

Research paper

Neo-charismatic Leadership: A New Theory for Effective Leadership in Higher Education

by Ghada T Angawi (dr.angawi@gmail.com)

Contextualisation

Higher Education (HE) in the United Kingdom is undergoing rapid change and transformation driven by various players in the field such as local governments, global markets and internationalisation, as well as student and local community demands. In these challenging situations many leaders have to co-ordinate between conflicting internal and external demands. Such co-ordination requires certain skills to motivate, influence and shape the attitudes of staff, academics and students. It becomes, therefore, imperative to transform, not only HE quality and service but also to transform leadership from being a figurative role with administrative responsibilities to leaders becoming agents of change playing progressive transformational roles. It could be argued that research into HE leadership is abundant, but I argue that researching leadership effectiveness in times of change and transformation is not sufficiently addressed. Bryman (2007) notes that there is not a great deal of literature that addresses leadership effectiveness in HE. Research in the field of university leadership is relatively new to the general field of leadership. "Until twenty years ago, there was virtually no systematic research into management of HE" (Watson, 2008). This research is intended to fill such a gap using strategic decision-making as a medium.

Abstract: *Many Higher Education (HE) Institutions are currently transforming their processes and programmes in response to global and local demands. Leaders in HE play a significant role in managing such external and internal pressures of change. HE leadership is considered to be under-researched, in comparison with the extensive amount of studies on leadership in general. This study focuses on leaders' behavioural roles in the context of strategic decision-making, using the neo-charismatic theory as a framework for analysis. A qualitative two case study approach is used which involved three leaders of HE in the United Kingdom and three types of strategic decisions: (1) location and reorganisation; (2) input in the form of buildings and funds; and (3) boundaries. Two main methods were used in this research: document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Data analysis revealed a set of recurring behavioural roles and this was compared across the two cases. The findings of the study suggest that the neo-charismatic model (NCM) is highly relevant for understanding effective leadership in HE. Moreover, the model places an emphasis on an ethical dimension that appeared to influence how leaders took decisions and reacted to the context. Finally the findings suggest that when leaders behaved in accordance with the NCM they were able to influence the internal and external context.*

Introduction

The Higher Education Context

Researchers in HE leadership have studied HE organisational structure and identified several models for operation where leaders play different roles (Bensimon et al, 1989;

Bolman and Deal, 1991; Middlehurst, 1995). McNay's identified a four structures model: Collegiums, Bureaucracy, Corporation and Enterprise. McNay's interpretations of the tension between the different structures that could exist in one institution is an example of the current dilemmas that leaders have to confront in any transformational process or strategic decision-making process (McNay, 1995; 2003). According to Watson (2009), there are three players on the level of governance and decision-making in HE: the governing body, the leader, and managers. The governing body play the role of a steward for the organisation's legal and constitutional status and is restrained by the regulation of the national laws. It is also restricted in the way it receives funding, whether private or public. Academic governance is the responsibility of the academic board and relates to matters of teaching, research, awarding of qualifications and any other academic issue. Between the two boards many decisions relating to appointments, resource allocation and strategic options are decided. The leader is a member of both boards and chair for the academic board and they are not the sole decision makers. The leader sets the performance goals according to the strategic direction of the institution and motivates its members to achieve them. Managers execute and take action on implementing decisions (Watson, 2009). The outcome of HE organisations, be it learning, research, consultation and other intellectual output, differentiate them from other type of organisations.

Rationale for Using the Neo-Charismatic Model (NCM)

Leadership was examined through the four leadership theories that are the most relevant to the HE context. Traits theory explains the qualities and personalities of leaders. To this category belongs Weber's original charismatic theory. Weber defined charismatic leaders as having "supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (Weber, 1978, p. 241). Behaviour theory illuminates two main categories of behaviours: task and people (Mouton and Blake, 1984). The main problem with this model is that the importance of developing propositions about appropriate behaviours for different situations was overlooked and the contextual factor or contingencies ignored (Yukl, 2010). The third set of theories is concerned with contingencies and situational factors. Fiedler's contingency model explained the interrelation between three factors: task structure, position power and leader-member relations (Fiedler, 1967). The Vroom-Yetton theory (1973) was concerned with leadership behaviours during the decision-making process. The theory explained the behaviours by considering the external situational context (Vroom and Yetton, 1973). The theories were valuable in facilitating the emergence of transformational leadership style theories among which is the neo-charismatic theory. Middlehurst elaborates that traits and behavioural theories are limited in their ability to explain leadership. She concluded that the contingency theory led to a better understanding due to its consideration of contextual factors relating to academics, staff and students and their different backgrounds (Middlehurst, 1993). The power and influence theories are still of interest to researchers in explaining leaders' behaviours from a power perspective. They can be categorised in two ways: the influence on the followers (social power theory) and the mutual influence between the leaders and the followers (social exchange theory). Among those who theorised in the first way were French and Raven (1968). They suggested five bases of social power: (1) legitimate power earned from a position, (2) reward power be it material or mental reward, (3) coercive power by using physical and other types of threat, (4) referent power, which comes from liking someone and being inspired by them, as with charismatic leaders, and (5) expert power when one has knowledge or expertise (French and Raven, 1968). These theories explain the influence between the leader and the led, which form the basis of the transformational and the neo-charismatic theory.

