

Educational Leadership:  
Examining the Influence of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Theory in  
Educational Leadership Discourse

Jason Lennard, BBA

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of requirements for the degree of  
Master of Education

Department of Educational Studies  
Faculty of Education, Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario

© Jason Lennard 2020

**Abstract**

This conceptual analysis of higher educational leadership explores the influence of transactional and transformational leadership theories on 21<sup>st</sup> century leadership discourse. Applying an in-depth understanding of transactional and transformational leadership theories amassed through the work of Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, and Flowers (2005), and Wheatly (2007), this research identifies *transactional leadership systemic concepts* of standardization, control, and efficiency, and *transformational leadership systemic concepts* of collaboration, shared meaning, and change as indicators of leadership theory that lend significance within higher educational leadership literature. Utilizing a framework consisting of these systemic concepts, this research identifies essential insights within the espousal of transactional and transformational leadership theory in higher education leadership discourse.

### **Acknowledgements**

Research reported in this study was conducted in the Department of Educational Studies, Master of Education (MEd) program, at Brock University in St. Catharines, Ontario.

My opening thanks goes to my wife, Tia Lennard, and our daughter, Juliana Lennard, for providing never-ending support and constant motivation to achieve my goal. It's certainly been a challenging journey throughout my studies, which has included multiple career changes, the birth of our daughter, and the purchase of a new home, but Tia, you never stopped being my number one fan.

I'd also like to thank Dr. Michael Owen for his unwavering guidance, and for agreeing to tackle such an ambitious timeline for this final piece. Through your leadership and expertise, it's been a wonderful experience to see this research paper come to life.

Finally, I reserve my final 'thank-you' to my co-pilot throughout this journey, Claire Price. I am forever indebted to you for the countless hours and never-ending reviews of all my final paper submissions. Your limitless unique comments within each review provided the right amount of encouragement to complete this journey!

**Table of Contents**

**ABSTRACT** ..... II

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**..... III

**CHAPTER ONE: POSITIONING THE STUDY**..... 1

**BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**..... 2

**CONTEXT OF THE STUDY** ..... 8

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY** ..... 9

**ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK**..... 10

**METHOD OF ANALYSIS**..... 17

**METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES** ..... 18

**SCOPE, DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS** ..... 21

**RATIONALE AND POSITIONALITY**..... 22

**CHAPTER TWO: RESULTS OF THE STUDY** ..... 25

**TRANSACTIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMIC CONCEPTS**..... 25

**TRANSFORMATIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMIC CONCEPTS** ..... 34

**SYSTEMIC ANCHORS AND SHIFTS**..... 42

**CHAPTER SUMMARY** ..... 45

**CHAPTER THREE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**..... 48

**SUMMARY OF THE STUDY** ..... 48

**DISCUSSION** ..... 49

**IMPLICATIONS**..... 55

**CONCLUSION** ..... 59

**REFERENCES**..... 61

**APPENDIX A** ..... 66

**APPENDIX B** ..... 67

## CHAPTER ONE: POSITIONING THE STUDY

Educational leadership is an immense subject area that can be variably focused on primary, junior, and secondary schools, postsecondary institutions, and non-formal and informal educational organizations. I have chosen to focus on educational leadership at the postsecondary level and, more specifically, within the Canadian postsecondary context. The academic literature on postsecondary educational leadership is vast, complex, and – not surprisingly – often contradictory. There are many theories and models that shape and explain the norms and expectations associated with being an administrator in a postsecondary institution. Serving as informational guidelines for institutional leaders, these models and theories provide the knowledge and foundational structures needed to assure our education systems continue to flourish, be well-managed, and be well-led. Yet, there are, within the published research, incompatible or contradictory models and theories of educational leadership that co-exist and that, as a result, create confusion among postsecondary leaders seeking to identify a model(s) or theory(ies) suitable for their institution and for their approach to leadership.

This analysis is formulated through philosophies surrounding two contrasting narratives within organizational leadership: *transactional* and *transformational leadership theories*. The analysis will examine the impact of both of these theories within the educational leadership literature. More specifically, I will assess the influence of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the evolution of 21<sup>st</sup> century postsecondary educational leadership.

### **Background of the Study**

Postsecondary educational leadership is a complex and complicated field of study. Postsecondary administrators provide leadership in a regulated environment comprised of policies, guidelines, professional standards, and principles that construct our educational landscape. This analysis reveals the extent to which educational leadership in such a field is influenced by transactional and transformational management theories.

In my review of the literature on educational leadership and, in particular, leadership in postsecondary education, I identified two models of leadership that are often highlighted: *transactional leadership* and *transformational leadership*. While set up as models in opposition one to the other, they often co-exist within all organizations – and, particularly, in my experience, in postsecondary institutions. *Transactional leadership* approaches may be viewed to be those modeled by middle managers, while *transformational leadership* characteristics are those modelled by senior leaders, including presidents, vice-presidents, and deans (although not exclusively) (Jones & Harvey, 2017). Emerging leaders often espouse transformational or conscious leadership theories as their approach to leadership, yet they engage more frequently in transactional practices. This can be seen in senior leaders, whose public personas are those of transformational leaders, frequently engage in transactional practices to achieve their goals and objectives (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). In my efforts to understand this dichotomy between two approaches to educational leadership and what one *actually* observes in practice, I have chosen to use an analysis methodology (see Methodological Procedures section below) to explore the systematic body of concepts – or *theory* – that undergirds these two approaches to leadership.

Prior to analysing the literature, it is useful to define what it is that I mean by *leadership* and *educational leadership*. There are many definitions of leadership. Much of the literature highlights that leadership is not position-dependent: a title, for instance, does not signify who is a leader or who possesses leadership qualities. As Yukl (in Leithwood et al., 2004) notes,

leadership influences ‘. . . the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities to accomplish objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization.’ (1994, p. 3)

Leadership, then, is, “the ability to guide and influence others, to complete a task or outcome the way I/we want” (Impactful and Meaningful Leadership, 2019, para. 4).

Expanding on these ideas, Kirby, Paradise, and King (1992) position *meaningful leadership* as the ability to alter their environments. They contend that effective leaders do not necessarily react to environmental circumstances; rather, they create them through routine actions. These actions consist: (i) articulating and focusing on a vision and mission; (ii) creating and maintaining a positive image in the minds of followers/subordinates; (iii) showing confidence in, and respect for, followers; and (iv) behaving in a manner that reinforces the vision and mission of the organization. Although Kirby et al. argue that it is difficult to adapt multiple leadership theories or models to different situations, leaders learn to expand their range of environmental knowledge and become effective in the routine application of their approach to leadership in different

environmental circumstances. They contend that effective leadership can be identified in ordinary hierarchy levels such as middle management, military officers, and teaching personnel.

Kirby et al. (1992) suggest that effective leaders demonstrate an ‘unusual level of commitment’ to the modeling of expected attitudes and behaviours and take enhanced measures in support of identified goals and objectives. Through the notion of ‘leading by example,’ effective leaders actively demonstrate and communicate their vision to subordinates, also referred to as followers, as a means to accomplish the institutions’ and leaders’ goals and objectives; this is done by altering workplace narratives and modifying the work environment in ways that support subordinates to work towards such institutional goals. In turn, followers identify their own needs, perspectives, and desires to develop new skills and attributes. As a result, these leaders are viewed in a more positive context through changing workplace narratives (i.e. working longer hours with increased dedication and devotion), thereby resulting in further developed levels of trust between leaders and followers.

Similarly, Tschannen-Moran (2007) identifies the building of trust between leaders and followers as the central determinant for establishing a successful higher educational organization. Both the creation and maintenance of healthy relationships between an institution’s leadership and faculty, students, and surrounding communities are essential components to a leader’s successful completion of their term and the achievement of institutional priorities. Without trust, the progress made by the effectiveness of leaders within an educational institution can suffer due to a disconnect between leaders and these key constituents. If a disconnect or divide occurs, trust may be

completely eroded throughout the educational community, affecting the institution's overall academic integrity and reputation. Tschannen-Moran contends that recent demands for increased faculty accountability, coupled with major institutional changes and an ever-changing educational landscape, place greater expectations on organizations to be trusted to ensure that appropriate support measures exist to support affected stakeholders. Tschannen-Moran argues that without trusting environments for students to develop within and connect to their communities, they will divert energies from their studies towards a mentality of self-protection. Trust is an essential component, then, to effective leadership within educational communities, as it promotes an environment built on open and effective communication and engagement among stakeholders, including but not limited to students, teaching faculty, support staff, and the surrounding community(ies). The ability to ask constituents/stakeholders for assistance in institutional governance requires trust in organizational leaders in order to establish a shared vision and objectives – all while continuing to inspire and develop faculty, students, and surrounding communities.

While trust in or trustworthiness of a leader is essential for leaders to be successful, the type of leadership most individuals – leaders and followers alike – seek is one that appeals to that person's values and emotions, formulated through sound communication, and one that is morally focused (Sergiovanni, 2007). For many in educational institutions, the idea of *servant leaders* has taken hold and become highly attractive, as it aligns with the self-concept that many who work in educational institutions have of themselves, their profession, and their institution's mission, vision, and values. *Servant leadership* is a form of leadership that aids in the balance of helping

others within an organization with the desire to perform the principles and standards that constitute the basis of a community (Sergiovanni, 2007). Sergiovanni identifies that the alignment between an educational institution and the principles and standards of those directly affected by the quality of education must improve due to the fact that educational institutions are communities consisting of learners. Therefore, an educational leader must identify as ‘a lead learner,’ that is, one who demonstrates the expected attitudes and demeanor of servant leadership within the organization and exhibits enthusiasm to develop and grow as an individual. As a lead learner, the educational leader ensures the surrounding learning community’s values align with that of the institution. By gaining legitimacy through these actions, an educational leader develops trust within the community by actively serving the needs of the institution and its stakeholders. This results in confidence among the community (constituents) that the institution’s leader possesses the appropriate skillsets needed to instill and/or reinforce and articulate both a values system and organizational morals that are worth embracing.

This brief overview illustrates some contrasting approaches to educational leadership theory. More important, however, is how these theoretical approaches influence our understanding of transactional and transformational theories.

For many aspiring leaders, the prevalent management philosophies of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century focused on two core theories: *transactional leadership theory* and *transformational leadership theory*. *Transactional leadership theory* concentrates on clarifying, explaining, and implementing the status quo requirements, roles, and rewards of the tasks (Kirby et al., 1992). Transactional theory, as presented in Tschannen-Moran (2007), focuses on performance outcomes and measurable objectives. However, both

Kirby et al. (1992) and Tschannen-Moran (2007) also reference and analyse *transformational leadership theory* when they identify the importance of decentralised leadership and foundational relationships among constituents.

