

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORAL TAXONOMIES IN UNIVERSITIES

Riaz Ahmed Mangi, (Corresponding Author)

*Assistant Professor
Department of Commerce
Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur
E-mail: ramangi30@gmail.com*

Asad Raza Abidi

*Assistant Professor
Department of Commerce
Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur*

Hasan Jawad Soomro

*Assistant Professor
Department of Commerce
Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur
E-mail: hassanjawadsoomro@yahoo.com*

Ikhtiar Ali Ghumro

*Assistant Professor
Department of Commerce
Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur
E-mail: ikhtiarghumro@yahoo.com*

Dr. Amanat Ali Jalbani

*Professor
SZABIST Karachi*

ABSTRACT

The study was intended to recognize and replicate the Yukl's (1989-2004) behavioral taxonomies in the university settings in Sindh. A comprehensive questionnaire based on the items in taxonomies was developed, face validity of the questionnaire was test and found suitable. A total of 90 university Deans and head of Departments were randomly selected from public and private universities of Sindh. Categorical reliability of the data was checked and found highly reliable. The majority of the respondents were male, post graduate, above 50 years of age, married and had more than 15 years of experience. The statistical analysis describes the typical Sindhi culture among the respondents. A large number of university leadership focused on the relation as compared to task and change at the universities. This research also supports partial replication of three dimensions i.e., Relation, Task and Change as Yukl's behavioral taxonomies with first order factor analysis. Relation factor was replicated completely, while other two were replicated in two different facets each i.e., Change was replicated in two facets – Improvement and Process and Task was also replicated in two facets – Improvement and Process. Making a second order factor analysis assured these two factors were replicated completely.

Keywords: *Behavioral taxonomies, Relations, Task, Change, Leadership, Universities*

1. INTRODUCTION

During the last century Leadership theories emerged as major ingredient for business successes; a large number of models were developed to describe the activities of leaders with association to their success in diverse situations (Antonakis and House, 2002; Yukl, 2006). (Yukl, 1989) classified the behavior of in distinct leadership taxonomies for decision making. The autocratic leader is the managers who detest any involvement from the subordinated or any other person in decision making. In the case of higher education institutes the decision making authority rests with Vice chancellors, Pro Vice Chancellors, Deans and Head of the Departments. This study was an attempt to discover and determine the behavioral classification of university leadership according to the leadership taxonomies of (Yukl, 1989). An exploratory-descriptive approach was applied for the determination of leadership classification in higher education institutes of Sindh.

1-1. Problem Statement

Higher education is growing at tremendous pace. During the last decade, a number of higher education institutes have been opened throughout the country. As the number of universities, student enrolment and diversity is growing, the leadership challenges are also emerging. (Daft, 2005) expressed that the organizations throughout the world are sensing the impact of the changes and these must adopt accordingly. He further asserts that, new leadership needs to manage the crisis properly, keep firm control, build collaboration, appraise diversity and be affectionate for the achievement of objectives. The leadership of the higher education institutions makes various decisions at different levels regarding the future of the institutions. Particularly, in Pakistan and specifically in Sindh the author could not find any meaningful research on the subject area regarding the behavioral approaches of the leadership in academic institutions. Understanding the behavioral taxonomies of leadership will be an important addition to literature.

1-2. Statement of Purpose

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relevance of (Yukl's, 1989) three dimensional taxonomies to the leadership of universities in Sindh. The research sought to make classification of the university leadership (Dean, Head of Department) according to the three dimensional taxonomies.

1-3. Significance of the study

Through this study the behavioral taxonomies of leadership in the higher education institutions in Sindh were explored. This research was a ground breaking work to understand how leaders in higher education institutions conceive their role, duties, responsibilities and behavior in order to fulfill task, improve relationship and bringing positive change in the institution. The findings of the research can be utilized for increasing leadership potential for attaining strategic objectives of the institution. This research was an empirical scoping study to investigate to recognize and develop efficient and competent leadership in higher education institutions. The leadership studies in higher education institutions tend to focus on the behavior of the Deans and Head of Department (Bargh et al., 2000).