Transformational leadership was examined in contrast with transactional leadership and was seen to address followers' higher need of self-actualisation and meaningful contribution. The transactional leader emphasises social exchange, keeping things as they are without change

or improvement. The transformational leader focuses on challenging the existing paradigm and engaging followers in a new level of thinking concerned with values and vision (Bass and Avolio, 1993; Burns, 1979). Yukl (2010) considers charismatic and neo-charismatic theories transformational. Bensimon and colleagues think that charismatic leadership is difficult to achieve in the academic world except in three suggested conditions: institutions in crisis, small-sized institutions, and achieving institutional quality (Bensimon et al, 1989, pp. 42-43). Bargh and colleagues argue that a transformational theory may only be suitable under divergent conditions. Under convergent conditions, leaders need to be “in tune with prevailing goals and practices, nurturing and accommodating by degrees, rather than questioning and challenging” (Bargh et al, 2000). Middlehurst elaborates that this difficulty might be due to the duality in authority where administration is separate from academia and where loyalty is to departments and disciplines more than to an individual. She also points out that transformation requires a level of visibility that might be difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, with the changing context in British HE, a transformational approach might be required (Middlehurst, 1993, p. 36). Middlehurst’s views seem applicable in relation to the changing context of HE. Visibility becomes important for followers’ trust during transformation. Duality in management or authority can be handled through strong communication and teamwork, which is what a transformational leader does.

What past studies on leadership lack, Middlehurst comments, are the followers’ dimension, as well as falling short of explaining the leadership process (Middlehurst, 1993, p. 31). Mendonca and Kanungo (2007) criticised how past studies focused on the need for power, affiliation, and achievement as being motives for effective leadership. They proposed a new overarching motivational need, which has been overlooked by researchers and that is the moral altruistic need, which drives and motivates leaders for effectiveness. They critiqued past studies in how they ignored some of the core leadership behaviours and focused on the day-to-day routine maintenance of the status quo, which is the core role of management, rather than improving the organisational performance by bringing in change and transformation, which is a leadership role. Past studies also gave inadequate attention to the study of followers’ motivation in their submission to their leaders. Most of the studies used small groups in organisations or artificial lab settings; this would only capture part of the story and miss other important roles such as strategic planning and vision formulation. There was always a separation between followers and leaders. Followers were dealt with as an independent variable and not as one of the leadership explanations especially when it came to attributing charisma or effectiveness (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007). The neo-charismatic theory takes into account these problems and captures leadership in real life situations covering many aspects of leader/followers relation and leader/context influence. It also captures leadership in its paramount functions of transformation and change focusing on two roles in the definition of leadership: setting group goals and moving the group towards achieving these goals (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007).

In higher education, attention is paid to transformational leadership versus transactional leadership; no research exists on charismatic leadership theory and its application in the field. This could be because the theory is confused with Weber’s views on charismatic leadership or simply that it is viewed as a form of transformational leadership. Recent studies in the field of management have made use of the NCM. Jaussi and Dionne (2004) attempted an explanation of the behavioural roles of taking personal risks and unconventionality in the NCM. Rowold and Heinritz (2007) studied the measures of the three transformational, transactional and charismatic leadership styles. Rowold and Laukamp (2009) conducted another study that focused on objective measures to address the existing limitation in the neo-charismatic theory, which emerged from the previous study. Waldman and Javidan (2009) focused on the role played by leaders during strategic decision-making and specifically mergers, using the neo-charismatic theoretical framework. Levine et al. (2010) gave a close examination of the NCM measurable elements. Most of these recent studies were performed outside the field of higher education and that is the omission that is

addressed by the research described in this article.