Overall, leadership theory, as Sergiovanni (2007) suggests, has a closer relation to transformational leadership theory when it acknowledges the importance of serving the needs of all students and faculty, as well as the values and objectives that model the organization. Transformational theory focuses on the criticalness of transparency in communication and providing clear directional pathways for organizational visions and supplemented mission statements (Basham, 2012). Transformational theory advocates the importance of a shared vision between an organization and its affected stakeholders, as well as continued efforts to collectively accomplish core values and objectives (Wheatley, 2006). As a result of shifts within the educational leadership discourse, transformational theory has been adopted as the most common approach in modern postsecondary academic institutions. By forging a new vision and shared core values through the strengthening of intra-institutional relationships and communication channels, an organization is able to become stronger as a whole than if merely relying on separate collective units.

As a result of exceptional enhancements in technology in the education sector and change within our current socioeconomic conditions, Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2007) suggest that the role of leaders is in constant mutation. Our society constantly adapts to changes in the political, economic, technological, and ethical landscapes, which has compelled leaders to incorporate multiple leadership theories and models into their practice. Komives et al. (2007) posit that there were times when individuals held

positions of power as a result of personal attributes such as height and self-confidence or were embraced due to their understanding of situational context and how to adapt leadership qualities to such contexts. During these periods, communal support highlights servant leaders as a result of social or civil rights ideology, or support stemming from captivating and poised public personas. Komives et al. (2007) contend that there is no single form of leadership that can be effectively applied to every situation: some organizations require leaders who are transactional, focused with machine-like precision to ensure centralized procedures and predictability exist, while for other organizations and, perhaps, stages of development for stakeholders affected the opposite may be true. Organizational crises and uncontrollable circumstances often arise without warning and Komives et al. identify new approaches surrounding leadership authenticity and the capacity to model desired behaviours and value traits observed by all constituents. They highlight, for instance, the recognition and power that trust and hope can bring to an organization, as well as understanding the personalities and behaviours of students, faculty, and administrative professionals through adaptable leadership models.

### **Context of the Study**

An interest in exploring the influence of transactional and transformational leadership theory on educational leadership discourse stems from my personal development and professional management roles within postsecondary institutions, as well as my exposure to the literature on postsecondary leadership during my time in the Master of Education (M. Ed.) program at Brock University. These personal experiences have highlighted the discourse that currently exists within the postsecondary educational system broadly in Canada. Once demarcated by performance-based results and

characterized by central governance and top-down hierarchical structures, postsecondary education institutions are now challenged to become more collaborative by demands imposed on the leadership from outside forces (the government and public) and inside constituents' (faculty, staff and students) active involvement in the decision-making processes or shared governance, and the decentralisation of leadership. My research is designed if this shift reflects the emergent hegemony of transformation leadership styles or the inevitable tension between management and administration (primarily but not exclusive non-academic) and teaching faculty as institutions are required by governments to pursue more transactional-driven results and less transformational engagement with students and communities. This is seen through the Ontario governments current Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process, which requires each of the provinces 45 publicly funded post-secondary institutions to identify institutional priorities for three-year periods (College and University Strategic Mandate Agreements, 2019). Grant-based funding is then allocated based on an institutions ability to successfully fulfill their identified priorities. While the agreements are said to help increase institutional excellence and promotion of student success, they also serve as a mechanism to increase accountability towards each individual institution (College and University Strategic Mandate Agreements, 2019).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this analysis is to explore transactional and transformational leadership theories-related influences in the scholarly literature on postsecondary educational leadership. In doing so, I was able to isolate key identifiers or systemic concepts that shape transactional and transformational management theories in scholarly

articles by Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, and Flowers (2005), and Wheatly (2007). This analysis of current educational leadership articles identified the key concepts of transactional and transformational management theories. The intention of the analysis was to identify and assess those concepts pertaining to transactional and transformational leadership theories and their influence on the recent discourse on educational leadership.

### **Analytic Framework**

Grounded in the research of Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge et al. (2005), and Wheatley (2007), this conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership theories examines the key systemic concepts and characteristics of each theory, delineated in sub-sections by each author below.

#### **Burns (1978)**

*Transactional leadership* is identified as being comprised of mechanical, impersonal, and ephemeral connections. Burns (1978) argues that transactional leaders exploit external factors, including social, economic, psychological, and institutional ones, as well as their own influences, training, skills, and competences, and assess how these factors and attributes affect or contribute to the development of an obedient workforce. Burns (1978) contends that the motives of transactional leaders may not coincide with what the followers/subordinates desire. Identified as “objectified and dehumanized leadership” (p. 16), Burns (1978) states such power-focused leadership approaches objectify an organization’s employees, categorizing them as objects rather than as key contributors to the organization’s overall success.

In contrast to transactional leadership theory, Burns (1978) posits *transformational leadership theory* as one that identifies power in relationships and connections, such as human motives and physical constraints, rather than in positions. Burns argues the intention or purpose of power involves a holder – subordinate dyad. He further demonstrates how power is a collective notion and not solely vested in one individual. Individuals included in a *transformational* power relationship tap into motivational bases within each other and bring varying resources to bear in the process (Burns, 1978). The result of this transformational power relationship is where individuals are able to achieve both individual and common goals through the use of the others motivational bases. The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivation and power potential in pursuit of a common or joint purpose. Transformational leadership theory is identified by Burns as being moral, in the sense of raising human conduct levels and ethical aspirations of both leader(s) and follower(s) – thereby creating a *transforming* effect.

### **Capra (2002)**

Mirroring the mechanistic nature of transaction leadership theory in Burns (1978), Capra (2002) identifies *transactional leadership* within organizations as an assembly of interlocking parts, defined by functional departments connected through centralized channels of communication and authority. Transactional leadership, according to Capra, consists of routine-based, tested procedures, organized within formal structures and controlled through a top-down hierarchical system. An example of transactional leadership theory, Capra argues, is the fast-food industry, where its main focus is promoting organizational productivity and efficiency. Animosity is bred internally in this

model, as the organization is highly controlled through autonomy-based theories; contributions from staff are standardized and methodical, and individuals are merely viewed as cogs within a piece of machinery.

In contrast to transactional leadership, Capra (2002) argues, *transformational leadership theory*, while, too, comprised of formal structures, is defined by both (i) rules and regulations, which govern everyone including leaders, and (ii) informal communication channels, which organically develop networks that adapt and grow based on stakeholders within the organization. This self-sustaining organization establishes collective identities, values, and a common purpose among all employees. Interactions between networks of stakeholders within a transformational organization promote decentralized power distribution and organizational policies and procedures, as well as a vision and strategies that are holistically developed. Capra further argues that transformational leadership theory is adaptable to ever-changing socioeconomic conditions and organizational challenges, providing leaders with the flexibility to respond effectively to such changes or challenges to ensure that the network of internal communication channels remains intact.

### **McGregor (1957) / Argyris (1993)**

McGregor (1957) also theorizes transactional management, identified as a result of *Theory X*, aligns with *Pattern A* as described by Argyris (1993), as directing the behaviour of organizational constituents, and involving coercion or threats, close supervision, and tight controls over behaviour. Though behaviour is not a consequence of an individual's inherent nature, it is a consequence of organizational and management philosophy, policy, and practice. Through McGregor's (1957) assumptions, Argyris

(1993) argues that direction and control do not motivate individuals whose needs are embedded in social and egotistic desires. If individuals are deprived of opportunities to satisfy the needs which are important to them in the workplace, negative behaviour and responses will follow. Examples of these negative behaviours and responses include, but are not limited to, indolence, passivity, resistance to management leadership and direction, refusing or displaying a lack of responsibility for one's actions or performance, willingness to follow the demagogue, and arbitrary demands for economic benefits (McGregor, 1993).

Identified as *Pattern B* by McGregor's (1957) assumptions described as *Theory Y*, Argyris (1993) postulates transformational leadership as one consisting of tightly knit, cohesive organizations focused on achieving common goals and objectives.

Understanding that leaders cannot provide an individual(s) with self-respect, respect of fellow colleagues, or self-fulfillment satisfaction, Argyris notes that they can, however, create conditions where an individual(s) is (are) encouraged and enabled to seek these satisfactions for themselves; otherwise, leadership may be thwarted for failing to create such conditions. Therefore, McGregor (1957) and Argyris (1993) posit transformational leadership theory as one consisting of opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, and providing guidance. Ultimately, transformational leadership is defined as being management by objectives, in contrast to management by control.

### **Mitchell and Sackney (2009)**

Continuing the mechanistic or industrial characterization of *transactional leadership theory*, Mitchell and Sackney (2009) define it as grounded in the notion of an

authoritarian-structured hierarchy. Arising during the growth of the industrialization era, transactional theory is formulated around centralized decision-making in support of manager-identified standards and principles. During this era, workplaces led by transactional leaders demanded compliance, predictability, and efficiency, all of which may be attributed to the hierarchy and routinized processing of the industrialized era. When an organization was not operating at optimal levels, negative contributing factors would be identified, investigated for repair, or replaced to return to the most efficient levels of productivity. Mitchell and Sackney argue that these authoritarian functions existed to aid in the production of task-specific jobs that produce prescribed outcomes, resulting in the workforce being constrained by explicit principles or directives outlining their limited or narrow roles, responsibilities, and accountability.

*Transformational leadership theory*, on the other hand, is defined by Mitchell and Sackney (2009) as based on positive interconnections and relations existing with an organization and between all stakeholders. They argue that transactional leadership theory is demarcated by an organization's connections and shared influences. Based on this approach, organizations exist as one cohesive unit with common goals and objectives, rather than as individual units functioning separately. Connections and relationships define transformational leadership theory because very little works in segregation, and organizations only become stable through reliable interdependence between all constituents. Both transactional and transformational leadership theories identified above by Mitchell and Sackney (2009) also closely align with how they postulate mechanistic and organic organizational systems. Mechanistic organizations typically follow a traditional top-down hierarchy with clear delegation of roles and

responsibilities. Organic organizations adopt horizontal working clusters rather than vertical clusters, where the goal is to develop a more harmonised culture of personnel. These organization systems (mechanistic and organic) are inter-related with both transactional and transformational theories as they continue to be described below.

**Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, and Flowers (2005)**

While less mechanistic in their analogies, Senge et al. (2005) postulate *transactional leadership theory* as one consisting of fear and based on false division: making a division where there is tight connection and seeing separateness where there is wholeness. Operating to achieve goals and objectives that are outlined through a top-down hierarchical structure, transactional management leaders do not focus on building new capacities to achieve sustained process improvement or performance. Senge et al. (2005) argue that balance is lost when valuing measurables in this pursuit of sustained performance, as the educational organization's attention is directed towards quantitative objectives, thereby resulting in the displacement of learning and judgement. This results in a lost vision of core values, as the organization is more business-oriented and focuses less on developing a human community.

Conversely, Senge et al. (2005) argue that *transformational leadership theory* is comprised of connectedness, providing linkage between the outer world of manifest phenomena and the inner world of lived experience. The theory surrounding connectedness consists of self-organizing systems, which are made up of parts that are themselves whole at a lower level (Senge et al., 2005). This is seen in higher education through common goals or objectives being identified by an executive team or board of trustees, and a committee of lower level management and collectives collaborate to

determine the best course of action and execution. The authors argue that because each system is whole at various levels throughout the organization, it allows the system to be greater than the sum of its parts. In other words, quality relationships with one another are more fundamental than matter or materialistic objects, as they create a decentralized environment that allows the organization to grow and develop organically. To instill and sustain such an environment, legitimacy and trust are critical, as they allow for the free flow of information and translate transformation into organizational value.

