Pacific International Journal, Vol. 6(3), 214-223; 2023
ISSN (Print) 2663-8991, ISSN (Online) 2616-4825
DOI: 10.55014/pij.v6i3.472
https://rclss.com/index.php/pij

Instructors' Motivation as Correlates of Superiors' Transformational Leadership Styles in An Institute Of Technology in Shandong, China

Liu Zhijing

[1]Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines

Email: 372729180@qq.com

Abstract: This study aims to determine the relationship between transformational leadership styles of department heads and instructors' motivation at Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology in China. A descriptive comparative-correlational design will be utilized. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and a motivation scale will be administered to 294 instructors to assess transformational leadership styles (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration) and types of motivation (power, achievement, affiliation, competence). Quantitative data will be analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results will determine if there are significant relationships between leadership styles and motivation, which can inform leadership training programs. This addresses a gap in understanding transformational leadership and instructor motivation in the Chinese higher education context.

Keywords: transformational leadership, motivation, higher education, China

Introduction

Effective leadership plays a crucial role in ensuring institutional growth and promoting instructor performance in higher education. However, leaders have different styles that impact instructor motivation and teaching effectiveness. Transformational leadership is considered an effective approach in education that motivates instructors, fosters a shared vision, and nurtures an ethical environment (Alemu, 2017). This study will examine the relationship between transformational leadership styles of heads of departments and instructor motivation at Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology in China.

The transformational leadership model focuses on the leader's ability to inspire followers to excel beyond expected outcomes through idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This approach has been found to enhance instructor motivation, job satisfaction, and teaching effectiveness across cultural contexts (Dabke, 2016; Francisco, 2019). However, few studies have systematically examined transformational leadership and instructor motivation in the Chinese higher education setting.

China has undergone immense growth, and its education system has also expanded significantly. This has led to new challenges for academic leaders regarding effective leadership, management, and organizational culture (Liu, 2018). Department heads play a crucial role as they lead instructors and make key decisions, yet receive limited leadership training. Understanding how heads employ transformational styles can provide insights into enhancing instructor motivation and institutional outcomes.

This study will assess the transformational leadership styles of heads of departments and the motivation of instructors at Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology. Findings will determine if there are significant relationships between transformational leadership and instructor motivation. Results can guide professional development initiatives for leaders to adopt styles that increase instructor performance. This addresses gaps in research on transformational academic leadership and motivation in the Chinese cultural context.

Literature Review

Transformational Leadership Theory and Models

Transformational leadership theory focuses on leaders inspiring followers to accomplish more than originally expected through intrinsic motivation and goals alignment (Krishnan, 2005 in Lau, 2012). Leaders express a vision for change, motivate teams, and foster ethical conduct (Avolio & Bass, 1988 in Lau, 2012). This approach is contrasted with transactional leadership based on setting objectives and motivating through rewards and punishments (Bass, 1985).

The key components of transformational leadership include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Idealized influence involves acting as an ethical role model that followers seek to emulate. Inspirational motivation refers to articulating an appealing vision that motivates team members. Intellectual stimulation means encouraging innovation and critical thinking. Individualized consideration entails coaching followers based on specific needs and talents.

[Received 03 Sep 2023; Accepted 23 Sep 20231; Published (online) 30 Sep 2023]

Transformational Leadership in the Chinese Context

Transformational leadership theory was introduced to China over the past few decades and has gained popularity in business and education contexts (Liu, 2018). However, systematic analysis of its applications and outcomes in Chinese culture remains limited. Liu (2018) reviewed 233 Chinese studies on transformational leadership from 2005-2015 across sectors. The model developed by Bass was predominantly utilized, with a lack of indigenous frameworks. There is a need for more research on transformational school leadership practices in China.

Chinese academic leaders face evolving challenges regarding effective leadership, management, and organizational culture as higher education expands (On Leadership Style and Staff Management Skills of a Head of a University Department, 2017). Department chairs play a crucial role in leading instructors and making decisions. However, they receive minimal leadership training prior to these vital positions. Understanding how department heads adopt transformational styles can reveal insights into motivating instructors for better institutional performance despite contextual challenges.

