

Prioritization of Transformational Leadership Dimensions in the Industry (Case study: Aircraft Industry of Iran)

Ali Jokar^{1*}, Abdolreza Miri², Esmail Sabzikaran³

¹Senior lecturer and Instructor of Shahid Sattari Aviation University, Tehran, Iran

²Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

³M.A. in Public Administration, Faculty of Management Department, Shahid Sattari Aviation University

*Email: Alj_26478@yahoo.com

Abstract : In the recent researches conducted in the field of leadership, interactions of transformational leadership with regards to charisma have been investigated. Interactive leaders mostly emphasize on maintaining the status quo, but in the transformational leadership, leaders inspire followers to change the status quo and cause the sense of emotional commitment to the missions of organization among employees. Hence, the experts consider transformational leadership more effective than interactive leadership. Though, investigating dimensions of transformational leadership in the country provides the possibility of getting benefits from appropriate mechanisms to improve the leadership. This description and surveying was applied, and field research provided to explain aspects of priority of transformational leadership dimensions in the Iran's aircraft industry. The study population randomly selected among top companies in the aircraft industry. Findings show that, based on viewpoint of employees, managers have different priorities for transformational leadership dimensions, in which the personal identification of individuals and their mental stimulations have the least and perspective expression have the highest priority.

[Ali Jokar, Abdolreza Miri, Esmail Sabzikaran. **Prioritization of Transformational Leadership Dimensions in the Industry (Case study: Aircraft Industry of Iran)**. *J Am Sci* 2012;8(7):1-5]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). <http://www.americanscience.org>. 1

Keywords: dimensions of transformational leadership, perspective expression, personal identification, mental stimulation.

1. Introduction

According to Senge study in 1990 about traditional viewpoint to the leadership, in which certain people determine the directions, leader would make major decisions and give people the spirit and power which is deeply rooted in the thinking of individual and non-systematic attitude. In western societies, this emerged as a "legendary leader".

New attitude towards leadership in inclusive organization emphasizes on the finer and more important points. In an inclusive organization, leaders are designers, supervisors and teachers. Their responsibility is providing organizations where people continually develop their abilities to recognize complexities, make goals clear, and develop mental models. This means that leaders are responsible for employees learning (Senge, 1991).

It should be noted that the correspondence among new leadership tasks is one characteristics of transformational leadership. In order to having better understanding about transformational leadership, it can be said that most of the classical studies have focused on aspects of leadership that was compatible with maintaining the status quo and meet the standards of work, called interaction-oriented leadership. Nowadays, more emphasis is on the characteristics and behaviors that are compatible with charismatic leadership, namely transformational

leadership (Seyed javadin, 2004).

Most theorists stated common factors for transformational leadership such as inspiration, part attitude, charisma, human communications, consideration to the feelings of staff, learning development and stimulating the minds of followers, establishing emotional connections with employees, etc (Bass, 1985; Rafferty et al. (2004); Senge, 1991).

Based on the importance of leadership as one of the essential elements of successful organizations and due to the importance of transformational leadership development, this study was sought to assess and prioritize aspects of the transformational leadership in aircraft industry. Several definitions presented for leadership, but none of them has been generally accepted. Attitude of leadership as a process, is leading to significant influence to directing and coordinating activities among employees without any obligation in order to achieve the goal of members of a group (Griffin, 2005; Hult et al., 1997). Simply from process vision, "Leadership means influencing on staffs in their tasks with the desire and interest" (Moshabeki, 2001; Shermerhorn et al. 2001).

1-1. Literature Review

Zigurs (2003) have investigated different aspects of leadership in virtual organizations and present it in terms of comprehensive leadership.

Comprehensive leadership creates the meanings and tools for leaders and followers to think precisely and also to create legal grounds for leaders and followers, in order to grow and flourish.