### **Wheatley (2007)**

Lastly, Wheatley (2007) identifies *transactional leadership theory* as models surrounding control and command: power-driven entities who rely on internal leadership to influence power shifts and change throughout. Wheatley argues that transactional leadership exists through demanding processes and measures that are designed to diminish creativity. The theory based around centralized authority aims to increase employee disengagement through repetitive, monotonous tasks and responsibilities, that do not utilize full potential of employees and ultimately restricting independent problem-solving and inspired process improvement.

On the other hand, Wheatley (2007) defines *transformational management* as a naturally occurring phenomenon, consisting of intricate communication channels and foundational principles that support inclusive productivity and collaboration among all constituents. Wheatley argues that the theory inspires the growth of communication channels between all levels in the organizational hierarchy to allow for creative and collective decision-making and problem-solving. From this, an organization can develop and grow as a flexible, intellectual, and robust workplace, as all stakeholders are able to

investigate shifts in economic platforms, utilize personal experience, and pair perceptions to collaborate with other stakeholders to develop solutions for organizational concerns. The responsibility of the leader within transformational theory is to develop a sound understanding of their organization through the self-sustaining, interconnected networks developed by all stakeholders. Intellectual stimulation is provided by transformative leadership, as everyone is invited to develop the purpose of the organization.

By summarizing the fundamental or central components of transactional leadership theory and transformation leadership theory through the lens these scholars, this literature review presages the methodological approach used in this paper.

### **Method of Analysis**

This research explores educational leadership through the lens of transactional and transformational leadership theory approaches and employ an analytic framework to examine how these apparently opposing and incompatible theories of leadership and management co-exist within our postsecondary institutions. The research method used in this paper draws on both historical and philosophical observations of leadership within transactional and transformational theories, with the purpose of assessing the role and influence of leadership within postsecondary education. Below, I examine briefly how analytic method is employed within other fields, as well as its philosophical basis.

Neuman (2000) identifies *historiography* as a similar method of conducting research. This method suggests that researchers understand past events, theories, concepts, and principles through historical analyses. Here, phenomenon and the development of history are explained through the collection and analysis of previously collected and written documents and, in the case of Indigenous peoples, oral histories and

stories. In relation to philosophical analysis, Soltis (1978) postulates that such analyses enable a researcher to investigate the true meaning of a given subject or phenomenon. Soltis (1978) argues that philosophizing educational research provides an accurate representation of educational concepts, while also providing an enlightened understanding of basic notions within education systems.

Foundational for understanding and analysis as it applies to this study, the research methods provide an appropriate framework for this conceptual analysis, allowing for an exploration of existing connections between organizational structures and the authenticity of leadership within postsecondary institutions. From this, I maintain that leadership within postsecondary education is moderately reliant on organizational structure and hierarchy. Employing a combination of philosophical and historiography studies (see Chapter Two), I analyzed educational leadership and its impacts through available scholarly literature, particularly research published since 2007. These scholarly articles were identified as requirements for my research: philosophical investigations provide the ability to identify connections between theories to better understand a phenomenon, while historiographies review historically identified theories to deliver a better, more contextualized comprehension of a phenomenon. My research of transactional and transformational leadership theory is characterized by my desire to understand new and pre-existing correlations of management theory, and its influence on leadership.

### **Methodological Procedures**

My analysis of transactional and transformational leadership theories is based on selected published literature by authors who have extensive knowledge of educational

leadership and organizational behaviour. Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1957/1993), Argyris (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge et al. (2005), and Wheatley (2007) have contributed greatly to the analysis of educational leadership and its effects on organizational behaviour. Therefore, the compiled literature selections position my knowledge framework of transactional and transformational leadership theory, and this study's understandings of the main systemic concepts inherent in the two leadership approaches.

The research literature, selected from the Brock University Library's online repository, was analyzed based on convenience and relevancy. For the purpose of this study, *convenience sampling* (also commonly referred to as *availability sampling*) was used; this sampling method refers to the collection of data from a conveniently accessible data set (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012). Since this method relies on identifying participants in any location that is convenient for the researcher, there are logically some advantages and disadvantages. For instance, while this method of sampling is simple and helpful for pilot studies or hypothesis generation, it may also be vulnerable to influences beyond the researcher's control such as convenience and personal preference and be biased towards selection criteria. Other disadvantages may include sampling errors and lower credibility among other researchers.

To ensure relevance to modern leadership and current discourse on higher educational institutions and systems, articles written in the 21<sup>st</sup> century were selected. These articles include: Adserias, Charleston, and Jackson (2017); Basham (2012); Black (2015); Bush (2007); Cetin and Kinik (2015); Hargreaves and Fink (2006); Jones and

Harvey (2017); Khan (2017); Townsend (2011); and Wahab, Rahmat, Yusof, and Mohamed (2015).

A personal knowledge base of transactional and transformational leadership theory was then developed utilizing literature from Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1957/1993), Argyris (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge et al. (2005), and Wheatley (2007), creating the foundation of my theoretical framework. I analyzed each author's work to categorize the main systemic concepts of transactional and transformational leadership theories and created a matrix (see Appendix A) to recapitulate each writer's viewpoint. This matrix served as the underlying framework during my analysis of selected leadership literature, which is represented in a detailed table (see Appendix B) that records the most frequently applied transactional and transformational systemic concepts within the aforementioned matrix.

The analysis of leadership-related articles was completed through a review of 10 articles that explore the subject of educational leadership in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, including an examination of the literature to identify references pertaining to transactional and transformational leadership theory concepts that were isolated in the developed framework. From this analysis, direct quotations citing the identified terminology of *transactional* and *transformational leadership theory* were noted, including a cross-reference of each passage with systemic concepts. As a result, this method enabled me to trace each citation to identified systemic concepts in the selected leadership literature, while also creating the opportunity to classify the most frequently applied transactional and transformational indicators. Moreover, this allowed me to determine systemic

concepts and interrelationships existing within transactional and transformational leadership theories.

### **Scope, Delimitations and Limitations**

The main focus for this analysis was to reveal transactional and transformational leadership theory-related influences within educational leadership scholarly literature.

The study is limited to the 10 scholarly published articles selected, which were published in the last decade. These scholarly articles were selected based on publication date and for content pertaining to transactional and transformational management theories, as well as the articles' relevance to educational leadership.

Research included in the analysis predates most of the scholarly articles analyzed in the study. Therefore, this limits the potential impact of the educational leadership discourse, and its associated correlations, that this study identifies.

Moreover, this analysis is further limited in that it relies exclusively on a single perception and interpretation of each scholarly article. The views of each published article were based on immediate impressions and associations to other analyzed studies without an opportunity for further review, which could possibly identify deeper insight and correlations.

The research on educational leadership is highly focused on primary and secondary schools rather than postsecondary institutions. Scholars such as Fullan (2011), Sackney and Mitchell (2009), apply theories of leadership to primary and secondary schools. In this analysis, I have appropriated these approaches to my understanding of leadership in postsecondary institutions. This analytical approach may impose limitations

on the applicability of the findings to the practice of leadership in postsecondary institutions in Canada.

Although this study is an example of a micro-research environment completed in a moment in time, it may still reflect the realities of other postsecondary educational institutions, as all micro-research environments are shaped by the ever-changing economic conditions of research that affect higher education institutions, both domestically and internationally.

### **Rationale and Positionality**

In my professional development and my studies in the Master of Education program, I was drawn to two leadership theories: transactional and transformational management. I recognize that transactional leadership theory is typically concerned with control, efficiency, extrinsic motivation, and structure, whereas transformational leadership theory is described through systemic concepts including connectedness towards a common objective or goal, adaptability, and decentralization. My personal desire to examine educational leadership vis-à-vis transactional and transformational leadership theories are consequential of my own personal understanding; I trust that practical experiences can be informed through research, thereby resulting in the clarification of the influential factors between leadership theories and 21<sup>st</sup> century educational leadership discourse.

From past experience as a manager and leader within postsecondary education administration, I felt compelled to further investigate educational leadership. In postsecondary institutions, the leadership and management environments are informed by client-based or service-based models. These models led me to try and identify leadership

theories earlier in my career that presented customer satisfaction as a main objective. I placed less emphasis on learning and support for teaching faculty, both of which are essential to producing positive connections among all constituents – thus resulting in my own failure to endorse core organizational values.

As important as educational leadership is, there exists a very large, and contradictory, scholarly body of literature in the field, that challenges the importance of a common understanding of objectives, free flowing communication channels, and trustworthiness within higher educational leadership. Leaders, including those within the educational sector, identify themselves through personal strengths and weaknesses, which are then paired with the organizational structure one works in and its associated policies and procedures. These policies and procedures help define a knowledge base of educational leadership theories that may be both complementary and contending. This work utilizes contributions from Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1957/1993), Argyris (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge et al. (2005), and Wheatley (2007) to identify elements of transactional and transformational leadership theories. I use these systemic concepts to examine the 21<sup>st</sup> century educational leadership discourse. To identify frequently referenced systemic concepts associated with transactional and transformational management theories, an itemized informational table, or a matrix, was constructed to act as a framework in my analysis of the identified modern leadership literature (see Appendix A). Direct quotations were cross-referenced with the framework to isolate for prevalently used concepts (see Appendix B). The objective was to examine the complexity and breadth of influence from transactional and transformational

leadership theory systemic concepts, and to then identify this discourse as it is currently present in contemporary postsecondary education.

In the next chapter, I review current educational leadership literature and isolate key systemic concepts found in modern post-secondary scholarly articles. The top three systemic concepts for both transactional and transformational leadership theories are identified through the analyzed articles and reviewed in greater detail. Lastly, the final chapter will examine this analysis, and any potential impacts as a result, while also proposing opportunities for future research in post-secondary education.

## CHAPTER TWO: RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research was to identify transactional and transformational leadership theories-related influences within postsecondary institutions. Following the development of a conceptual methodology, an analysis of 10 scholarly articles was conducted with the purpose of uncovering the fundamental concepts that relate to transactional and transformational leadership theories. Six main conceptual elements emerged from the close reading of transactional and transformational leadership theories conducted in this study. The results of that analysis are presented in this chapter, which examines the main systemic concepts of transactional and transformational theories, and the revealed systemic anchors and differences between them. For the purposes of this study, *systemic concepts* are defined through an apprehension of a number of terminologies which aid in the construction of dynamic and quantified attributes (Donnadieu, Durand, Neel, Nunez, & Saint-Paul, 2003).