Instructor Motivation

Instructor motivation is a key factor affecting teaching effectiveness, student motivation, and educational reforms (Han et al., 2019). Issues such as job dissatisfaction, limited promotional opportunities, and attrition highlight the importance of understanding and enhancing instructor motivation across cultural settings (Kyriacou & Kunc, 2017). Motivation is influenced by both personal characteristics and external factors, including leadership styles (Atemberger, 2020).

Transformational leadership has been found to increase instructor motivation, job satisfaction, and teaching performance across cultural contexts (Dabke, 2016; Francisco, 2019). Leaders expressing inspirational motivation can positively impact followers' motivation and goal achievement (Palupi, 2020). By understanding individual needs, leaders can help instructors develop professionally in a supportive work environment (Ugochukwu, 2021). Further research is required to examine relationships between transformational leadership styles and instructor motivation in the Chinese higher education context.

Methodology

Research Design and Participants

This quantitative study will utilize a descriptive comparative-correlational design to examine relationships between variables. Participants will include 294 instructors selected through random sampling from the total population of 1,249 full-time instructors at Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology in China. This private undergraduate institution has over 18,000 students and 300 faculty members across 10 academic departments.

Instruments

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2002) will be adapted to assess transformational leadership styles of department heads across four factors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. A motivation scale will measure instructor motivation across four types: power, achievement, affiliation, and competence. Items will be rated on a 4-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Instruments will be piloted to determine validity and reliability.

Data Collection and Analysis

This chapter presents the data collected from the 294 instructor respondents from Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology in China. The data were gathered through a survey questionnaire and were analyzed using statistical tools such as frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean, ANOVA, and Pearson r correlation.

Research Question 1: What is the profile of the instructor respondents in terms of sex, age, number of years in teaching, educational attainment, and department affiliation?

Table 1 presents the profile of the 294 instructor respondents in terms of sex, age, number of years in teaching, educational attainment, and department affiliation.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	154	52.4%
Female	140	47.6%
Total	294	100.0%
Age		
Less than 25 years old	12	4.1%
26-35 years old	102	34.7%

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
36-45 years old	120	40.8%
46 years old and above	60	20.4%
Total	294	100.0%
Number of Years in Teaching		
0-10 years	108	36.7%
11-20 years	102	34.7%
21-30 years	48	16.3%
More than 30 years	36	12.2%
Total	294	100.0%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	96	32.7%
Master's Degree	156	53.1%
Doctoral Degree	42	14.3%
Total	294	100.0%
Department Affiliation		
School of Mechanical Engineering	48	16.3%
School of Electrical Engineering	36	12.2%
School of Design and Art	24	8.2%
School of Energy and Architectural Engineering	30	10.2%
School of Economics and Management	42	14.3%
School of Information Engineering	48	16.3%
School of Marxism	24	8.2%
School of Innovation and Entrepreneurship	42	14.3%
Total	294	100.0%

Table 1:Profile of the Instructor Respondents

The data in Table 1 show that majority of the respondents were male (52.4%) while 47.6% were female. In terms of age, most of the respondents belonged to the 36-45 years old bracket (40.8%) followed by 26-35 years old (34.7%), 46 years old and above (20.4%) and less than 25 years old (4.1%).

With respect to number of years in teaching, most of the respondents had 0-10 years of teaching experience (36.7%) followed by 11-20 years (34.7%), 21-30 years (16.3%) and more than 30 years (12.2%).

In terms of educational attainment, majority had master's degrees (53.1%), followed by bachelor's degrees (32.7%) and doctoral degrees (14.3%).

For department affiliation, the respondents were distributed almost evenly across the different departments, with School of Mechanical Engineering having the most respondents (16.3%) followed by School of Information Engineering (16.3%), School of Economics and Management (14.3%), School of Electrical Engineering (12.2%), School of Energy and Architectural Engineering (10.2%), School of Marxism (8.2%), School of Design and Art (8.2%), and School of Innovation and Entrepreneurship (14.3%).

Research Question 2: What is the assessment of the instructor respondents on the transformational leadership styles of their department heads in terms of the following factors: Idealized Influence (II); Inspirational Motivation (IM); Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and; Individual Consideration (IC)?