Quinn (1988), based on the part of Burns and Bass models, was established his conflicting values framework. This framework consists of four models or four quadrant provided by comparing the values in two dimensions: "internal - external" and "control – flexibility" dimensions. Open system model emphasize on the outer quarter of external - flexibility, while the internal process model emphasize on the inner quarter of internal - flexibility. Quinn presented conflicting values in order that this framework could be used in the leadership. Leadership roles could be categorized in the eight species. The manager plays the following roles: the monitor, coordinator, director, producers, and innovators, broker, facilitator, and monitor (Yang, 2007).

In the recent researches conducted in the field

of leadership, interactions and transformational leadership with regards to charisma have been investigated. These researches showed that in most leadership theories such as Ohio and Fiddler studies, target path and participatory management emphasize on interactive leaders who were satisfied to maintain the status quo. These leaders would direct their subordinates so that they achieve their own goals and objectives of the organization and acquire their self-discovery phase of the upgrade needed to give satisfaction. However, in transformational leadership, leaders would inspire followers and increase their morale and also followers would obey leaders unconditionally and enthusiastically and have an emotional sense of commitment towards the organization and their missions. Therefore, experts know transformational leadership more effective than interactive leadership (Kiedrowski, 2006). Table 1 shows differences between these two leaderships (Javadin, 2004).

Table 1. Comparison of interactive and transformation leadership

Interactive leadership	Transformational leadership
Contingent rewards: pay bonuses based on performance and contracts	Charisma: a magnificent picture, from heart and based on trust with your followers
Exception-based management (active), work according to standards and regulations and in case of deviations, corrective actions	Inspiring: making ideals and new objectives
Exception-based management intervene only when standards are not observed	Part vision: increase insight of followers
Without the bonds: the leader's role is minimized and is intangible.	Human considerations: will address issues personally, consider the staff and acts as a coach

Source: (Seyed Javadin, 2004)

In this study, we are supposed to measure transformational leadership dimensions proposed by Rafferty and Griffin (2004). The studied dimensions are as follows:

1) Vision: We identify vision as an important leadership dimension encompassed by more general construct of charisma. Bass (1997) argued that the most general and important component of transformational leadership is charisma (Rafferty and Griffin, 2004).

2) Inspirational communication: Transformational leadership goes beyond the cost-benefit exchange of transactional leadership by motivating and inspiring followers to perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985) and inspirational motivation has been identified as an important component of transformational leadership.

3) Supportive leadership: staffs show their interest when leadership shows developing tendencies toward his/her employees, paying personal attention to his/her employees and appropriately meeting their needs [7].

4) Intellectual stimulation: This leadership factor encompasses behaviors that increase followers' interest and should be aware of their problems, and that develop their ability and propensity to think about problems in new ways (Bass, 1985).

5) Personal recognition: In such a system of rewarding, in response to achievement of visions, which is agreed upon, various types of rewards are given. In this study, "personal recognition" is chosen; because among contingency rewards, it is more compatible with the transformational leadership. Personal recognition was defined as follows: "The provision of rewards such as praise and acknowledgement of effort for achievement of specified goals" (Rafferty, 2004).

2. Materials and Methods

Based on methodological point, this study was surveyed and described for research aspect and its application was based on goal aspect. The population of the research consists of 950 people of managers of aircraft industries companies in Iran. A sample of 295 subjects was selected as statistical

sampling. The transformational leadership's measurement questionnaires composed of fifteen 6-choice questions which each of them had five factors. The reliability of the questionnaires has confirmed by selecting appropriate measurement indicators and benefiting experts' corrective recommendations in the preliminary study stage. The single sample T-test was used to examine the dimensions status and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to determine the variables distribution and Friedman test to determine the presence or absence of a significant difference between ordinal means of transformational leadership factors. The reliability of the questionnaires is confirmed in the tables below table 2 and 3.