### Transactional Management Systemic Concepts

Transactional leadership theory is concerned with increasing levels of efficiency while still remaining predictable and accountable through strict hierarchical structures and high-stakes evaluative processes. The analysis of the concepts relating to transactional leadership theory uncovered three most prominent systemic concepts: *efficiency, control, and standardization*. Standardization was the most frequent marker, followed by control and efficiency. The frequency with which they were evoked was the basis of classifying them as top three sub concepts. For the purpose of this analysis, this study operationalizes the following definitions:

- i) *Standardization*, as depicted by the creation, evaluation, and reporting of performance objectives (Wheatley, 2007);
- ii) *Control*, expressed by the use of a formal, centralized decision-making model (Burns, 1978); and
- iii) *Efficiency*, described as the use of educational market practices (the attainment of performance outcomes and target development) to quantify an institution's level of productivity (Taylor, 1911).

These concepts are trademarks of transactional leadership theory through their promotion of a highly structured and monitored organization. The next section presents the results related to the examination of each of these systemic markers.

### **Standardization**

Of the three identified systemic markers, the most commonly referenced systemic marker pertaining to transactional leadership theory within the scholarly articles is standardization. Basham (2012), as well as Wahab et al. (2015), identify the need to foster or preserve standards within higher education as a means of evaluating institutions in relation to decision-making capacity, performance objectives, mandated priorities, and comparison among institutions (e.g., rankings, efficiency targets, student/faculty ratios, research funding). Other authors, such as Bush (2007) and Khan (2017), recognize standardization as a way to maintain the structure of accountability within their institution and among faculty, administrative staff, and students. Through priority-setting and analyzing gathered information, higher education institutions have the ability to appraise their performance in a manner that is, it is argued, transparent, observable, and

quantifiable. The concept of standardization, as it relates to institution-level accountability and decision-making, is addressed by Townsend (2011), who states:

School leaders now need to be able to oversee (if not do themselves) the identification and collection of relevant data associated with a wide range of student achievements and environmental conditions, to be able to analyze and report on [these] data in a meaningful way that identifies successes, trends over time, and things that need to be improved and then make decisions about how to allocate resources, staffing, material and financial, in ways that will maximize the school's performance in the future. (p. 97)

In postsecondary institutions, the observations made by Townsend (2011) translate into similar practices and accountabilities, where all levels of stakeholders are involved in determining the allocation of resources and funding for the development of learning and key performance indicators (KPIs).

The systemic concept of standardization is utilized when reviewing the performance of higher educational leaders in the achievement of institutional objectives and priorities, as well. For example, Wahab et al. (2015) reference the correlation between performance objectives for higher educational leaders and quantifiable homogeneous data:

As institutions and their leaders are being evaluated on the meeting of targets and value-added data, there is a persuasive rationale for school leaders to structure their leadership and management around adding value to school performance data. Simply put, if performance is being evaluated on the basis of quantifiable data from standardized tests (currently literacy and numeracy only) and the

system is delivering a linear rational model of decision-making and goal setting, the policy context is shaping the way educational leaders conceptualize their work. (p. 38)

However, Hargreaves and Fink (2006), as well as Basham (2012), observe some undesirable effects from employing quantifiable data and outcomes on the higher education system. The detrimental effects of standardization on institutions and higher educational leaders is argued by Hargreaves and Fink (2006), who believe that standardization will disadvantage development and inter-communication channels between institutional stakeholders (leadership, staff, teaching faculty, students, and surrounding communities). They contend, “Our consuming obsession with reaching higher and higher standards is exhausting our institutional leaders” (p. 2) as, “short-term targets seem expedient to politicians and appealing to some parts of the public, but they undermine almost every goal of sustainable improvement” (p. 253). Furthermore, they posit that, “all-consuming standardized education reforms leaves plagues of exhausted educators and joyless learning in its wake” (p. 4). Basham (2012) echoes these sentiments, and maintains that creativity and passion are being eliminated from the educational sector as a result of government-imposed performance-driven approaches:

The [higher education] environment is highly structured with an emphasis on managerial authority. This creates an uncreative climate and impedes creative expansion of the organization due to the assumption that people are largely motivated by simple rewards for specific job performance. In many cases this results in a lack of improvement in job satisfaction. The major disadvantage of

this model is that it does not take into account people's desire for self-actualization. (p. 18)

Finally, Hargreaves and Fink (2006) state that, "despite or perhaps even because of its apparent initial success, imposed short-term, performance-driven standardization is ultimately unsustainable" (p. 14). Through my review of standardization as a systemic concept in transactional management, I maintain that the value of institutional standardization and quantifiable data certainly remains – and has created substantial tension – within the higher education system.

### **Control**

Control is the second-most referenced systemic concept in the scholarly literature on transactional leadership theory. The articles emphasize the importance that is placed on performance objectives and their effect on leadership and control in higher education institutions. Various authors (Khan, 2017, and Hargreaves and Fink, 2006) suggest that institutions are assessed based on the execution and achievement of academic targets and, as such, higher educational leadership shifts towards a centralized control model where decisions are made at the top and move downward through the authority structure. Khan (2017) argues the difficulty of this type of top-down approach in stating:

Transactional leaders have an over-reliance on a single approach, and unwillingness to discuss, or even consider ideas of others, which limits a leader's creativity and their ability to adjust if things go wrong. (p. 181)

Hargreaves and Fink (2006) challenge the idea that significant amounts of control are necessary for effective leadership. The authors suggest that control is maintained over performance objectives, engagement indicators, values, and beliefs, and that higher

education leaders can ensure attention is directed to institutional goals and objectives by fostering a culture or approach that links institutional goals to followers' motivations:

Many kinds of data matter – test scores and achievement results, attendance and suspension figures; data on satisfaction, engagement, and development styles; as well as data on retention, motivation and morale. What is important is that such data sets are used not only for marketing appearances or for appeasement of public opinion but also to ensure preservation and improvement of the overall learning environment. (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006, p. 254)

In postsecondary institutions, the observations made by Hargreaves and Fink (2006) surrounding the importance of data are critical, as higher education continues to evolve and transform to meet ever-changing market demands. Decisions are made with heavy influence from represented data, and it is imperative for postsecondary institutions to determine how to appropriately use such data to drive decisions that are best suited for their staff, students, and surrounding communities.

Basham (2012) highlights the degree of control within higher education, suggesting that leadership and maintained pre-existing concepts of control are purposefully positioned to ensure that leaders uphold desired practices within the institution. He opposes this approach, articulating that,

Previously designed or existing theories for leaders intrude significantly into the domain of school leaders' work because they operate through highly structured and externally imposed regimes of assessment and accreditation, the intention of which is to license or authorize the initial appointments of education professionals

and to guarantee their continuing engagement in professional practice in conformity with sets of desired norms. (Basham, 2012, p. 18)

Though this may be true, my analysis also presents opposition to authoritarian or top-down control within higher educational organizations. Basham (2012) states, “transactional leaders are usually at the top of their functional specialty and have limited perspective to see that change is needed and what the consequences may be for continuing the same practices” (p. 16). These perspectives reverberate in Jones and Harvey (2017), who argue that,

Rather than address the complexity facing the sector, increased regulation has created further problems through its failure to recognize the particular nature of the sector. Higher education, it is claimed, has at its core a culture of shared governance that requires that key constituents be part of the decision-making process; to instigate changes in this community, there must be opportunities for faculty, staff and students to voice their views. (p. 127)

The scholarly literature on transactional leadership theory, then, proposes that control is a systemic concept which is utilized to increase accountability within and by higher education institutions – something that is increasingly demanded by the public and governments alike. It is also enforced from within organizations by the administrative cadre. From outside the universities, control in the form of accountability measures (metrics) is imposed by funders (e.g., government, donors); from within the universities, control in the form of downloaded accountability measures is imposed by senior leaders on administrative staff and/or middle managers. Thus, my analysis indicates that a top-down structure prevails in higher education systems as it perpetuates and encourages the

normalizing process regarding externally mandated performance objectives. Ultimately, control is applied in higher education because it supports predictability and reliability within the system.

### **Efficiency**

Within transactional leadership theory, my analysis of the research literature reveals that efficiency is the third-most referenced systemic concept. The exploration of the scholarly literature in this study underlines that education systems are informed by market practices, used as a means of assessing their overall efficiency. While the systemic marker of efficiency was not explicitly stated in all of the articles, each article insinuated that higher educational leaders establish an institution's efficiency by reviewing performance objectives and targets, strategic goals, and government-mandated priorities. Efficiency is appraised (evaluated/assessed) by an institution's ability to meet or exceed its performance objectives, similar to how we would expect a business to increase its overall profit by quarter or year-over-year. This notion is confirmed by Townsend (2011), who states,

One global trend that impacts on all the countries . . . is the move towards a market orientation for education, with an underlying rationale that if schools compete for students, for resources and for achievements, then this will lead to an increase in the general level of education achievement. (p. 97)

Townsend also contends that,

We have seen a shift towards a market approach, towards high levels of accountability, towards more responsibility in decision-making and performance

at the individual school and towards a better understanding of the importance of leadership for these approaches to be maximized. (p. 99)

Although the trend toward efficiency as a measure of institutional effectiveness is posited by Townsend, other scholars such as Adserias, Charleston, and Jackson (2017) and Khan (2017) criticize the market approach to higher education – and its associated requirement for institutions to cultivate a heightened sense of efficiency – as being detrimental to stakeholders (e.g., students, instructors, and community). While transactional leadership theory is founded on the premise of defining expectations, and scrutinizing and rewarding compliance and progress, punishment and correction occur if outcomes deviate from expectations. Adserias, Charleston, and Jackson (2017) argue, for instance, that the success of transactional management is reliant on a leader's, "access and ability to distribute rewards and, whether the employees want the rewards or fear the penalties" (p. 318). Khan (2017) echoes these sentiments and adds that, "followers may become demotivated or may not strive for higher achievements because of the lack of praise for greater achievement by the transactional leader" (p. 181). Khan contends that constructing an organizational culture which includes, "trust and honesty in a reciprocal manner" (p. 318) may lead to increased productivity and an added fluidity of understanding its performance objectives and expectations.

In sum, this analysis demonstrates that the systemic concept of efficiency is evident in transactional leadership theory as a result of increasing global trends and demands that advocate for the benefits of an efficient, performance-based institution. Meaningful leadership and opportunities for collaboration are replaced in this system by a drive to attain higher performance objectives and mandated priorities.

The selected literature further supports the commonalities between transactional leadership theory and top-down hierarchical management and strict evaluative processes. Postsecondary educational leaders who implement policies and practices identified in transactional leadership theory – with a focus on efficiency, predictability, and accountability – are unlikely easily adaptive to changing market demands – especially when juxtaposed with those who utilize transformational management systems.

### **Transformational Management Systemic Concepts**

While transactional leadership approaches and their accompanying core concepts of standardization, control, and efficiency are viewed by scholars as hindering the effective engagement of academic and administrative staff in contemporary postsecondary institutions, transformational leadership and its core concepts of shared meaning, collaboration, and change are viewed as having positive influences within higher education. Postsecondary leaders who embrace transformational leadership theory are concerned with their ability to engage with interconnected networks of people that cooperatively endeavour to achieve their organization's purpose and priorities, while adapting to ever-changing environments. Similar to transactional leadership analysis, this analysis of the systemic concepts relating to transformational leadership theory revealed three most frequently cited systemic markers as *collaboration*, *shared meaning*, and *change*.