The Neo-Charismatic Model (NCM)

Researchers now address charismatic leadership more intensively, covering the areas of behavioural roles (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Yukl, 2010), the influence on followers (House, 1998) and the effect of contextual factors (Bass and Avolio, 1993; Burns, 1979). Conger and Kanungo conducted six empirical studies on charismatic leadership in three countries: Canada, USA and India. The studies resulted in a five-factor scale for measuring charisma that was called the Conger and Kanungo Scale (CKS). Their scale was based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) of Bass and Avolio which measured four behavioural components: (1) charisma and idealised influence; (2) inspiration; (3) intellectual stimulation; and (4) individualised consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Conger and Kanungo's scale measured different aspects considering the environment and followers: (1) Strategic Vision and articulation; (2) sensitivity to the environment; (3) sensitivity to members needs; (4) personal risk; and (5) unconditional behaviour. The scale can be used as a diagnostic tool as well as a tool for revealing specific effects of the perceived behaviour on followers' attitudes and behaviours (Conger and Kanungo, 1998, p.94). The model consists of three stages: (1) the search for opportunity stage; (2) formulating a shared vision stage; and (3) devising means to achieve the vision stage.

Different behavioural roles appear in each stage. The search for opportunity stage consists of three main behavioural roles: (1) assessment of the environment in realisation of constraints, limitations and existing opportunities; (2) sensitivity to people's needs; (3) challenging the status quo with a new vision or venture. Formulating a shared vision stage requires: (4) involvement with every level of staff to the point where they embrace the vision, which gives them the power to act towards achieving it, and (5) the articulation of the vision. Devising means to achieve the vision stage is characterised by two main roles that makes a leader a role model for the followers: (6) taking personal risks and (7) acting unconventionally, thus, demonstrating readiness for change and motivating followers' towards transformation (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). The NCM encompasses an ethical dimension based on a leader's altruism, which is defined as a disinterested and selfless concern for the organisation and its members (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007).

The study described in this paper used strategic decision-making as a medium to examine leaders' behavioural roles. Mintzberg defines a decision as a 'commitment to action' (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 58). Noorderhaven (1995) defines it in terms of selection then commitment where two or more courses of action are proposed and an actor who is the decision maker selects one purpose or plan and commits themselves to it. Strategy is defined as a plan designed to achieve a particular long-term aim (Oxford Dictionaries, 2011). Strategic decision-making, therefore, is a process of selection, commitment and long term planning. Leaders' behavioural roles were assessed during this process.

The research questions and propositions

The main question the research addresses is: What is the role of leadership in strategic decision making in HE? In answering this question, the study used the NCM to explain leadership behavioural roles. The model addresses transformation in three stages that are common in strategic decision making literature (Noorderhaven, 1995). In addition, the NCM addresses ethical leadership, which was an integral part of HE leadership roles long ago in the 19th century (Bowen and Shapiro, 1998), and is becoming an integral part of effective leadership research (Olivier, 2012). The detailed behavioural roles that the model addresses included almost all three categories of behaviour addressed in most leadership theories: people, task, and change behaviours.

This theoretical framework led to further questions. Each question aimed at verifying a hypothesis:

(1) There is a relation between the context and leaders' behavioural roles. Therefore the first question is: What is the influence of context on leaders' behavioural roles?

(2) There is a relation between every behavioural role and the one that follows. The second question: Can each behavioural role in the NCM appear alone or does it have to be in conjunction with other roles?

(3) There is a direct relation between effectiveness and a leaders' altruism (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007). The third question is: What is the relation between leaders' altruism and effectiveness?

(4) Finally, if the above hypotheses were confirmed, could the NCM explain effective leadership of strategic decision-making? Are there other effective models or explanations?

In addressing these questions the research aims to achieve the following goals:

1. Test the suitability of NCM for explaining effective leadership in the context of HE.
2. Determine the behavioural roles for effective leadership, which are related to change and transformation.
3. Explore the ethical leadership dimension in relation to effective leadership.
4. Examine mutual influences between context and leadership.

Research design and case selection

The research used a case study methodology with two methods for data collection: document analysis and critical incident interviews. Documents were consulted for their historical content and broad coverage of events. Documents included reports on plans and achievements, minutes of meetings of various working groups as well as minutes of board of governors and academic boards, personal communication between leaders and staff or students, internal and external press coverage, official reports from QAA or HEFCE, etc. They gave an indication of different leadership roles through the text and the way they were written (Somekh and Lewin, 2005). Critical incidents interviews gave freedom to leaders to outline the important details that they thought were vital to explain how a decision was taken and what roles they played that were effective in the decision implementation (Marrelli, 2005; Miles et. al., 2012).