Table 2 - Assessment of questionnaire validity

Variable coefficient	Cronbach's alpha
Transformational leadership	0.96

Table 3: Assessment of questionnaire validity

Transformational Leadership factors	Questions	Alpha Cronbach's coefficient
Perspective	1 to 3	0.82
Spiritual communications	4 to 6	0.87
Mental motivation	6 to 8	0.86
Supportive leadership	9 to 11	0.90
Personal identification	12 to 15	0.96

Table 4 shows the mean scores for each leadership factors. As it is obvious, the lowest scores are related to personal identification factors with an average of 3.40 and mind stimulation of the employees with an average of 3.42 and the highest scores are related to expressing perspective with an average of 4.2.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the variables distribution.

Table (4): description of Transformational leadership factors in the Aircraft industry

Agent name	The average	Standard deviation
Perspective expression	4.2	1.13
Spiritual communications	3.7	1.1
Supportive leadership	3.67	1.08
Mental motivation(intelligence)	3.42	1.22
Personal identification	3.40	1.22

Hypotheses

H₀: Data have a uniform distribution.

H₁: Data have not a uniform distribution

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the variables distribution

According to the Kolmogorov test in table 5, since the significance levels for all cases are greater than 0.05, so the zero hypothesis could not be rejected and these data have a uniform distribution. Therefore, parametric tests can be used in their analysis. The single sample T-test was used to examine the dimensions status.

Hypotheses

H₀: Dimensions status has a significant difference with the mean = 3.5

H₁: Dimensions status has a significant difference with the mean \neq 3.5

As it is obvious in table 6, except in the case of perspective expression which has low significant value less than 0.05; in other cases, significant levels was more than 0.05. Thus only in the factor of perspective expression it could be concluded that have a significant difference with the mean, and since the mean difference is positive, so would have a positive significant difference i.e. is above the average. But in the case of other factors, their closeness to average could not be rejected based on the available findings. In other words, the other actors have been assessed as moderate.

Table (5): Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.

	Perspective expression	Spiritual communications	Supportive leadership	Mental motivation	Personal identification
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	0.56	0.46	0.50	0.57	0.97
significant levels of the two domains	0.93	0.98	0.95	0.90	0.92

Table (6): single sample T-test

Transformational Leadership factors	Criterion number = 3.5					
	t	Degree of freedom	Significant levels of the two domains	The mean difference	0.95	
					Low limit	High limit
Perspective expression	2.40	14	0.03	0.71	0.08	1.33
Spiritual communications	0.85	14	0.41	0.25	-0.38	0.87
Supportive leadership	0.604	14	0.56	0.17	-0.43	0.77
Mental motivation (intelligence)	-0.243	14	0.81	-0.08	-0.75	0.60
Personal identification	-0.346	14	0.73	-0.11	-0.79	0.57

Table (7): Mean ordinal factors Transformational industry leadership

Agent Name	Mean rank
Perspective expression	4.08
Spiritual communications	3.36
Supportive leadership	3.02
Personal identification	2.20
Mental motivation (intelligence)	2.38

As Table 7 shows the mean rank of transformational leadership factors are various and ordered from highest to lowest as follows: Perspective expression, spiritual communications, supportive leadership, personal identification, and mind stimulation. The following chart displays these priorities. Then, the Friedman test was used to determine the presence or absence of a significant difference between ordinal means of transformational leadership factors.

Hypotheses

H_0 : ordinal means of Transformational leadership factors

H_1 : ordinal means of Transformational leadership factors

Table (8): Friedman test statistics

N	15
Chi-square	14.32
Degree of freedom	4
Significance level	0.006

As Table 8 shows, the significance level is equal to 0.006 and less than 0.05. Therefore, zero hypothesis was rejected and also significant differences between mean ordinal rank of transformational leadership factors in the aircraft industry was confirmed. In other words, different factors have different priorities.