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are employed in this section for the systemic markers of transformational leadership theory:

- i) *Collaboration*, demarcated by an institution's reinforcement of collaboration and process of increasing or decreasing the level of participation based on importance (Vroom & Jago, 1988);
- ii) *Shared meaning*, described as a process by which all stakeholders define the purpose and direction of an institution (Mitchell & Sackney, 2009);  
and
- iii) *Change*, characterized by an institution's capability and preparedness to respond to its market or industry (Wheatley, 2007).

These notions are foundational within transformational leadership theory, as they foster interaction and communication between all stakeholders within an organization. In the sections that follow, I present the results of my analysis of the scholarly literature on each of these systemic markers. My analysis begins with the transformational management systemic concept of collaboration.

### **Collaboration**

The systemic marker of collaboration is the most common concept that surfaced from the literature review. Specifically, the scholarly literature demonstrates a transition from a command-and-control model towards a collaborative environment where all stakeholders contribute to the vision, performance objectives, and strategic priorities of an institution. Those who embrace transformational leadership theory strive to build capacity within institutions by distributing leadership accountabilities and responsibilities among all participants to ensure the institution accomplishes its objective(s). For example, Bush (2007) argues that higher education institutions must extend their governance base and provide stakeholders with both time and capacity to share what they

have learned and achieved. He argues that, “the critical leadership skill in the establishment of a broader leadership base is the way in which the institutional leader builds capacity for leadership in other people” (p. 393). He suggests,

One other element that seems to be coming into focus is the need for leaders to share what they know and what they can do, not only with the teachers within their institution, but also outside of their institutions with other leaders from different institutions, different areas, different countries. Instead of lowering our sights to what is happening, we need to raise them to see what we might learn from (and what we might offer to) colleagues from other institutions, areas, and countries. (Bush, 2007, p. 395)

In postsecondary institutions, the observations made by Bush (2007) are of critical importance as the higher education market extends globally, and institutional leaders must be aware of market trends and demands that may have a potential impact on the decision-making process. Acknowledging that communication must flow with transparency to those impacted throughout the decision-making process allows for a holistic perspective to be reviewed and considered, thus allowing all stakeholders and multiple outcomes to be considered. Sharing similar sentiments, Basham (2012) argues that an alternative approach to transactional educational leadership within higher education was required to prepare for challenges stemming from an unstable, changing educational landscape. Basham states that

A different approach is needed to prepare today’s learners to meet tomorrow’s challenges. The new structure should enhance preparation, allowing for innovation and futuristic thinking in a collaborative setting. (p. 15)

Jones and Harvey (2017) reiterate these notions, while adding the importance of leadership that includes the equal consideration of all stakeholders and engages them on a deeper level:

The paradigm change requires a re-conceptualization of leadership built on collaboration rather than authority, on process and activity rather than positions and on the practice of leadership to include more subtle, moral, emotional and relational aspects. (p. 128)

Interestingly, though, Hargreaves and Fink (2006) challenge collaboration as a prerequisite for the formation of institution objectives. They suggest that progressive leadership employs all potential stakeholders when creating institutional goals and targets, in order to foster meaningful development. They argue that, “sustainable institutional leadership for learning is not opposed to targets. It encourages and insists on developed targets, as a shared and continuing responsibility, between teacher and student and among the teachers and parents in the school’s community” (p. 266). Collaboration is a critical factor of transformational leadership theory, as it engages stakeholders in noteworthy ways, thereby resulting in a community fostered by shared capacity and effort. My analysis thus highlights collaboration as a strengthening component of institutions and their communities. Collaboration through distributed leadership, accountability, and decision-making responsibilities results in meaningful development.

### **Shared Meaning**

As the second-most referenced systemic marker of transformational leadership theory, shared meaning identifies direction and vision for an organization or institution by defining specific objectives and overall purpose. Shared meaning is identified as being

developed from guidance and recommendations stemming from all stakeholders tied to the institution (or organization). This approach results in clearer direction when defining the purpose of the institution in a meaningful manner, as the stakeholders are involved with the development process of the institution's mission, vision, values, and objectives. Some scholarly articles (see Hargreaves and Fink, 2006, and Bush, 2007) caution institutional leaders of the dangers of not identifying or properly communicating a shared purpose. Hargreaves and Fink (2006) argue that in transactional leadership theory, an organization's purpose is disbanded by the need to achieve short-term performance objectives. Contending that institutions need to, "put purpose before profit" (p. 5), Hargreaves and Fink (2006) posit that, "sustainable school leadership begins with the moral purpose of the product integrity. It puts learning first, before achievement or testing" (p. 266). Echoing these sentiments, Bush (2007) states that,

In many organizations, staff do not share a sense of purpose above and beyond the short-term unit performance, because most organizations are over-managed and under-led. Strategic intent provides clarity about ends but is unspecific about means. (p. 396)

Townsend (2011) posits that deliberate intent defines the direction or meaning of an organization that fosters creativity. He argues that,

Strategic intent offers staff an enticing spectacle of a new destination. It is broad enough to leave room for considerable experimentation in how to reach the destination. It contains the 'where' but not the 'how,' so creativity is unbridled. (p. 100)

While this notion may not be entirely practical or feasible, it demonstrates that shared meaning must come from all stakeholders connected to the institution (or organization).

Black (2015) echoes similar views, while adding that consistent and transparent translation of institutional performance targets and objectives is critical. He argues:

. . . in contemporary management and leadership literature it is increasingly recognized that separating leadership from management is unhelpful; both should complement each other, linking strategic visions and organizational machinery, and this means that having suitably complementary constructs of leadership and management becomes important. (p. 56)

Shared meaning, then, is a crucial systemic marker of transformational leadership theory, as it defines the stakeholders tied to the institution. The development of shared meaning is derived from dialogue between all participants involved in the decision-making process, as well as overall accountability to the institution, to establish the direction and meaning of the organization. My reading or understanding of the educational management literature supports the notion that shared meaning fosters creativity through the empowerment of individuals within the institution to pursue their purpose in whatever direction they deem necessary.

### **Change**

The final and third-most referenced systemic concept relating to transformational leadership theory is change. Change is the institution's capability and preparedness to respond effectively and in a timely manner to its market or industry demands. Thus, this marker is an institution's ability to appropriately adapt to its environment.

Transformational leadership theory positions organizations as ever-changing because

they adjust to the signals and queues received from their ecosystem of stakeholders and surrounding organizations, much like a living system (Khan, 2017). The literature proposes that higher educational leaders interrelate with components within their environment on a consistent basis, since this connection allows them to anticipate upcoming changes, trends, and demands of the institution. Khan (2017), for instance, suggests that,

Higher education institutions operate in a complex environment that includes influence from external factors, new technologies for teaching and learning, globalization, and changing student demographics to name a few. Maneuvering such complexity and change requires leadership strategy that is flexible and supportive. (p. 178)

The approach to change from a transformational leadership theory perspective differentiates it from transactional leadership theory, as followers are empowered to make decisions that are in reaction/response to changing factors in the institution's surrounding environment. Yet, transformational leaders and transformational institutions are not simply 'reactive': they are often proactive in shaping their environment or eco-system. Hargreaves and Fink (2006) contend that, "the most resilient schools don't just react to external and unwanted pressures; they engage assertively with their environment" (p. 257). Cetin and Kinik (2015) reinforce the necessity for decentralized leadership to adopt a philosophy that endorses developing the capacity of others. They posit that,

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. (p. 521)

Townsend (2011) argues that higher educational leaders have a vast range of accountabilities that develop and determine change and within the institution. He argues:

No longer can [leaders] simply manage the implementation of decisions made by others, they now have to make a range of decisions themselves, decision about marketing, about collaboration, about the image the school wishes to project about itself, and about the development of people within the school, all of which may impact on the viability of their school. (p. 97)

This identified shift is a frequent theme among the educational literature, as the scholars argue that institutional management must rid themselves of historic leadership models that cling to a centralized leadership structure. They argue that leadership needs to be shared among stakeholders within the organization. Wahab et al. (2015) argue, for instance, that,

Challenging the orthodoxy of school leadership required an inevitable and radical shift in our understanding of school development and change. If schools are to be true learning communities, this cannot be achieved by clinging to outdated models of leadership. To cope with the unprecedented rate of change in education requires not only challenging the current orthodoxy of school leadership and relinquishing models suited to a previous age but also establishing new models of leadership that locate power with the many rather than the few. (p. 595)

Change, then, is a vital systemic marker of transformational leadership theory, as it allows institutions to anticipate forthcoming shifts and adapt to an ever-changing environment. Transformational leadership theory encourages stakeholders to engage with their surrounding communities to keep pace with changing factors while fulfilling their objectives. This analysis indicates that change is identifying a paradigm shift related to higher educational leadership, one that encourages a decentralized approach to authority because the community within the institution distributes the leadership and decision-making responsibilities.

Overall, my reading or understanding of the selected literature supports the notion of embracing transformational leadership theory if a postsecondary educational leader's main objective is to develop or further instill interconnected networks within the institution. The reviewed systemic concepts further highlight the ability people have to cooperatively work together to achieve an institutional purpose and priority, while collectively adapting to their surroundings and shifting market demands.

### **Systemic Anchors and Shifts**

My analysis of transactional and transformational management theories reveals a consistent disconnect within the scholarly literature. This review identified countless instances where the pervasiveness of hallmarks of transactional leadership theory surfaced – and, yet, it also uncovered that transformational leadership theory is becoming the prominent or preferred approach within higher educational leadership literature.

I complete my review by highlighting core systemic anchors pertaining to transactional leadership theory within the leadership discourse. This review will transition into the association of the systemic shifts rippling through the leadership

literature, while identifying the tensions existing in the educational leadership economy as a result of clashes between transactional outcomes and transformational management processes.

A clear advocacy for transactional leadership theory – or, more precisely, an endorsement of standardization and control substantiated in organizational performance objectives and quantifiable information – was revealed in my analysis of the scholarly literature. Even though a general influence of transactional leadership theory tenets vis-à-vis higher educational policy is declining, the continued encouragement for standardized organization systems through strategic priorities and quantifiable information is well-anchored within the leadership discourse. Hargreaves and Fink (2006) delineate the significance of standardized objectives and priorities, since quantifiable targets dictate both the predictability and reliability of the system. These priorities or objectives are guided by quantifiable information and are utilized to enlighten higher educational practices within the education system. Through these outcomes, future targets and influential direction is established to meet new strategic priorities and performance objectives. Hargreaves and Fink (2006) contend that quantifiable results are very informative and influential with policymakers, as they help establish a measured and regularized system that endorses a common evaluative process. Higher educational administration and faculty are accountable for such performance objectives and strategic priorities, since the quantifiable data is utilized to evaluate an institution's effectiveness.