1-4. Theoretical Framework

The study was based on (Yukl's, 1990-2004) three dimensional taxonomies theory. It has been observed from the various studies that a number of behavioral theories were developed but it was difficult to determine which is most suitable in a given situation. In the last four decades scholars came up with bewildered behavioral categories of the leaders (Bass, 1990) (Flieshman, 1990). (Yukl, 1989) stated that there are various reasons for the variation in the behavioral taxonomies. As much as 16 studies (Yukl, 2002) have been conducted from 1953 to 1994 to determine the behavior of the leaders and still there is need of more studies to comprehend and settle on the behavioral categories. (Yukl, 1989-2004) have developed three dimensional taxonomies which include task oriented leaders, relation oriented leaders and change oriented leaders. The three dimensional taxonomies are the most useful and parsimonious of all the behavioral theories (Ekvall & Arvonen 1991). Present study is an attempt to classify the leadership of the universities of Sindh according to the (Yukl's, 1989-2004) three dimensional taxonomies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher education institutions around the world employ public funds now a days these are under escalating demands from different stakeholders to exhibit value for money performance (Pounder, 2000). This increasing pressure is shifting on the leadership of the institutions. Leadership in today's academia must take into account the needs and demands of changing conditions in the institutions. It emphasizes that leadership behavior significantly influence the behavior of subordinates. Thus, it can be accentuated that an effective leader can persuade others to achieve organizational objectives. (Daft, 2005) while comparing old and new paradigms of leadership, contrasts stability with change and crisis management, control with empowerment, competition with collaboration, uniformity with diversity, self-centeredness with higher purpose and hero with humble. The behavioral approach of leadership includes trust, respect, affection, kindness and interaction between the leaders and subordinates (Halpin, 1957) (Hemphill, 1955) (Stodgill, 1963). On the other hand (Yukl, 2006) pointed out that leadership is the process of persuading subordinates to understand the conditions and agree upon what to do and how to do the work according the predetermined objectives, he further asserts that leadership is the process of assisting others for collective efforts for attaining mutual objectives. (Mintzberg, 1973) developed taxonomy of ten managerial roles identified in terms of figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesman, entrepreneur disturbance handler, and resource allocation. The innovativeness, creativity and progressiveness should be the integral qualities of the leaders of higher education institutions (Bulger, 2005). The challenges of higher education institutions; he has delineated curriculum, resources and public perception as major predicament confronted by the leadership of higher education institutions (Ramsden, 1998). The university leadership influence the subordinates to work hard and be committed to achieve predetermined objectives

(Sugarman, 2000). He further stated that the leadership of higher education institutions are either task oriented or peoples oriented. Task-oriented, leaders are most concerned with training; educate behavior and performance whereas person-oriented leaders are more interested in the interpersonal relationships among the subordinates. (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000) describe that the leadership attribute in university comprises broad vision, mutual trust and ability to communicate the objectives and direction to subordinates. There are several reasons for the diversity of taxonomies developed to describe the leadership behavior ((Fleishman et al., 1991) (Yukl, 1989). The most recent research suggest that three dimensional taxonomy provides most useful and parsimonious way to group specific behavior into general categories (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991) (Yukl, 1999).

3. METHODOLOGY

3-1. Sampling

This study had employed an exploratory-descriptive approach and covered academic and executive leadership of six institutes and universities of Sindh. These higher education institutions were selected on the basis their significance, type, size, location and disciplinary mix.

Table No.1

Respondents Demographics

Demographics	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	79	88
	Female	11	12
Age	Up to 50 Years	30	33
	Above 50 Years	60	67
Academic Qualification	Post Graduate	90	100
Experience	Up to 15 Years	18	20
	Above 15 Years	72	80
Marital Status	Married	90	100

3-2. Research Instrument

A detailed questionnaire based on the (Yukl, 1989-2004) three dimensional taxonomies was developed containing the demographics of the respondents and the items elaborated in the research framework. A five point Likert scaling was used in the questions starting from 5 - Always; 4 – Frequently, 3- Seldom, 2- Occasionally; 1- Never. Survey items were constructed by the researcher based on extensive literature reviews on leadership behavior.

Table No. 2

Respondents Sample Representation

Institutions	No Respondents	%
MUET Jamshoro	14	16
University of Sindh	36	40
SALU Khairpur	24	26
IBA Sukkur	04	4.4
Iqra University Karachi	04	4.4
QAUET Nawabshah	08	8.8

4. DATA ANALYSIS

Table No.3

4-1. Reliability

Items	Number of Variable	Reliability
Task	06	.75
Change	07	.76
Relations	06	.90

The reliability of all variable was checked and it was observed that the items related to variables task had .75, change, relations .90. It can be concluded that data regarding the variable was highly reliable.

4-2. Demographic Analysis

The intended population for this study was leadership (Deans, Head of Departments) of universities in Sindh. The sample was selected by considering the previous studies of Brooks (2007) Ogulana, Limsila(2007) Tabbod, Prahallad(2009). The size of sample was 90 both male and female respondents of public and private universities in Sindh. The questionnaire was divided into two categories; the first category included 19 questions contained opinion of respondent's leadership taxonomies and second portion included nine questions regarding the demographics of the respondents. 79 (88%) of the respondents were male and 11(12%) were female. The age of the respondents was 30(33%) up to 50 years and 60(67%) were above 50 years of age. All of the respondents were postgraduate, 18(20%) had experience up to 15 years and 72(80%) had experience more than 15 years. All of the respondents were married.