3. Results and Discussion

The research findings confirmed the similar research such as Ohio and Fiddler studies, target path about interactive leaders (Javadin, 2004). The results obtained from descriptive data indicate that managers of aircraft concerned to organizational goals and duties more than employees. Managers have major weaknesses with regards to using some management leverages, because they disesteem to staffs' needs and feelings. They also do not pay attention to quality of their work. They are interactive leaders who were satisfied to maintain the status quo. This is in accordance with Ohio and Fiddler studies and also Seyed Javadin model (2004). According to the employees' point of view, managers are neglectful to admire more than average work, considering their needs, admiration of quality improving, and considering the feelings of subordinates, but have a good recognition of the organization's goal. Based on interpretation of descriptive results of factors in Rafferty and Griffin (2004) and Bass model (1985), the lowest scores are related to factors of personal identification and mind stimulation, and the highest score is related to perspective expression. This also shows that managers do not get enough attention to the psychological aspects of individuals and are unaware of intellectual capabilities of their employees. Research shows that managers' visions are traditional and hardware-oriented and they neglect software aspect of organizations including personnel and organizational intellectual capital.

4. Conclusion

According to the warnings from low scores of some indicators, it is recommended to give the managers required trained about various management levers, material or non-material. Managers relatively appropriate considerations about goals and perspectives from employees' point are strengths that besides reducing the weaknesses could lead to the development of industry. The clear proposal of research is that managers always try to encourage staff to through identify and reward the people that

work better than standard, while trying to effectively benefit from suggestions system in order to take advantage of employees' ideas and use the good suggestions in the organization and provide a serious mechanism for encouraging employees. Studying the topics of learning organization and single ring, double ring, and secondary learning and their practical use could also provide required readiness to fix weaknesses. About suggestions to researchers, several issues of leadership and its relationship with other organizational factors that can be proposed and here are a few points. Investigating the differences between the private sector and public sector managers in various industries such as aircraft companies to demonstrate the effectiveness of government in organizations' leaderships could be subject to investigation. It is recommended to study "Assessment of leadership learning among managers" with the expansion of leadership indicators with regards to Senge's comments (1990) in the books "fifth wheel" and "Dance of Change" and also comments of Deft (2001) in the final chapter of the book "structure theory and design". These indicators include: leader as a designer, leader as a supervisor, leader as a teacher, constructive concerns in leadership, thinking leader, providing an overall picture of the organization, etc. Clarifying the relationship between transformational leadership with the other organizational elements such as culture, technology, structure, etc. can also provide a variety of fields to study.

References

1-Bass, B. (1985). "Leadership and performance beyond expectations". New York: The Free Press.
 2-Griffin, Morehead. (2005). "Organizational behavior" translated by Alwani, Mehdi and

Memarzadeh, Gholamreza Tehran: Morvarid publications.

3-Hult, T.M. and Ferrell, OC (1997). "A global learning organization structure and market information processing". Journal of Business Research, Vol. 97, No. 40, pp. 155-66.

4-Javadin, Seyed R. (2004). Comprehensive overview of management and organization theories. Tehran: Negahe Danesh publications.

5-Kiedrowski, P. Jay. (2006). Quantitative assessment of a Senge learning organization intervention. The Learning Organization. 13 (4), 369-383.

6-Moshabeki, Asghar (2001) ; Management and organizational behavior. Tehran: Termeh Publication

7-Rafferty AE. and Griffin MA (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. The Leadership Quarterly. 15(3): 329-354.

8-Senge PM (1990). The leaders' New Work: Building learning organizations. Sloan Management Review, 32 (1): 7-23.

9-Senge PM (1991). Transforming the practice of management", paper presented at the Systems Thinking in Action Conference.

10-Shermerhorn, John R, James J. Hunt, Richard N.Osborne (2001). "Management of Organizational Behavior." Translated by Iran nejad Parizi, Mehdi; Babayi, Mohammad Ali; and Sobhanollahi

11-Yang, JT (2007). Knowledge sharing: Investigating appropriate leadership roles and collaborative culture. Tourism Management. 28(2): 530-543.

12-Zigurs, I.(2003) .Leadership in Virtual Teams: Oxymoron or Opportunity? Organizational Dynamics, Vol .31, No .4, pp.339-351.

4/29/2012