Control is another transactional leadership theory systemic marker that is grounded in higher education leadership discourse. While the scholarly literature on higher educational leadership appears to be transitioning towards a heightened awareness

of and support for collaborative models, the importance placed on performance objectives within higher education by policy makers and institutional leadership emphasizes a system that is controlled, monitored, and assessed. Higher education administrators and faculty alike receive directives surrounding performance outcomes that, in turn, reinforce the differentiation between leaders and followers.

My analysis of the 21<sup>st</sup> century higher education leadership articles indicates important shifts flowing through leadership discourse. It is evident, for instance, that transformational leadership theory is becoming dominant among leadership practices within higher education systems in Ontario and Canada. Cetin and Kinik (2015), Hargreaves and Fink (2006), Khan (2017), Townsend (2011) and Wahab et al. (2015) collectively note a shift in the perception of higher educational leadership discourse or, more precisely, in how higher education institutions articulate their strategic objectives. The review of these authors identifies systemic concepts from transformational leadership theory, including shared common meaning and change, as altering this leadership discourse. Unlike the discredited and pigeon-holed structure of transactional leadership theory, an institution or organization described by shared meaning fosters capacity among all its stakeholders through heightened commitment and interconnection. Here, the community has a conferred interest in the administration of institutional meaning, organizational objectives, and strategic priorities.

The literature also indicates a transition is occurring regarding higher educational leadership becoming collaborative, where purposeful relationships are fostered through greater involvement from institutional leadership, faculty, students, and surrounding communities – and their participation in the creating and achieving the vision of the

institution (organization). The emergence of shared meaning among all stakeholders around key issues of significance to an institution produces important developments, such as interconnected networks of stakeholders within the institution who support and endorse it.

Lastly, collaboration is another systemic marker of transformational leadership theory that is changing the higher education landscape in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Cetin and Kinik (2015), Hargreaves and Fink (2006), Khan (2017), Townsend (2011), and Wahab et al. (2015) assert that organizations are leaning towards leadership roles that are highly decentralized. The dated notion of the command-and-control model of leadership is moving closer towards an organizational model that supports sustainable leadership through fostering the creation of networks and shared accountability. This decentralized model of promoting collaboration and relationship-building is placed at the forefront of organizational directives. Hierarchical structures are being replaced with interconnected networks of stakeholders, who are focused on shared organizational objectives and priorities.

### **Chapter Summary**

A clear espousal of the tenets of transactional and transformational management theories and, particularly, the pervasiveness of the transactional systemic markers of efficiency, control, and standardization were revealed throughout my analysis of the scholarly educational leadership literature. Identified as the last vestiges of transactional leadership theory, these systemic markers still remain while the educational leadership landscape continues to evolve towards a more transformational approach. The difference may be between external actors (e.g. government) and internal actors (e.g. institutional

leaders), with the former more focused on transactional approaches, and the latter on more transformational approaches. Performance objectives and measured outcomes were highlighted throughout the literature as a way of evaluating institutions, while also encouraging meaningful development. A change in leadership discourse was also discovered during my analysis, identifying how transformational systemic markers such as collaboration, shared meaning, and change influence the educational leadership literature. Administrators and educators within postsecondary institutions engage in shared leadership practices intended to influence and develop their organizational purpose; as such, capacities are constructed through transformational markers like shared organizational meaning and collaboration in an attempt to develop sustainable learning communities.

However, adherents to transactional leadership theory create tensions between transformational leadership practices that lobby for distributed accountability and responsibility, contradictions certainly continue within educational leadership discourse.

A societal and governmental fixation with performance objectives and quantifiable outcomes undeniably strengthens centralized leadership theories in favour of a more command-and-control tactic. Rather than developing capacity within their institutions through collaboration and shared meaning, educational leaders revert back into their hierarchical tendencies, which preoccupy them with managing measurables and performances outcomes. It is evident that higher educational leadership is undergoing transitional tensions: transformational leadership theory fosters capacity within institutions to instill meaningful development, while focus resides elsewhere as leaders' fascination with performance objectives and quantifiable outcomes remain. As a result,

the tension created from conflict between transactional outcomes and transformational processes limits the overall effectiveness of higher educational leadership and other stakeholders alike by muddling the purpose of education. Therefore, the responsibility of reconciling the tension between the management of performance objectives and meaningful development lies ultimately with policymakers and politicians.

In the next and concluding chapter, I examine analysis regarding the impact of these theories on educational leadership literature and propose suggestions for leadership practices, policy development, and leadership theory. Lastly, I propose opportunities for further research in the area of postsecondary leadership practices.

### **CHAPTER THREE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this paper was to review scholarly leadership literature to identify transactional and transformational leadership theories-related influences within higher education. I begin with a synopsis of the study and transition into an examination of my findings from the analysis regarding the impact of these theories on educational leadership literature. The implications of the study for leadership practices, preparation and policy development, and leadership theory are then reviewed. Lastly, I identify the implications for further research by suggesting new opportunities for future studies and analysis.

#### **Summary of the Study**

My intention with this research was to identify the effects of transactional and transformational leadership theories within leadership discourse through an in-depth analysis. The study was identified core principles and systemic concepts of transactional and transformational leadership theories. A detailed overview (see Appendix B) of transactional and transformational leadership theories was created by reviewing the work of Burns (1978), Capra (2002), McGregor (1957/1993), Argyris (1993), Mitchell and Sackney (2009), Senge et al. (2005), and Wheatly (2007). As a result, a detailed table (see Appendix A) was crafted that documents the twelve most frequently referenced attributes associated with transactional and transformational leadership theories. These attributes provided a framework to conduct this study's analysis of current scholarly educational leadership literature.

The analysis was performed through a review of 10 scholarly articles published in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that investigate the subject of higher educational leadership. The articles

were examined for references to transactional and transformational leadership theory, as identified through the aid of the attribute framework, which takes the form of a matrix. Direct quotations from each author were isolated and cross-referenced against the matrix (see Appendix A) to ensure references were appropriately investigated and organized with other identified concepts. This allowed me to determine the top three concepts for transactional leadership theory – which were efficiency, control, and standardization – and transformational leadership theory – those being shared meaning, collaboration, and change – along with any correlations, systemic anchors, and shifts.

### **Discussion**

My analysis of transactional and transformational leadership theory vis-à-vis higher educational leadership allowed me to identify three overarching higher educational leadership themes:

1. Educational leadership discourse is critical of the influence of transactional leadership theory in higher education;
2. The transactional management concept of control remains a significant approach to leadership in higher educational leadership literature; and
3. Higher educational leadership literature is supportive of and actively promotes transformational leadership theory concepts.

### **Criticism of Transactional Leadership Theory**

The first outcome of my review of transactional and transformational management theories reveals substantial criticism of transactional leadership theory concepts, specifically regarding their influence on leadership and higher education. This is significant for two reasons: (i) the analysis demonstrates an overall minimal reference

to transactional leadership theory systemic concepts; and (ii) an overwhelming support of transformational leadership theory systemic concepts is present in the discourse. As a result, a paradigm shift from transactional to transformational leadership approaches in the domain of higher educational leadership is apparent. As many higher education leadership scholars are critical of transactional leadership theory and concepts, practitioners (leaders) have shifted their focus from quantifiable measures of teaching toward a more profound emphasis on comprehensive learning.

Embedded in the criticism of transactional leadership theories, concepts, and practices is a deep opposition to significant global trends toward the use of performance objectives (KPIs or metrics) as a mechanism to measure, evaluate, and compare the performance of higher education institutions to affect and support learning. This focus on performance objectives and efficiency is identified as hindering higher education, as that focus undermines both significant learning opportunities and faculty and staff satisfaction Hargreaves and Fink (2006). The focus on performance objectives and efficiency also creates impediments for leaders. As Hargreaves and Fink (2006) argue, an obsession with improving institutional standards and performance targets undermines long-term investments in leadership and training that promote meaningful learning and sustainable growth. They contend that short-term targets might seem appealing to policymakers and the affected community members, but they are at the expense of foundational learning: “short-term targets push most institutions to focus on testing before learning; they put a priority only on learning that is easily measured” (p. 253).

### **Significance of Control**

Even though criticism of transactional leadership theory is a common theme within the research literature, the analysis of higher education leadership discourse reveals references to transactional leadership theory concepts that were, in fact, encouraging and supportive of that a transactional approach. This finding is significant as modern educational literature was not particularly supportive of the use of transactional systemic concepts within education.. In particular, the second discovery recognized that the transactional leadership theory marker of control collected favourable interest within transformational leadership literature. This discovery is important as, overall, the reviewed literature was not supportive of transactional leadership theory or its associated concepts in higher education. Control was the only systemic concept from transactional leadership theory that remains present amongst authors on transformation leadership.

Some scholars acknowledge that varying levels of control contribute to meaningful learning. Hargreaves and Fink (2006) argue, for instance, that preserving control over performance metrics, KPIs, and learning opportunities is critical, as these data sets and tenets affect the institutional learning environment and culture and help direct attention and focus towards the improvement of the institutional community. They contend that the collection of all data is important, such as information regarding achievement and examination, results on student population growth and satisfaction, teaching faculty and administrative staff morale, attendance and disciplinary matters, and retention and motivation information – to name but a few. These data present opportunities for sustainable learning and for improvements to be made to the overall institutional culture and environment.

Control can be used to advocate for transparency and accountability within higher education, in relation to establishing institutional targets and performance outcomes. Bush (2007) and Clarke and O'Donoghue (2017) indicate that institutional leaders may favour more highly centralized control mechanisms as a result of evaluative education trends. In some jurisdictions internationally, such as universities in Kentucky and Tennessee, higher education institutions are awarded operating and research grant funding based on the attainment of performance outcomes (Adserias et al., 2017). Consequently, institutional leaders employ hierarchical leadership approaches which enable them to control academic environments through top-down methods to maximize the institution's access to external resources that are associated with specific performance objectives. Adserias et al. (2017) indicate that there are times when control and centralized decision-making are required. They argue that although a devolved leadership style is typically favored, there are moments within an institution's evolution where it is neither suitable nor viable – and that critical times exist when institutional leaders need to centralize their decision-making. This analysis also uncovered how control is wielded over educational leaders themselves as a way of validating the maintenance of desired practices within the institution and educational system. This is seen through development of leadership programs that are created to perpetuate series of desired standards as educational leaders operate in highly controlled organizations.

It is evident that the systemic transactional concept of control remains a significant component of higher education leadership practice and discourse, although in this study it was not possible to source supportive quotations related to control. It was only seen in a positive context if it allowed educational leaders to perpetuate desired

standards resulting in the promotion of meaningful learning. Institutional leaders may be guarded in their public statements which might be interpreted by subordinates such as faculty members to undermine the collegial governance models that are promoted within universities (OCUFA, 2019) This systemic transactional concept was supported only in those cases where it enabled institutional leaders to advance preferred norms and promote meaningful learning and development. Higher educational leaders analyze information and data that heighten learning environments while also promoting positive learning communities. However, times may arise through subordinates or legislation, in an institution's development where a leader may require a more transactional leadership approach.