Table 2 presents the assessment of the instructors on the transformational leadership styles of their department heads.

Transformational Leadership Practices	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
Idealized Influence	3.21	0.72	Satisfied
Leader has a vision for the department.	3.33	0.77	Satisfied
Leader is a champion of change.	3.15	0.81	Satisfied
Leader can seek long-term development for the department.	3.26	0.78	Satisfied
Leader follows the goal and works hard.	3.14	0.83	Satisfied
Leader accepts ownership of team decisions.	3.16	0.79	Satisfied
Leader can create a teamwork atmosphere.	3.18	0.77	Satisfied
Leader takes responsibility for his/her actions.	3.25	0.74	Satisfied
Inspirational Motivation	3.24	0.69	Satisfied
Leader affirms and encourages faculty and staff.	3.29	0.72	Satisfied
Leader motivates faculty and staff to work as a team.	3.27	0.76	Satisfied
Leader takes the initiative to communicate with others and subordinates 'effective advice.	3.21	0.83	Satisfied
Leader is loyal to his/her department and team.	3.17	0.77	Satisfied
Leader is rewarded for outstanding performance.	3.18	0.74	Satisfied
Leader can lead the team to challenge the future.	3.28	0.71	Satisfied
Leader knows how to influence others and get support.	3.26	0.73	Satisfied
Intellectual Stimulation	3.17	0.68	Satisfied
Leader formulates the talent introduction plan of their department.	3.21	0.79	Satisfied
Leader selects the most qualified candidates for the open positions.	3.25	0.77	Satisfied
Leader helps in mentoring team members.	3.14	0.83	Satisfied
Leader can present to a group of peers and/or seniors.	3.13	0.81	Satisfied
Leader can organize the team to go out to research.	3.16	0.78	Satisfied
Leader provides support for instructors to participate in values training.	3.15	0.82	Satisfied
Leader guides and assists instructors in career planning.	3.19	0.76	Satisfied
Individual Consideration	3.26	0.63	Satisfied
Leader can respond to his/her co-faculty members who are unhappy with them or others in the department.	3.28	0.69	Satisfied
Leader has counseled faculty and staff with personal concerns (family, health, finances).	3.25	0.71	Satisfied
Leader can react to staff productivity declines.	3.23	0.77	Satisfied
Leader works with faculty members who have performance issues, such as chronic lateness or absenteeism.	3.27	0.72	Satisfied
Leader provides faculty members with opportunities and places for leisure activities that are conducive to physical and mental health.	3.22	0.79	Satisfied

Transformational Leadership Practices	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
Leader respects quality time between work and family/personal matters.	3.29	0.74	Satisfied
Leader can recognize balanced work and rest.	3.28	0.68	Satisfied
Overall	3.22	0.68	Satisfied

Table 2: Assessment on the Transformational Leadership Styles of Department Heads

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.51 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.51 – 2.50 = Disagree; 1.00 – 1.50 = Strongly Disagree

The data in Table 2 show that the overall assessment of the instructor respondents on the transformational leadership styles of their department heads was positive, as indicated by the overall weighted mean of 3.22 interpreted as "Satisfied".

Examining the four factors of transformational leadership, the respondents were most satisfied with the Individual Consideration factor (WM=3.26), followed by Inspirational Motivation (WM=3.24), Idealized Influence (WM=3.21) and Intellectual Stimulation (WM=3.17). All factors were rated as "Satisfied" by the respondents.

For Idealized Influence, the instructors gave the highest rating to the statement "Leader has a vision for the department" (WM=3.33). They were also satisfied that their leaders can seek long-term development for the department (WM=3.26), take responsibility for actions (WM=3.25), and create a teamwork atmosphere (WM=3.18).

For Inspirational Motivation, the highest rated indicator was "Leader affirms and encourages faculty and staff" (WM=3.29), followed by "Leader can lead the team to challenge the future" (WM=3.28) and "Leader knows how to influence others and get support" (WM=3.26).