4-3. Analysis of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table No. 4

Experience		TASK	CHANGE	RELATION
up to 15 yrs	N	18	18	18
	<i>M</i>	2.19	2.28	2.23
	<i>SD</i>	1.156	1.086	1.080
above 15 yrs	N	72	72	72
	<i>M</i>	1.90	2.31	2.22
	<i>SD</i>	.851	.967	.751
Total	N	90	90	90
	<i>M</i>	1.96	2.31	2.22
	<i>SD</i>	.920	.986	.820

Above table show the demographic characteristics, *M* and standard deviation of the respondents regarding the three leadership taxonomies. The results suggest that the *M* value for the respondents having 15 years of experience had *M* value of (2.1) for task, change (2.28) relations (2.23). So it can be concluded that the leaders with 15 years of experience mainly focus on change so they are change oriented. The *M* value for the respondents having more than 15 years of experience is, task (1.90) change(2.31) relations(2.22), the results suggest that these kind of leaders are change and relations oriented.

Table No. 5

Gender		TASK	CHANGE	RELATION
1 Male	N	79	79	79
	<i>M</i>	2.01	2.33	2.24
	<i>SD</i>	.954	.972	.819
2 Female	N	11	11	11
	<i>M</i>	1.58	2.15	2.09
	<i>SD</i>	.496	1.119	.858
Total	N	90	90	90
	<i>M</i>	1.96	2.31	2.22
	<i>SD</i>	.920	.986	.820

The *M* score for male for task (2.01) change (2.33) relations (2.24) so it can be concluded that the male leaders are mainly change oriented. On the other hand *M* value of female leaders for task (1.58) change (2.15) relations (2.09). The results show that the female leaders of the universities are change oriented.

Table No. 6

Income		TASK	CHANGE	RELATION
1 Up to 100K	N	33	33	33
	<i>M</i>	2.00	2.12	2.40
	<i>SD</i>	.932	.908	1.017
2 Above 100K	N	57	57	57
	<i>M</i>	1.94	2.42	2.12
	<i>SD</i>	.920	1.020	.671
Total	N	90	90	90
	<i>M</i>	1.96	2.31	2.22
	<i>SD</i>	.920	.986	.820

The academic leaders having salary up to Rs 100,000 had *M* value for task (2.0) change (2.12) relations (2.40). These results explain that the respondents are more relations oriented but they also focus on change as well. The leaders having salary more than Rs 100,000 has *M* score for task (1.94) change(2.42) relations(2.40) are more likely to be change oriented they also focus on the relations, but they does not pay much attention to the accomplishment of the tasks

Table No. 7

Age		TASK	CHANGE	RELATION
Up to 50 yrs	N	30	30	30
	<i>M</i>	2.16	2.20	2.45
	<i>SD</i>	1.027	1.027	1.025
Above 50 yrs	N	60	60	60
	<i>M</i>	1.86	2.36	2.11
	<i>SD</i>	.853	.969	.678
Total	N	90	90	90

The leaders up to 50 years of age had *M* score of (2.16) fro task (2.20) change and (2.45) for relations. The *M* score of the respondents above 50 years of age were (1.86) task (2.36) change and (2.11) for relations. The above results suggest that the younger leaders mainly focus on the relations and change, where as, the older leadership consider change and relations So it can be concluded that the younger leaders are relations oriented and older leaders are change oriented.

The results of factor analysis describe that the Yukl's behavioral taxonomies were not replicated as one construct in the universities of Sindh. It was divided into two facets. Therefore second order factor analysis showed that these two facets loaded on a single factor change leadership and task leadership.

Table No.8**4-4. Factor Analysis**

	First Order					Second Order	
	Relation	Change Improvement	Change Process	Task Improvement	Task Process	Change	Task
Eigenvalues	6.03	3.05	2.53	1.94	1.36	1.23	1.22
Variance Explained (%)	31.91	47.78	61.12	71.32	80.58	61.33	61.02
Items	Factor Loadings						
help subordinates to resolve conflicts	0.86						
provide support and encouragement to subordinates	0.82						
express confidence in peoples for attaining objectives	0.80						
recognize contribution and	0.79						

accomplishment							
lead by examples	0.76						
socialize with the subordinates	0.74						
celebrate progress in implementing change	0.69						
interpret the conditions that need urgent change		0.96	}			0.781	
encourage views of peoples for improvement		0.94					
study competitors for getting ideas for improvement		0.92					
at work, organize activities to improve performance			0.92	}		0.781	
explain rules, policies and standard operating procedures			0.91				
assign work to group or individual to achieve objectives			0.88				
experiment with new approaches to get objectives					0.93	}	0.783
form task teams to implement change					0.91		
encourage innovative ideas of subordinates					0.88		
monitor operations and performance of subordinates						0.92	}
resolve problems that disrupt the work						0.91	
emphasize the importance of efficiency at work						0.88	