The selected cases fulfilled certain criteria set by the researcher. The first relates to the strategic decision selection. The institution must have gone through strategic change and transformation because of a strategic decision that the leader had taken earlier. The decision must have been lengthy, risky and required a high level of collaboration and resource allocation. Butler (1998) defined six strategic decision types, of which three types fulfilled the criteria above: (1) Input in the form of funds and capital; (2) Location and reorganisation; (3) Boundaries in the form of mergers and alliances (Buttler, 1998). The second criterion relates to the decision outcome. The decision must have reached its outcome and the institution settled into stability before the research was conducted. The outcome must have been positive or successful. It is important to note here that the literature is not definitive on what counts as success or effectiveness, but that does not mean it is impossible to define, or that the work on effectiveness is not recognized (Bell, Bromiley and Bryson, 1998, p. 171). The clearest explanation of the term 'effective' or the term 'success' indicates the achievement of the measures set by the leaders and their organizations for the decision in hand (Sharfman and Dean, 1998, p. 186).

Two cases were chosen for the research. The first is Case X, which fulfilled the first two types of decisions: campus closure and campus development. The leader was appointed as a principal for College X and stayed on to become the first vice-chancellor for University X until leaving post. College X had two campuses: one of them was seen as threatening the future of the college with its inability to retain students, huge maintenance requirement,

distance and other factors. The second campus was heavily invested in with a student-centred approach. Eight informants were interviewed as well as the leader and 43 documents were consulted in the process. College X was awarded full University Title as a result of the transformational decision. The second case is Case Y, which is an example of a merger between two institutions with multi campuses spread across a wide geographical location. The case involved two leaders who agreed on a merger of equals with a dual leadership arrangement. The leader of College A left his post after initiating and signing the merger with the leader of College B who remained in position until retiring. Case Y involved 12 interviews and 78 documents from both merging institutions. After the merger the new institution achieved University Title.

Interviews lasted around 40 minutes and took place where interviewees were most comfortable: private offices, homes, coffee shops and common rooms. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed immediately within the first 24 hours by the researcher. The sample of informants was selected based on the leaders' recommendation of who had a key role during the decision making process or were affected by the decision. Samples involved student union representatives, external consultants and some ordinary staff. Interviewees were asked to elaborate on critical success factors and roles played by leaders. Their analysis was a major part of the research findings. The virtue of the critical incident interviewing technique is that it counters the researchers' subjectivity by reporting what worked according to the interviewees. The researchers' subjectivity only appears in how data was arranged to form each behavioural role and how these roles are interpreted in relation to the contextual variables that surrounded the case. However, this approach may be criticised in terms of how events were interpreted according to the limited perspectives of insiders. I argue that the strength of this technique lies in the repetition of collected data to a point of saturation, which counters individuals' subjectivity. This means that the researcher would stop seeking more views when the collected data was repeated in every new interview indicating an agreement on the effective behavioural roles. Triangulation with Document analysis verified events and actions in their broad occurrence and falsified subjective assumptions of actions or behavioural roles to a great extent.

Ethical Considerations

All interviewees were anonymous except for the case leaders. The declaration of the leaders' identities was important for understanding the context. This thought to pose several problems related to the analysis. The major concern was the effect on the research validity by the inability to report negative roles or findings. To counter this argument it is important to note that the focus was on what was effective, and what contributed to a positive outcome; even if a leader did not disclose a negative aspect, the 'what did not work' was inferred from the evidence. When 'what did not work' was reported, it would be stated in a positive manner. This was agreed with leaders as an ethical consideration to the leaders and their respective institutions. Triangulation with document analysis covered missing data from interviews. All three leaders reviewed the case reports and made their comments on the wording. Leaders were happy to report on 'what did not work' and were comfortable that this was included in the analysis in a positive manner. For the purpose of this paper the identities of the leaders and the institutions have been anonymized.

Data analysis

Thematic text analysis from interviews resulted in specific codes for different behavioural components. The intention was to widen the scope of analysis to cover all effective behaviour that was highlighted in the literature before narrowing down the findings into roles. The final roles that appeared in the findings were the result of this grouping. Behavioural roles were organised according to their appearance on the time line established through

each case's document analysis. Finally a comparison between the three leaders' behavioural roles was conducted before final conclusions were drawn.