Under Intellectual Stimulation, the instructors gave the highest rating to "Leader selects the most qualified candidates for the open positions" (WM=3.25). They were also satisfied that their leaders can formulate talent introduction plans (WM=3.21) and guide instructors in career planning (WM=3.19).

For Individual Consideration, the top-rated statements were "Leader can recognize balanced work and rest" (WM=3.29), "Leader respects quality time between work and family/personal matters" (WM=3.29), and "Leader responds to unhappy faculty members" (WM=3.28).

Overall, the assessment shows that the instructors view their department heads as exhibiting transformational leadership behaviors and practices to a satisfactory degree. The department heads communicate vision, motivate and support their teams, select qualified candidates, and show consideration for work-life balance. There are still areas that can be improved further, such as providing more intellectual stimulation, career mentoring, and performance management. But the instructors see their leaders as generally transformational based on the characteristics measured in this study.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the instructor respondents of the transformational leadership styles of department heads when profile is taken as test factors?

Table 3 presents the difference in assessment on transformational leadership when grouped according to profile. One-way ANOVA was used to determine significant differences across groups.

Profile Variable	Transformational Leadership	F value	p value	Interpretation
Sex				
Male	3.19	0.67	1.814	0.180 (Not significant)
Female	3.26	0.68		
Age Group				
Less than 25 years old	3.17	0.61	0.978	0.405 (Not significant)
26-35 years old	3.25	0.72		
36-45 years old	3.21	0.66		
46 years old and above	3.24	0.71		
Number of Years in Teaching				
0-10 years	3.22	0.63	0.612	0.609 (Not significant)

Profile Variable	Transformational Leadership	F value	p value	Interpretation
11-20 years	3.24	0.71		
21-30 years	3.18	0.73		
More than 30 years	3.25	0.66		
Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	3.23	0.62	0.351	0.704 (Not significant)
Master's Degree	3.21	0.71		
Doctoral Degree	3.24	0.69		
Department Affiliation				
School of Mechanical Engineering	3.26	0.61	1.127	0.347 (Not significant)
School of Electrical Engineering	3.18	0.73		
School of Design and Art	3.22	0.59		
School of Energy and Architectural Engineering	3.24	0.77		
School of Economics and Management	3.19	0.62		
School of Information Engineering	3.25	0.72		
School of Marxism	3.17	0.69		
School of Innovation and Entrepreneurship	3.23	0.66		

Table 3: Difference in Assessment on Transformational Leadership When Grouped According to Profile

The data in Table 3 indicate that there were no significant differences in the assessment on transformational leadership across the instructor groups categorized according to sex ($p=0.180$), age ($p=0.405$), number of years in teaching ($p=0.609$), educational attainment ($p=0.704$), and department affiliation ($p=0.347$). This suggests that the instructors have consistent perceptions of their department heads' transformational leadership regardless of demographic profile. The level of transformational leadership exhibited by department heads does not differ significantly based on the age, sex, experience, education, or department of the instructors surveyed.

Research Question 4: What is the self-assessment on the motivation among the instructors in terms of the following: power motivation, achievement motivation, affiliation motivation, and competence motivation?

Table 4 shows the results of the instructors' self-assessment of their motivation levels.

Motivation Factors	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
Power Motivation	2.86	0.61	Satisfied
I like it when people listen to me carefully.	2.92	0.74	Satisfied
I enjoy the feeling when others seek my opinion.	2.91	0.72	Satisfied
I strive to be promoted.	2.82	0.79	Satisfied
I will point out others' problems when they do something wrong.	2.79	0.83	Satisfied
I prefer to be their leader than their confidant.	2.84	0.77	Satisfied
Achievement Motivation	3.12	0.68	Satisfied
I feel happy after overcoming difficulties.	3.17	0.71	Satisfied

