and adopt an approach appropriate for their institution.

References

1. Al-Husseini, S., and Elbeltagi, I. (2014). Transformational leadership and innovation: a comparison study between Iraq's public and private higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(1), 159-181.
2. Antonakis, J., and House, R. (2002). *The full-range leadership theory: The way forward*. Transformational and charismatic leadership: *The road ahead*. New York: Elsevier.
3. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., and Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Reviews of Psychology*, 60:421–49.
4. Baker, E. (1996). Leadership styles of women in higher education: An ethnographic study. *Journal of the American Association for Women in Junior Colleges and Community Colleges*, 8, 12-15.
5. Bakar, M.S., and Mahmood, R. (2014). Linking transformational leadership and corporate entrepreneurship to performance in the public higher education institutions in Malaysia. *Advances in Management and Applied Economics*, 4(3), 109-122.
6. Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press, New York.
7. Bass, B.M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications* (3rd ed). New York: The Free Press.
8. Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
9. Bass, B.M., Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
10. Bass, B.M., and Avolio, B.J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. CA, Mind Garden.
11. Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., and Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
12. Bethel, C. (1998). A study of the relationship between presidential leadership orientation and organizational effectiveness in bible colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(06), 1838A. (UMI No. 9926656).
13. Benjamin, L., and Flynn, F.J. (2006). Leadership style and regulatory mode: Value from fit? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 216-230
14. Bensimon, E. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. In Peterson (Eds.), *ASHE reader of organization and governance in higher Education* (pp. 421-431). Lexington, MA: Ginn.
15. Beyer, J.M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 307–330.
16. Blake, R.R., and Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
17. Blanchard, K.H. (2007). *Leading at a higher level*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
18. Bo, Yu (2013). The influence study of transformational leadership in university on teachers' organizational commitment: The construction and verification of a theoretical model. *Canadian Social Science*, 9(4), 126-137.
19. Bolman, L., and Deal, T.E. (1991) *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Josey Bass Publishers.
20. Borden, M. (2000). Leadership orientations of area campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems: A frame analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3913.
21. Brown, F.W. and D. Moshavi. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8, 79–92.
22. Bryant, S. (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing and exploiting organizational knowledge. *The Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(4).
23. Bryman, A., and Lilley, S. (2009). Leadership Researchers on Leadership in Higher Education. *Leadership*, 5(3): 331–346.
24. Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row Publishers, New York.

25. Cantu, D. (1997). The leadership frames of academic deans randomly selected and nominated as exceptionally effective at public colleges and universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58(03), 657A. (UMI No. 9724134).
26. Casimir, G., Waldman, D.A., Bartran, T., and Yang, S. (2006). Trust and the relationship between leadership and follower performance: Opening the black box in Australia and China. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12, 68–84.
27. Conger, J.A., and Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations* (Eds). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
28. Çetin, M.O., and Kınık, F.S.F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 519 – 527.
29. Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolly, H. and Beresford, J. (2000). *Leading schools in times of change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
30. Fernandez, C.F., and Vecchio, R.P. (1997). Situational leadership theory revisited: A test of an across-jobs perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 67–84.
31. Fiedler, F E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
32. Fiol, M., Harris, D., and House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 449-482.
33. Gilley, D. (2003). Bedside manner and effective academic administrative leadership. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 124, 95–102.
34. Hampton, D.R., Summer, C E., and Webber, R.A. (1987). *Organizational behavior and the practice of management* (5th Ed.), Glenview, IL : Harper-Collins.
35. Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K.H. (1988). *The management of organizational behaviour* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
36. Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., and Johnson, D.E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th Ed). Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
37. House, R.J. (1976). A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (eds), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
38. House, R., and Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-474.
39. Judge, T.A., and Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.
40. Kark, R., and Shamir, B. (2002). *The dual effect of transformational leadership: priming relational and collective selves and further effects on followers*. Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead. New York: Elsevier.
41. Kelloway, E.K., Barling, J., Kelley, E., Comtois, J., and Gatién, B. (2003). Remote transformational leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(3), 163 – 171.
42. Kim, K., Dansereau, F., and Kim, I. (2002). *Extending the concept of charismatic leadership: An illustration using Bass's (1990) categories*. Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The road ahead. F.J. New York. Elsevier.
43. Leithwood, K., and Jantzi, D. (1997). Explaining variation in teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership: A replication. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(4), 312-331.
44. Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129.
45. Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational leadership research, 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-200.
46. Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., and Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385–425, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2).
47. Mason, A.M. (1998). *Perception of presidential leadership by chief academic officers and their relationship to job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and perceived effectiveness in American community colleges: A composite model of transformational and transactional leadership* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

48. Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L., and Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20–52.
49. Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading academics*. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
50. Moolenaar, N.M., Daly, A.J., and Slegers, P.J.C. (2010). Occupying the principal position: examining relationships between transformational leadership, social network position, and schools' innovative climate. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 623– 670.
51. Mouton, J.S., and Blake, R.R. (1984). *Synergogy: A New strategy for education, training and development*. San Francisco; London: Jossey-Bass.
52. Northouse, P.G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
53. Ogawa, R.T., and Scribner, S.P. (2002). Leadership: Spanning the technical and institutional dimensions of organizations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(6), 576-88.
54. Russell, C. (2000). Community college academic deans: Leadership frames and stress. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(10), 3866A. (UMI No. 9990484).
55. Silins, H.C., Mulford, W.R. and Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 613-642.
56. Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(5), 407- 417.
57. Sypawka, W., Mallett, W., and McFadden, C. (2010). Leadership styles of community college academic deans. *The Community College Enterprise*, 16, 1; 63-74.
58. Thompson, G., and Vecchio, R.P. (2009). Situational leadership theory: A test of three version. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20:837-848.
59. Tipple, R. (2010). Effective leadership of online adjunct faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/oidla/spring131/tipple131.html>.
60. Trees, D.H. (2006). *Leadership orientations of senior administrators at American metropolitan universities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Florida: University of Central Florida.
61. Vecchio, R.P. (1987). Situational leadership theory: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 444–451.
62. Vroom, V.H., and Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
63. Vroom, V H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
64. Vroom, V.H., and Jago, A.G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
65. Yukl, G. (1993). A retrospective on Robert House's 1976 theory of charismatic leadership and recent revisions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(3/4), 367-373.
66. Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organisations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
67. Yukl, G.A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285–305.
68. Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
69. Yukl, G.A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. London: Pearson.
70. Webb, K.S. (2003). *Presidents' leadership behaviors associated with followers' job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and presidential effectiveness at Evangelical colleges and universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Northern Texas.
71. Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. (T. Parsons, Translator). New York: Free Press.
72. Weber, M. (1978). *Max Weber economy and society*. CA: Berkeley, University of California Press.
73. Wittington, J.L. (2004). Corporate executives as beleaguered rulers: The leader's motive matters. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, (3).