Results and Findings

Nine effective behavioural roles emerged and were organised based on the NCM stages as follows:

Stage One: The Search for Opportunity

Assessing the environment behavioural role: the three leaders started their decision-making process with a comprehensive assessment of the environment. While the leader of Case X used external consultants, the leaders of Case Y used their senior management teams to produce the required assessment and did not hire an external consultant until late in the third stage. That resulted in a lack of cultural assessment on a cross-institutional level and affected the accuracy of other decisions related to the leadership arrangement and how the new institution would be structured and managed.

I think the cultural differences were not fully examined and discussed frankly. Instead, we hoped to deal with these issues as part of the formal process. (Leader A, Case Y)

Once you have a merger and you are bringing people together, you notice the differences. (Leader B, Case Y)

Sensitivity to people needs behavioural role: all the three leaders conducted consultation to what people aspire for, before making a decision.

I immediately undertook a vast consultation process, I met with groups ... I went in with a series of questions; I asked them about research, about vision and mission. After that I pulled the responses into a document and sent it back to every member of staff. I sent it back saying: this is what I learned from you and on the basis of this, this is what I propose doing. That led to the development of a new plan and a new mission statement. Building upon what I learned from people. (Leader B, Case Y)

Nevertheless, the leaders in the merger case relied on each other's assessment of their followers' needs on a cross-institutional level as we saw in the previous role. On the other hand, at Case X, the leader was able to form strong and close relations with followers from different organisational levels at the start.

It is the ability to identify with the people you are leading at every level. It is not the trivial bit of saying good morning to your cleaner. That is important but not that alone. It is really having an engagement and making sure that all have a sense of what they are looking for. In addition, that you understand their worries and hopes. (Case X leader)

Challenging the status quo: Each leader was motivated by an idealised vision for the future. Followers observed these decisions as challenging. The leader of Case X took a decision to close a campus against public opinion.

(X Leader) dared to think the unthinkable and to say the unsayable and to do the undoable. (Member of the Board of governors, Case X).

Case Y leaders agreed to a merger of equals with a dual leadership arrangement, which was <http://www.educatejournal.org>

viewed as challenging by their Board of Governors (noted from the Minutes of Meetings). At this stage, all three leaders operated from an altruistic motive benefiting the organisations and its members. In both cases the level of influence on the context was determined by the extent of assessment: the more knowledge the leaders acquired in terms of external environment and internal culture and in terms of people's needs, the more influence they had on the context. Leaders in both cases were able to direct the context to their desired decision and convince external and internal stakeholders with regard to what seemed difficult and challenging to achieve at this stage. In Case Y, the lack of internal assessment affected the sensitivity to people needs on a cross-institutional level, leading to a challenging decision that faced difficulties at the second and third stage. This meant that the NCM behavioural roles were highly dependent on each other's performance.

Stage Two: Formulating a Shared Vision

This stage is recognised as a vital tool for winning the support of followers and motivating them to achieve the vision, and therefore, influence the decision context. Leaders worked hard to formulate an organisational vision from their understanding of the previous assessment of the environment and people's needs. They used conventional strategic decision-making techniques and different levels of participation to involve various organisational members.

All staff were involved in the sense that they felt a new creation was in place.
(Leader B, Case Y)

I would say confidently that the vast majority of the academic staff favoured this scenario. (Leader A, Case Y)

Students would be fully engaged in the planning process. It was suggested that there would be a whole section devoted to the whole strategy range of student experience not just the student service strategy. (Academic Board Meeting, Case X)

The articulation took different forms and shapes. In Case X, the building design, the artwork spread across the college, the processes and policies, all conveyed the vision clearly. In Case Y, leaders ran road shows to articulate the vision between staff from both institutions. The main vision that united the two merging institutions was the prospect of University Title. Nevertheless, this stage witnessed a shift in the shared merger vision between both leaders in Case Y. While leader A continued to share a vision of a merger of equals and shared leadership, leader B operated from an absorption strategy and sole leadership perspective influenced by the context. The altruistic paradigm that was in operation at the first stage was weakened and the merger took a different path from what was planned. According to Waldman and Javidan (2009), acting on the bases of an absorption strategy is called a personalised power base. A socialised power base, on the other hand, promotes an equal merger of cultures in consideration of the other institution's needs. The leadership of A was ended soon after signing the merger agreement. The evidence from the documents and interviews indicated an influence from the external consultant and the Chairs of governors from both institutions, who were in favour of a sole leadership scenario. This was considered a contextual influence over the behavioural role of formulating and articulating a shared vision, thus affecting the performance of the neo-charismatic behavioural roles at the third stage.