### **Shift Toward Transformation**

The final discovery made by this study involves educational leadership scholars actively advocating for and fostering the adoption of transformational leadership theory and its systemic concepts. The significance behind this finding is that it recognizes a transition in leadership discourse and practices from transactional leadership theory toward transformational leadership concepts and practices. Systemic concepts from transformational leadership theory represented the commonality of references as each tenet or principal belief generally held in common by members of an organization as vastly recognized within the literature. The discourse within higher education leadership highlights the integration of transformational leadership theory and its systemic concepts by building shared meaning and collaboration both within and across institutions. Authors such as Adserias et al. (2017) report how leaders employ transformational leadership tenets to sustain productive working environments and, by means of positive

relationships and shared leadership, build community within and outside the institution. Adserias et al. (2017), for instance, contend that thriving leaders embrace a decentralized approach toward leadership and building a community. They argue that such organizational leaders are able to achieve these outcomes by: (i) allowing teaching faculty and administrative staff to partake in developing institutional priorities and objectives; (ii) supporting innovation within the institution and ensuring teaching faculty are key participants in the development of learning at all levels; (iii) advocating for a shared vision or meaningful leadership and collaboration throughout the institution; (iv) highlighting the importance of placing people ahead of systems and processes; and (v) developing an environment of trust, enthusiasm, and flexibility where all stakeholders experience respect and are valued. As a result, the organizational community shifts towards a self-sustaining, supportive leadership structure that is founded on open communication channels and trustworthiness towards common understanding for everyone affected.

Additionally, the element of engaging all stakeholders in the institution and its community through shared meaning is highly supported throughout the research literature, as well. As an example, Wahab et al. (2015) argue that,

A characteristic of strategic leadership is that the vision is based on upon what the institution needs to do best to respond to future needs for its stakeholders. Because the future is uncertain, the vision at times needs to be adapted or completely altered to meet the needs of a changing world. When a vision needs to be formed or altered, the experts need to do this work. The experts in an institution are those whose work determine the most important outcome, which is student learning. These people

should be involved in deciding where the institution needs to go to improve the quality of service provided to the student so that they learn and can be better prepared for successful futures. (p. 595)

Gronn (2003) states similar beliefs towards shared leadership and encouraging relationships:

In return for greater participation in decisions about institutional targets and operations, higher productivity is demanded of organization members, for which they are expected to give more time, to give more energy, to identify strongly with the goals and needs of their organization, and to learn how to collaborate effectively with coworkers. (p. 67)

These results substantiate the systemic concepts of transformational leadership theory being endorsed by higher educational leaders, and individuals who are promoted in higher educational settings are those placed at the forefront of building capacity through collaboration, fostering shared meaning, and leadership through positive working relationships and networks. Within transformational leadership theory, stakeholders are enabled to become more engaged within the institution's culture and community, allowing them to actively lead the organization through both its current and future efforts.

### **Implications**

The outcomes from this study maintain that systemic concepts in transformational leadership theory directly influence higher education leadership discourse. The findings lead to a recommendation that transformational leadership theory and its practices should be adopted by higher educational leaders as a model for 21<sup>st</sup> century institutions. The following sections explore how this thinking will impact higher educational leadership

discourse by affecting leadership planning and methodology. Furthermore, possible modifications to higher education leadership theory, as well as future research, will be addressed. Through this, future research consequences related to practice, theory, and implications will also be discussed.

### **Implications for Practice**

The outcomes from this study contend that transformational leadership theory should influence higher education leadership methods of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The scholarly discourse within higher educational leadership advocates for developing interconnections within an institution. Current and future leaders are challenged to recognize the importance of including all participants in the planning and decision-making process, while also ensuring that these participants are not restricted from engaging in affairs related to the institution. Institutional leaders begin this process when developing a vision for the organization that is grounded in collaboration and shared meaning. As indicated in the reviewed literature, capacity is built through leadership that results in a network of stakeholders sharing decision-making accountability, as their resources and strengths are amalgamated. As a unified team, these stakeholders develop a shared vision for the institution, striving to deliver meaningful learning. While institutional leaders can provide the motivation for a shift in this regard, it is imperative for them to be aware of how this process unfolds, ensuring it occurs organically rather than being imposed.

Reconciling the demands of performance objectives (e.g., Key Performance Indicators or KPIs) through decentralized leadership creates another challenge for higher education leaders. Institutional leaders must be involved in decisions surrounding strategic mandates and academic outcomes, as these are used as evaluative tools in

determining the success of the institution. Therefore, it is imperative that faculty and staff are provided some level of control or involvement to avoid feeling devalued or ignored when pressures and direction surrounding performance objectives arise.

Preparation for educational leadership begins at an executive level, when senior leaders and board members develop policies that communicate a decentralized leadership theory focused on collaboration and shared meaning. Accomplishing this is possible through recruitment and progression strategies and practices that aggressively provide educational leadership candidates with leadership training from accredited graduate or customized training programs. Boards of Trustees have even gone as far as developing their own leadership preparation courses that articulate the leadership skills, values, and preferred approaches connected to transformational management theories that they wish to foster (Basham, 2012). Development of such courses provides excellent supplementary leadership education by which boards and institutions clearly communicate and instill their believed values and goals. Moreover, institutions may reinforce decentralized leadership methodologies through internal evaluation processes and policies. These evaluations may include informal comments from other faculty and staff members, as well as formalized survey results, to assist in gauging a leader's ability to foster transformational leadership skills within their institution.

### **Implications for Theory**

This study suggests that a paradigm shift is underway in the realm of higher educational leadership. The historical model of transactional leadership theory is no longer fully supported in the reviewed educational leadership literature. Theories for institutional leadership must be revised to accurately reflect this change. While there is an

overwhelming support demonstrated in the reviewed literature toward transformational leadership theory there is a lack of guidance toward transitioning away from transactional leadership theory concepts and practices. Although the reviewed literature highlights the importance of a culture grounded in change, collaboration, and shared meaning, there was a shortage of information related to the process for accomplishing this transition. Therefore, organizational leadership necessitates that leadership methods be updated and reworked to reflect how to accomplish a shift toward transformational leadership theory, while also providing information on how to support the greater institutional community through the process.

### **Implications for Future Research**

It is evident that continued research is required in relation to higher educational leadership, and the transition institutions are undergoing when shifting from transactional to transformation management approaches. It is critical to investigate the potential impact of this transition on the recruitment and retention of leaders and in the actual implementation in institutions. While advocacy for transformational leadership theory is evident throughout the reviewed leadership literature, many scholars fail to appropriately communicate how the transition from one leadership approach to another should occur. Moreover, the literature fails to identify proper processes to ensure the institution's community is well supported throughout any transition. Further research could include an investigation of balancing the need to examine and assess performance targets and outcomes through transformational leadership theory and its processes. Few identified research studies discuss the potential impact that this transition could have on an institution's culture and community engagement. Educational leadership discourse

contends that institutional leaders need to be more engaged in developing, reviewing, and assessing performance outcomes, but the reviewed literature does not provide guidance on the methodologies in transformational leadership theory in this regard.

### **Conclusion**

This study was designed to investigate the influence of transactional leadership theory and transformational leadership theory on higher educational leadership. The study identified how the current leadership discourse is not in direct match with the use of transactional leadership theory at the postsecondary level. In fact, there was explicit advocacy towards supporting transformational leadership theory in higher educational settings. The reviewed educational literature reinforced the importance of gathering and utilizing performance outcome data as a device for quantifying and observing the institutional learning environment while preserving desired cultures within the organization.

There was a strong advocacy by leadership scholars (Bush, 2007, Hargreaves and Fink, 2006, and Jones and Harvey, 2017) to promote collaboration and creation of shared meaning in present day universities. Researchers suggest a devolution of educational leadership to foster relationship building through the development of collective institutional meaning. Evidently, additional research is required to encourage the use of transformational leadership theories throughout the higher educational landscape, however. Transformational leadership theory should be emphasized and encouraged through succession planning to ensure that institutions transition into communities that foster unified decision-making processes focused on a common objective. Higher education executive leadership committees must actively engage leadership applicants

who possess formal leadership education or training from accredited programs. These same committees may also supplement in-house leadership training courses and programs directed towards the promotion of transformational leadership theory approaches within their institutions. Appointments to leadership positions and the support of current higher educational leaders who display this leadership philosophy in practice would be made with the respect of future education candidates and the advocacy of the transformational leadership theory models in theory and in practice.

### References

- Adserias, R. P., Charleston, L. J., & Jackson, J. F. L. (2017). What style of leadership is best suited to direct organizational change to fuel institutional diversity in higher education? *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 20(3), 315–331. DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2016.1260233
- Argyris, C. (1993). *Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Basham, L. M. (2012). Transformational and transactional leaders in higher education. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 77(2), 15–37. Society for the Advancement of Management
- Black, S. A. (2015). Qualities of effective leadership in higher education. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 4, 54–66. DOI: 10.4236/ojl.2015.42006
- Burns, J. M. (1978). The power of leadership. In J. M. Burns (Ed.), *Leadership* (pp. 9–28). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), (pp. 391–406). Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37143230\\_Educational\\_leadership\\_and\\_management\\_Theory\\_policy\\_and\\_practice](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37143230_Educational_leadership_and_management_Theory_policy_and_practice)
- Capra, F. (2002). *The hidden connections: Integrating the biological, cognitive, and social dimensions of life into a science of sustainability*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

College and University Strategic Mandate Agreements (October 21, 2019). Government of Ontario. Retrieved May 11, 2020, from <https://www.ontario.ca/page/college-and-university-strategic-mandate-agreements-2017-2020>

Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, S. F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behaviour from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 207, (pp. 519–527). Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815052556>

Donnadieu, G., Durand, D., Neel, D., Nunez, E., & Saint-Paul, L. (2003) The systemic approach: What is it all about? (pp.1–11). Retrieved from <https://www.afscet.asso.fr/Archives/Systemic-Approach-eng.pdf>

Fullan, M. (2011) *Change Leader: Learning to do what matters most*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Gronn, P. (2003). Distributing and intensifying school leadership. In N. Bennett, & L. Anderson (Eds.), *Rethinking Educational Leadership* (pp. 60–73). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, S., & Harvey, M. (2017). A distributed leadership change process model for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39(2), 126–139. DOI: 10.1080/1360080X.2017.1276661

Khan, N. (2017). Adaptive or transactional leadership in current higher education: A brief comparison. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(3), 179–183. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1142294.pdf>