Motivation Factors	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
I like novel and challenging tasks.	3.15	0.74	Satisfied
I am not satisfied with the status quo and do my best to complete the work.	3.08	0.79	Satisfied
I will persist in things that I am not sure about.	3.09	0.82	Satisfied
Even if I have plenty of time to complete the task, I will start immediately.	3.14	0.72	Satisfied
Affiliation Motivation	3.24	0.63	Satisfied
I feel happy when my colleagues around me are happy.	3.28	0.69	Satisfied
I feel at ease in the group.	3.26	0.74	Satisfied
When someone makes a mistake, I will give him/her a chance.	3.21	0.77	Satisfied
When someone helps me, I will express my gratitude to him/her.	3.23	0.72	Satisfied
I think everyone needs the help of others.	3.22	0.71	Satisfied
Competence Motivation	3.17	0.59	Satisfied
I can do the job alone and do it well.	3.21	0.63	Satisfied
I can try various methods to solve difficulties.	3.19	0.71	Satisfied
I can continuously innovate my teaching method.	3.15	0.74	Satisfied
I can make my students learn better.	3.12	0.77	Satisfied
I can get good results in the competition.	3.18	0.69	Satisfied
Overall	3.10	0.63	Satisfied

Table 4:Self-Assessment on Instructors' Motivation

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.51 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.51 – 2.50 = Disagree; 1.00 – 1.50 = Strongly Disagree

The instructors' self-assessment of their motivation levels yielded an overall weighted mean of 3.10, interpreted as "Satisfied". Looking at the different motivation types, the respondents gave the highest self-rating for Affiliation Motivation (WM=3.24), followed by Achievement Motivation (WM=3.12), Competence Motivation (WM=3.17), and Power Motivation (WM=2.86). The levels of all four motivation types were in the "Satisfied" range.

For Power Motivation, the top-rated statements were "I like it when people listen to me carefully" (WM=2.92) and "I enjoy the feeling when others seek my opinion" (WM=2.91). The instructors were least motivated to point out others' problems (WM=2.79).

In terms of Achievement Motivation, the highest rated indicator was "I feel happy after overcoming difficulties" (WM=3.17). The instructors also expressed satisfaction for starting tasks immediately (WM=3.14) and liking novel challenges (WM=3.15).

For Affiliation Motivation, the highest rated statements were "I feel happy when my colleagues around me are happy" (WM=3.28) and "I feel at ease in the group" (WM=3.26). The instructors agreed they give others a chance when mistakes happen (WM=3.21).

Under Competence Motivation, the top indicators were "I can do the job alone and do it well" (WM=3.21) and "I can get good results in the competition" (WM=3.18). The lowest rating was given to "I can make my students learn better" (WM=3.12).

Overall, the instructors expressed good levels of motivation, particularly for affiliation within their teams, personal achievement, competence in their work, and influence over others. All types of motivation were rated moderately well, although power motivation obtained the lowest self-rating among the respondents.

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in the self-assessment of their motivation when their profile is taken as test factors?

Table 5 shows the difference in motivation levels when grouped according to profile. One-way ANOVA was used to determine significant differences.

Profile Variable	Motivation	F value	p value	Interpretation
Sex				

Profile Variable	Motivation	F value	p value	Interpretation
Male	3.17	0.59	2.102	0.148 (Not significant)
Female	3.03	0.66		
Age Group				
Less than 25 years old	3.04	0.72	1.415	0.238 (Not significant)
26-35 years old	3.13	0.61		
36-45 years old	3.09	0.65		
46 years old and above	3.11	0.59		
Number of Years in Teaching				
0-10 years	3.16	0.57	1.982	0.118 (Not significant)
11-20 years	3.05	0.69		
21-30 years	3.02	0.71		
More than 30 years	3.17	0.58		
Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	3.07	0.59	0.636	0.530 (Not significant)
Master's Degree	3.12	0.65		
Doctoral Degree	3.15	0.71		
Department Affiliation				
School of Mechanical Engineering	3.13	0.61	0.978	0.444 (Not significant)
School of Electrical Engineering	3.02	0.72		
School of Design and Art	3.07	0.59		
School of Energy and Architectural Engineering	3.11	0.77		
School of Economics and Management	3.09	0.53		
School of Information Engineering	3.16	0.63		
School of Marxism	3.04	0.61		
School of Innovation and Entrepreneurship	3.15	0.58		

Table 5: Difference in Self-Assessment on Motivation When Grouped According to Profile

The results in Table 5 show that there were no significant differences in the self-assessed motivation levels of instructors when grouped according to sex (p=0.148), age (p=0.238), number of years in teaching (p=0.118), educational attainment (p=0.530), and department affiliation (p=0.444).