Stage Three: Devising Means to Achieve the Vision

According to the NCM, the third stage is concerned with implementation. Taking personal risk and unconventional behaviour were two separate behavioural roles in the NCM, but due

to similarities and overlap between the two roles, the researcher decided to adjust the NCM by merging them into one behavioural role. According to Jaussi and Dionne (2004), unconventional behaviour is novel, which indicates originality, and surprising, which captures the element of unpredictability. The unconventional behaviour is also contextual and relates to the accepted norms of the organisational culture.

At Case X, unconventional behaviour and taking personal risks, according to the interviewees, ranged from announcing the decision and confronting angry students and staff, attending training courses with ordinary staff, sharing meals and corridor chats, travelling for long hours and being the first in the office every morning. They also viewed this role as stemming from an altruistic concern. They reported that this leader was 'extraordinary', 'remarkable', and 'constantly energetic' and if they were a normal leader they would have handled the situation differently, which indicates that the behaviour was clearly the leaders' choice. Moreover, it was viewed as effective and influenced the context to change in towards achieving the vision. At Case Y, leader A responded to the pressure to give up leadership by choosing to retire and step down early. This saved the merger from collapsing, and demonstrating altruism and sacrifice of their position and the merger vision in favour of the overarching vision of the University Title. Leader A viewed this as a signal to their followers to continue with the merger and its goals.

I thought it would not be in the interest of the new institution to have a fight at the moment the new institution was being launched. (Leader A, Case Y)

This behaviour influenced the context and was effective in achieving the desired general outcome of the decision. It was independently performed but would not have occurred without the previous understanding and high trust level that developed in the previous stages between leader A and their followers.

Three additional behavioural roles emerged from the analysis at this stage and were perceived to be altruistic. The three behavioural roles are: (1) empowering and motivating people; (2) encouraging collaboration and participation; (3) developing people skills and competencies. Leader B in Case Y used them to transform the culture of the five campuses and unite them into one.

It is a distributive leadership model. Leadership is not held exclusively by... B leader empowers people to act at all levels, which continues in a cascading way down the institution... B leader empowers each of us to have those authorities and responsibilities by granting the freedom to deliver back in a way which is suited to us as individuals. (Executive Dean, Case Y)

The leader of Case X also performed these roles in transforming the culture of resentment and anger into a highly performing culture. The Case X leader allowed full student participation in the planning process. In answer to a question asked by one of the angry students on the plan, the response was:

I am sorry, I only took a decision last night, there is no blueprint, and you are going to help me to write one. (Leader X, Case X)

These three behavioural roles were interdependent, each leading to the other and complementing it. They would not have occurred without the first and the second stage's behavioural roles of sensitivity to people's needs role and formulating a shared vision role. The roles influenced the context and were perceived by the followers as effective in achieving the decision objectives.

Discussion and Conclusions

The findings confirmed nine effective behavioural roles, which the three leaders demonstrated to varying degrees. With regard to the first research question, on the relation between the context and the behavioural roles performed, leaders who behaved in accordance with the NCM roles were influencing the context and changing it to their favour. Leader B in the merger case, on the other hand, diverted from the model and was influenced by the context to change their approach or adjust their vision along with the extent of altruism they exhibited towards the other merging institution and its leader.

With regard to the second research question on the relations between behavioural roles in each stage and in different stages, the findings confirmed a strong relation between the behavioural roles of each stage, and between each stage and the other. It was also found that the third stage's behavioural role of taking personal risks and acting unconventionally, although performed by choice, did relate to the first two stages in how it demanded the previous understanding of the environment and high trust level that is built through the formulation of a shared vision. This implies that the NCM is interdependent. The other three additional behavioural roles did depend on stage one and stage two roles as well. That meant if a leader omits one role from the first or the second stage the whole model would be affected and a leader would not be attributed neo-charismatic, even if that leader were effective and transformational as in Leader B case. That also meant if a leader adheres to the model they are likely to be attributed neo-charismatic even if they had lost their leadership in the process as in the case of Leader A.