- Kirby, P. C., Paradise, L. V., & King, M. I. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 85(5), 303–311. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27540491>
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. In *Review of research: Learning from Leadership Project* (pp. 20-69). New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from: <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.pdf>
- McGregor, D. M. (1957/1993). The human side of enterprise. In M. T. Matteson, & J. M. Ivancevich (Eds.), *Management and Organizational Behavior Classics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 229–237). Homewood, IL: Irwin. (Original work published 1957).
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2009). Sustainable learning communities: From managed systems to living systems. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 22(1), 19–38. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1029862710/>
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Toronto, ON: Allyn & Bacon.
- O'Malley, D. (September 4, 2019). Impactful and meaningful leadership [Blog post]. Retrieved from: <https://blog.typosy.com/impactful-and-meaningful-leadership>

- Ontario Council of University Faculty Associated (2019). Collegial governance at Ontario universities Report of the OCUFA University Governance Committee.  
<https://ocufa.on.ca/assets/2019-02-09-Governance-Report.pdf>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Limited.
- Senge, P., Scharmer, C., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2005). *Presence: Exploring Profound Change in People, Organizations and Society*. Toronto, ON: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). Leadership as a stewardship. In M. Fullan (ed.), *The Jossey Bass Reader on Educational Leadership* (pp. 75–92). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Soltis, J. F. (1978). *An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Toronto, ON: Addison-Wesley.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). Fundamentals of Scientific Management. In *The Principles of Scientific Management* (pp. 7–71). New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Townsend, T. (2011). School leadership in the twenty-first century: Different approaches to common problems? *School Leadership and Management*, 31(2), (pp. 93–103). DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2011.572419
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). Becoming a trustworthy leader. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *The Jossey Bass Reader on Educational Leadership* (pp. 99–113). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Wahab, S., Rahmat, A., Yusof, M. S., & Mohamed, B. (2015). Organization performance and leadership style: Issues in education service. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 224, (pp. 593–598). DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.447
- Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wheatley, M. J. (2007). *Finding our way: Leadership for an uncertain time*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

## Appendix A

### Transactional and Transformational Management Summary

<b>Transactional Leadership</b>	<b>Transformational Leadership</b>
1. Management by Control	1. Management by Objectives
2. External Control of Human Behaviour	2. Decentralization & Delegation
3. Efficiency	3. Self-Motivated
4. Change Resistant	4. Self-Control & Self-Direction
5. Directive	5. Inspirational
6. Extrinsic Motivation	6. Shared Meaning
7. Control	7. Change
8. Passive	8. Personal Integrity
9. Standardization	9. Adaptable
10. Hierarchy Dependent	10. Intrinsic Motivation
11. Dedication to Status-Quo	11. Relationship Management (Participation & Consultative Management)
12. Lack of Creativity	12. Collaboration

**Appendix B**

**Transactional and Transformational Management Chart**

AUTHOR	TRANSACTIONAL THEORY	TRANSFORMATIONAL THEORY
<p>BURNS (1978)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all human influences are necessarily coercive and exploitative, that not all transactions among persons are mechanical impersonal, ephemeral. It lies in seeing that the most powerful influence consists of deeply human relationships in which two or more persons engage with one another</li> <li>• Transactional leaders exploit their external resources (economic, social, psychological, and institutional) and their ‘effectance’, their training, skill, and competence, to make persons and things do what they want done</li> <li>• The motives of transactional leaders may not coincide with what the followers want done</li> <li>• Such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in contacting others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another person in exchange for willingness to listen to one’s troubles</li> <li>• Such power objectifies its victims; its literally turns them into objects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We must see power – and leadership – as not things but as relationships</li> <li>• We must analyze power in a context of human motives and physical constraints</li> <li>• Power is first of all a relationship; involving the intention or purpose of both power holder and power recipient; and hence that it is collective, not merely the behaviour of one person</li> <li>• To define power not as a property or entity or possession but as a relationship in which two or more persons tap motivational bases in one another and bring varying resources to bear in the process is to perceive power as drawing a vast range of human behaviour into orbit” (15)</li> <li>• Power is ubiquitous; it permeates human relationships</li> <li>• Leadership is relational, collective, and purposeful</li> <li>• The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivations and of power potential, including skill in pursuit of a common or at least joint purpose</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transactional – “Objectified and dehumanized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transforming leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality</li> <li>• Transformative - “Elevating, mobilizing, inspiring, exalting, uplifting, preaching, exhorting, evangelizing</li> <li>• Transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both</li> </ul>
<p>CAPRA (2002)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classical management theory (an assembly of precisely interlocking parts)</li> <li>• Command and communication identified through practical divisions</li> <li>• Associates transactional management style with Taylor’s Scientific Management model (analyzes and synthesizes workflows; main objective is improving economic efficiency, especially labour productivity; early attempts to apply science to engineering of processes and to management)</li> <li>• Control through machines</li> <li>• Efficiency increased through mechanistic approach; develops and fosters hostile work environments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-sustaining management theory built on web of communication linked to mutual meaning, values and beliefs</li> <li>• Organizations are living systems; networks within themselves and recognized structures</li> <li>• Individuals building societies founded on strong relationships and meaningful influences</li> <li>• Recognized structures define the rules and regulations between people, determine the distribution of power, policies, strategies and procedures</li> <li>• Informal networks establish networks of communication that evolve based on communication channels developed within organization</li> <li>• Adaptable to economic environment through</li> </ul>

		<p>transformation or replacement of mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continually changing to further develop network and structures</li> <li>• Individuals have autonomy to act and make decisions</li> <li>• Complex, integrated systems in which all aspects are interconnected, reciprocal, and relational</li> </ul>
<p>MCGREGOR (1957/1993)/ARGYRIS (1993)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory X</li> <li>• The methods for directing behaviour involve coercion and threat (usually disguised), close supervision, tight controls over behaviour</li> <li>• Force breeds counter force: restriction of output, antagonism, militant unionism, subtle but effective sabotage of management objectives</li> <li>• Behaviour is not a consequence of man’s inherent nature; it is a consequence, rather, of the nature of industrial organizations, of management philosophy, policy, and practice.</li> <li>• Direction and control are essentially useless in motivating people whose important needs are social and egoistic. Both the hard and the soft approach fail today because they are simply irrelevant to the situation</li> <li>• People, deprived of opportunities to satisfy at work the needs which are now important to them, behave exactly as we might predict – with indolence, passivity, resistance to change, lack of responsibility, willingness to follow the demagogue, unreasonable demands for economic benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory Y</li> <li>• Many studies have demonstrated that the tightly knit, cohesive work group may, under proper conditions, be far more effective than an equal number of separate individuals in achieving organizational goals</li> <li>• Management cannot provide a man with self-respect, or with the respect of his fellows, or with the satisfaction of needs for self-fulfillment. It can create such conditions that he is encouraged and enabled to seek such satisfactions for himself, or it can thwart him by failing to create those conditions</li> <li>• This is a process primarily of creating opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, providing guidance</li> <li>• Management by objectives in contrast to management by control</li> </ul>

<p>MITCHELL &amp; SACKNEY (2009)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management theory developed during times of industrial and technological economic growth; main concerns were production, efficiency, technology and predictability</li> <li>• Work environments developed around ideology of efficiency and compliance</li> <li>• Organizations can be understood by deconstructing into departments, removing communication networks and evaluating individual parts for efficiency and productivity</li> <li>• Broken components can be repaired or replaced</li> <li>• Believe organizations are similar to machines, complete tasks with precision and regularity</li> <li>• Organization connected through hierarchy, not communication networks or relationships</li> <li>• Workforce is controlled, prescribed, structured and homogeneous; employee’s roles and responsibilities are defined through rules and procedures; relationally detached</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management theory described as interconnected, reciprocal and relational</li> <li>• Understood through interconnectedness of organizational components and adaptability to changing environment</li> <li>• Theory of interdependence: organizational perspective moves from separate pieces within system to recognizing connectedness, shared influences and networks between individuals and their environments</li> <li>• Deep ecology: organization belief of shared influences, contexts, relationships, connections and patterns</li> <li>• All human life is somehow linked and argues organizations should be as well</li> <li>• Organization is defined by its values and meaning; its activities, procedures and policies develop its recognized structures</li> <li>• Developed principles guide individuals through visions, values, organizational beliefs</li> </ul>
<p>SENGE ET AL. (2005)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic problem of fragmentation is a way of thinking that consists of false division, making a division where there is tight connection and of seeing separateness where there is wholeness</li> <li>• Management by fear</li> <li>• Managers driving organizations to meet quantitative goals set at the top, with little serious effort to build new capacities required to achieve sustainable levels of improved performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectedness is the defining feature of the new worldview – connectedness as an organizing principle of the universe, connectedness between the ‘outer world’ of manifest phenomena and the ‘inner world’ of lived experience, and, ultimately, connectedness among people and between humans and the larger world.</li> <li>• Studies of effective teams in work settings, for example,</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of balance between valuing what can be measured and what cannot, and becoming so dependent on quantitative measure that displace judgement and learning</li> <li>• Lost sight of how to conserve those values at the top. Training for executives focused on learning about the business rather than learning about one’s effectiveness in relationship with others on behalf of the business</li> <li>• Became more business rather than a human community</li> </ul>	<p>typically focus on roles, tasks, and interpersonal dynamics, ignoring the fact that a team’s effectiveness often depends on how it interacts with the larger organizational context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationships are more fundamental than things</li> <li>• Each self-organizing system is a whole made up of parts, which are themselves whole at a lower level. At each level, the morphic field gives each whole its characteristic properties and makes it more than the sum of its parts</li> <li>• Transformational leadership aids organizations in “generating new patterns of organizing, or ‘self-organize’, and being aware in the sense of interacting effectively with their environment</li> <li>• Quality of our being and relationships with one another become more and more central in allow an organization to flourish</li> <li>• Legitimacy and trust are crucial for the free flow of information and for how information gets transformed into value</li> </ul>
<p>WHEATLEY (2007)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management theory based around command and control ideology</li> <li>• Increases employee disengagement, lack of problem-solving, routine work assignments, focus primarily on power</li> <li>• Belief in policies, procedures protocols, laws and regulations that paralyze employee activeness and creativity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management theory based on living systems model; naturally occurring and found in all living things</li> <li>• Individuals assemble with ideology of accomplishing more based on mutual values and beliefs</li> <li>• Self-sustaining organizations are more productive</li> <li>• Intelligence levels of organizational individuals</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized decision-making model resulting in less productivity</li> <li>• Organizational leader enact change by imposing power; only select few have power to wield, decreasing productivity, efficiency, creativeness, engagement</li> </ul>	<p>heightened in scenarios of problem solving and crises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory allows organization and individuals to develop mutual values and beliefs; natural networks of communication and relationships are generated</li> <li>• Power is translated to employee's, thus increasing engagement, desire to complete responsibilities, accountability, and overall efficiency</li> <li>• Organizations and their environments are adaptable, robust and intelligent</li> <li>• Individuals utilize past experience to identify issues, communicate with those who can assist and mutually develop solutions using creativity</li> <li>• Promotes participation, collaboration and self-organization, increasing their want to contribute</li> <li>• Effective communication channels developed and sustained through active information sharing through all networks</li> <li>• Organizations have historical context, individual identity that others can relate to and a purpose they can belief in</li> </ul>
--	--	---