The results of factor analysis describe that the Yukl's behavioral taxonomies were not replicated as one construct in the universities of Sindh. The results of first order factor analysis formulated five factors such as, relations, change improvement, change process, task improvement and task process. The large number of items were included in the first factor (relations) whereas the other factor were converging very closely so second order factor analysis was applied. The results created two factors, which were named as change and task. Therefore, second order factor analysis showed that these two facets loaded on a single factor change leadership and task leadership.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Through this research, it is found that the leadership in the universities mainly focuses on the relationship rather than task or change. The cultural settings of the universities are the integral part in the behavioral tendencies of the leadership and traditionally the Sindhi peoples believe in affectionate relations either with peers or with subordinates. It was observed that male leadership was more inclined towards change as compared to female; the experienced leadership was also change oriented and leaders having income more than 100,000 were change oriented and the group earning below 100,000 was tend to be relation oriented. A large number of respondents were unclear about their behavioral approach. A major portion of university leadership believes in supporting and guiding the subordinates, they frequently socialize with them and encourage, monitor and explain policies and set standards for achieving the objectives. The leadership of the universities described that for efficient performance from the subordinates they set performance examples. The leaders expressed that they always try to create congenial environment in the academic section by resolving the difference among the subordinates. The study has created a new behavioral construct and divided the taxonomies into two classes; one was related to relationship and other with task and change. This study portrays a traditional picture of Sindhi society where the relation are given significant age over other behavioral factor. The study would be very beneficial in terms of policy regarding the selection and retention of the university leadership.

This research also supports partial replication of three dimensions i.e., Relation, Task and Change as Yukl's behavioral taxonomies with first order factor analysis. Relation factor was replicated completely (See Table 8) while other two were replicated in two different facets each i.e., Change was replicated in two facets –

Improvement and Process and Task was also replicated in two facets – Improvement and Process. Making a second order factor analysis assured these two factors were replicated completely.

REFERENCES

1. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002) Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Mindgarden, Redwood City, CA.
2. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004) Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical Report. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
3. Bass, B. M. 1985. Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press: New York.
4. Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994) Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
5. Bass, B. M. (1998) Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
6. Bogler, R. (2001) The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.
7. Bogler, R. (2002) Two profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminate analysis of job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 665–673.
8. Brown, B. C. (2001) Wages and employment in the U.S. apparel industry. *Contemporary Economics Policy*, 19(4), 454-465.
9. Burns, J. M. (1978) Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
10. Chen, K. J. & Chen, S. I. (2008) Personal Traits and Leadership Styles of Taiwan's Higher Educational Institution in Innovative Operations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, 12, 2, 145-150.
11. Davis, J. (2003) Learning to lead. Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Praeger.
12. Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997) Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 1, 19-29.
13. Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. J. (2002) A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: an update and extension. In: Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., eds. *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The road Ahead*. Vol.2. Oxford: Elsevier Science. 12, 35-66
14. Globe, Frank. (1972) Excellence in leadership. American Management Association. Thomas Jefferson Research Center.
15. Heller, H. W. (1993) The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3(1), 74–86.
16. Hinkin, T.R. & Tracey, B.T. (1999) The relevance of charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 105-119.
17. Hirtz, P. D., Murray, S. L. & Riordan, C. A. (2007) The effects of leadership on quality. *Engineering Management Journal*, 19(1), 22-27
18. House, R. J. (1995) Leadership in the twenty-first century: a speculative inquiry", in Howard, A. (Eds), *The Changing Nature of Work*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
19. House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004) Culture, leadership and organizations. Beverly hills, CL: Sage Publications Inc.
20. Johns, H. E., & Moser, H. R. (2001) From trait to transformation: The evolution of leadership theories. *Education*, 110(1), 115–122.
21. Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995) The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333.
22. McKee, J. G. (1991) Leadership styles of community college presidents and faculty job Satisfaction. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 15(1), 33–46.
23. McLaurin, J. R. & Amri, M. B. A. (2008) Developing an Understanding charismatic and transformational leadership. Allied Academics International conference. Proceedings of the Academy of organizational Culture, communications and Conflicts, 13(2).
24. Nicholson II, W. D. (2007). Leading where it counts: An Investigation of the leadership styles and behaviors that define college and university presidents as successful fundraisers. *International Journal of educational Advancement*. 7 (4). 256-270.
25. Northouse, P. G. (2004) Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
26. Robbins S P., Judge, T.A. Millett B & Waters-Marsh T (2008) Organizational Behavior, 5th Ed, Pearson Education, Fenchs Forest, NSW.
27. Snodgrass, J. & Shachar, M. (2008) Faculty perceptions of occupational therapy program directors' leadership styles and outcomes of leadership. *Journal of Allied Health*, 37(4); ProQuest Education Journals.