Waldman and Javidan (2009) discuss the ethical dimension as having a social power base vs. a personal power base. In the former, a leader is powered by an altruistic motive that energises and motivates them. In the latter, the leader is powered by egoism and personal gain. Mendonca and Kanungo (2007), in their discussion on ethical leadership, differentiate between personal and institutional power needs, and personal or institutional power means. The need for power provides the motivation for the exercise of influence and the power base provides the means and resources that a leader uses to influence. Ethical leaders are high in institutional power base - that is the leader's expertise or attraction as perceived by the followers (Mendonca and Kanungo, 2007, p:51). The third hypothesis is built around this assumption. The evidence from Case X interviews confirms that the leader was motivated altruistically with ethical moral values that persisted throughout the decision-making process. In Case Y, the behaviour of leader A was also altruistic. Leader B, having performed altruistically in stage one and with a variable degree of altruism at stage two and having performed altruistically in stage three, is perceived as altruistic as well. It was noticed that the higher the altruism, the more likely that the third stage behavioural role of taking personal risks and unconventionality is used as a means to achieve the vision. That does not undermine the non neo-charismatic leader approach; it just explains it. All leaders were effective in handling the decision process. This suggests a direct relation between leaders' effectiveness and the level of altruism and the extent of moral thinking they adopt. Moreover, altruism gives a leader control and power over the context so they become highly influential.

In relation to the NCM's ability to explain effective leadership in HE, which is the fourth question, I conclude that the model is a good means for explaining the behaviour of effective leaders and the ethical dimension of their roles. The model seems to work better if performed holistically due to the interdependency between the behavioural roles. The two cases demonstrated this point, which makes it possible to generalise the NCM as an interpretive device or an operational tool in an HE context in most strategic decision making situations. The study presented another effective transformational leadership style that adopted a lesser level of altruism and used three additional behavioural roles to effectively achieve the decision objectives. As a result of this study, the NCM is adjusted to include the three

behavioural roles to accommodate Case X's leadership style. Moreover, the transformational leadership style, as a result of this research, would benefit from incorporating some or all of the behavioural roles in the neo-charismatic leadership style to strengthen its influence over the context and its effectiveness in achieving the decision objectives.

In addressing the differences between the neo-charismatic leadership style and the transformational leadership style, both styles address the higher needs of humans in the transformation process, which include the need to self-actualise in the form of a mission and a purpose that the leader addresses (Burns, 1979; Conger and Kanungo, 1998, p. 11; Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993). The differences between the two styles of transformational and neo-charismatic were the focus of the research of Rowold and Heinitz (2007). The researchers found that both were very similar in their variables and their effect on followers' subjective performance such as satisfaction and motivation. Where transformational leadership focuses on the effect of a leader's perceived behaviour on subordinates, the NCM provided a more leader-centred theory. However, the findings suggest an additional difference related to the ethical dimension; this is reflected in the process of achieving organisational goals and objectives. While, neo-charismatic leaders demonstrated higher degrees of altruism to the extent of taking personal risks, the transformational leader demonstrated a variable degree of altruism towards individual elements in the context, allowing the context to influence their behaviour in exchange for the achievement of the main objective. This contextual influence was still within acceptable moral and ethical behavioural code.

Waldman and Javidan (2009) agree that this variation in the altruistic and egoistic orientation at variant degrees can appear in one leader and that both can be charismatic. They also see the behaviour changing, depending on the contextual factor and its variables. Conger and Kanungo supported this view in their 1998 study. Later, Mendonca and Kanungo (2007) confirmed that effective leadership has to come from an altruistic institutional power base. Lower degrees of altruism do not contradict working from a social power base, but means that a leader is more flexible in achieving the organisational vision and adapts to the needs of their own institution. To summarise, altruism is related proportionally to effectiveness and both have to be weighed by the leader to arrive at a balance in responding to contextual variables.

Future Studies

From the conclusions above, it is suggested that further research should be conducted on measuring altruism in relation to effectiveness. Moreover, further studies are recommended to strengthen the findings of this study on other types of decisions in HE. Future research can help identify more differences between charismatic and transformational leadership styles. More studies are needed on the behavioural role of taking personal risks and unconventionality in HE context.

References

- Bargh, C., Boccock, J., Scott, P. and Smith, D. (2000). *University Leadership: The Role of The Chief Executive*. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational Leadership: A Response to Critiques. In M. M. Chemers and R. Ayman (Eds), *Leadership Theories and Research: Perspectives and Directions* (pp. 49-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Bell, G. G., Bromiley, P. and Bryson, J. (1998). Spinning a Complex Web: Links Between Strategic Decision Making Context, Content, Process and Outcome. In V. P. P. Barwise (Ed.),

Strategic Decisions. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., Birnbaum, R. and George Washington University. (1989). *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" Word in Higher Education*. Washington DC: George Washington University.
- Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, W. G. and Shapiro, H. T. (1998). *Universities and Their Leadership*. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Bryant, M., Wesley, K. and Grady, M. (2012). *Getting Skunked or Netting the Behemoth: the Critical Incident Technique for the Educational Researcher*. A paper presented at the British Educational Leadership, Management, and Administration Society, Manchester, England, July, 2012.
- Bryman, A. (2007). *Effective Leadership in Higher Education*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Burns, J. M. (1979). *Leadership*. New York; London: Harper & Row.
- Butler, R. (1998). Strategic Decision-making: A Contingency Framework, and Beyond. In V. P. P. Barwise (Ed.), *Strategic Decisions*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cohen, M. D. and March, J. C. (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American President*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in Organisations*. London: Sage.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York; London: McGraw-Hill.
- French, J. R. P. J. and Raven, B. (1968). The Bases of Social Power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds), *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilizing Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- House, R. J. (1988). Power and Personality in Complex Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 305-357.
- Jaussi, K. S. and Dionne, S. D. (2004). Unconventional Leader Behavior, Subordinate Satisfaction, Effort and Perception of Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 2004 (10, No.3), 15-26.
- Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The Leadership Challenge*. (Fourth Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, K. J., Muenchen, R. A. and Brooks, A. M. (2010). Measuring Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: Why isn't Charisma Measured? *Communication Monographs*, 77 (4), 576-591.
- Marrelli, A. F. (2005). The Performance Technologist's Toolbox: Critical Incidents. *Performance Improvement*, Nov/Dec 44 (10).

- McNay, L. (1995). From the Collegial Academy to the Corporate Enterprise. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University*. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
- McNay, L. (2003). The E-factor and Organization Cultures in British Universities. In G. Williams (Ed.), *The Enterprising University: Reform, Excellence and Equity*. Buckingham: Open University Press and The SRHE.
- Mendonca, M. and Kanungo, R. N. (2007). *Ethical Leadership*. Glasgow: Bell & Bain Ltd.
- Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Middlehurst, R. (1995). Changing Leadership in Universities. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University?* Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, inc.
- Mouton, J. S. and Blake, R. R. (1984). *Synergogy : a New Strategy for Education, Training and Development*. San Francisco; London: Jossey-Bass.
- Moodie, G. C. and Eustace, R. (1974). *Power and Authority in British Universities*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Noorderhaven, N. (1995). *Strategic Decision Making*. Biddles, Guilford: Addison-Wesley.
- Olivier, A. (2012). 'How Ethical is Leadership'. *Leadership*, (8), 67-84.
- Oxford Dictionaries. (2011). Available at: <http://oxforddictionaries.com>.
- Rowold, J. and Heinitz, K. (2007). 'Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: Assessing the Convergent, Divergent and Criterion Validity of the MLQ and the CKS'. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18 (2007), 121-133.
- Rowold, J. and Laukamp, L. (2009). 'Charismatic Leadership and Objective Performance Indicators'. *Applied Psychology*, 58 (4), 602-621.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J. and Arthur, M. B. (1993). 'The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory'. *Organization Science*, Vol. 4 (No. 4 (Nov., 1993)), pp. 577-594.
- Sharfman, M. P. and Dean, J. W. (1998). 'The Effect of Context on Strategic Decision Making Processes and Outcomes'. In V. Papadakis and P. Barwise (Eds), *Strategic Decisions*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Somekh, B. and Lewin, C. (2005). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. London: Sage.
- Vroom, V. H. and Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision-making*. London: Pittsburgh.
- Waldman, D. A. and Javidan, M. (2009). 'Alternative Forms of Charismatic Leadership in the Integration of Mergers and Acquisitions'. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (2009), 130-142.
- Watson, D. (2008). 'Learn Management from the Universities'. *Educational Alliance Quarterly*, 2, 20-21.
- Watson, D. (2009). *The Question of Morale: Managing Happiness and Unhappiness in University Life*: Open University Press.
<http://www.educatejournal.org>

Weber, Max (1978). *Max Weber Economy and Society*. CA: Berkeley, University of California Press.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A. and Taber, T. (2002). 'A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research'. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9 (2002), 15.

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. London: Pearson.