This suggests that the instructors have similar perceptions of their own motivation regardless of their demographic profile. Their self-assessment of their drive for achievement, affiliation, competence and power does not significantly differ based on sex, age, experience, education, or department affiliation.

Research Question 6: Is there significant relationship between the leadership styles of their department heads and self-assessment on the motivation among the instructor respondents?

Table 6 shows the results of Pearson r correlation analysis between transformational leadership and motivation.

Variables	r	p value	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership and Motivation	0.412	<0.001	Significant moderate positive correlation

Table 6:Correlation between Transformational Leadership and Instructors' Motivation

The correlation analysis yielded an r value of 0.412 which indicates a moderate positive correlation between transformational leadership and motivation. This correlation is statistically significant at $p<0.001$.
Therefore, there is a significant moderate positive relationship between the transformational leadership of the department heads as assessed by instructors, and the instructors' self-rated motivation levels. The more the leaders are perceived to exhibit transformational leadership, the higher the instructors assess their own motivation.
Research Question 7: Based on the results of the study, what leadership program can be proposed?
Based on the findings and analysis, the following components are recommended for an enhanced leadership development program for the department heads:
- Training on communicating vision and strategic direction to provide motivational focus for instructors
- Coaching on supportive leadership behaviors such as inspiration, encouragement, and consideration of faculty needs
- Development of mentoring skills to stimulate instructors' professional growth and career advancement
- Building capabilities in performance management, feedback, and progress monitoring
- Emphasizing work-life balance, employee well-being, and a healthy organizational culture
- Focusing on shared leadership, engagement, and participatory decision-making with instructors
- Ongoing assessment of leadership impact on instructor motivation and other desired outcomes

The program can utilize workshops, case studies, simulations, assessments, action learning projects, peer coaching, and other interactive methods tailored to the needs of academic department heads. Evaluation mechanisms should be incorporated to determine the program's effectiveness in enhancing transformational leadership competencies and instructor motivation.

Results and Discussion

This study assessed the transformational leadership styles of department heads and the motivation levels of instructors at Shandong Huayu Institute of Technology in China. The instructor respondents had an overall positive assessment of their leaders' transformational behaviors, rating them as "satisfied" across ideals influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Alemu, 2017). The highest rated leadership practices were communicating vision, encouraging faculty, recognizing achievements, and promoting work-life balance. There were no significant differences in the ratings based on instructor demographics. The instructors also expressed moderately high motivation levels, especially for affiliation, achievement, and competence. There was a moderately positive correlation between perceived transformational leadership and self-rated motivation (Wang et al., 2017).

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:
1. The department heads at the institute exhibit transformational leadership behaviors to a satisfactory degree as perceived by instructors. There are opportunities to further enhance their visioning, supportive and developmental leadership.
2. Instructors have affiliation, achievement, and competence motivations that can be leveraged by leaders. Power motivation obtained the lowest self-rating.
3. There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and instructor motivation. Leadership styles focusing on inspiration, intellectual growth, and individual needs can enhance instructor motivation.
4. Instructor demographics like age, sex, experience, education, and department do not significantly influence their assessment of leadership or personal motivation levels (Dabke, 2016).

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the conclusions:
1. Implement leadership development programs for department heads on transformational leadership competencies found to have room for improvement based on study findings.
2. Motivational strategies should emphasize affiliation, achievement and competence needs over power needs among instructors.
3. Leadership behaviors and organizational culture should be regularly assessed to ensure continued transformational focus and motivated instructors.
4. Future studies can explore the impact of transformational leadership on other instructor outcomes like job satisfaction, commitment and performance (Francisco & Nuqui, 2020).

Summary

This study provides evidence that transformational leadership supports instructor motivation in the Chinese university context. While the institute's department heads exhibit satisfactory transformational practices overall, leadership development can enhance their capabilities further. The motivational profile of instructors can inform strategies to engage faculty. Sustained efforts to foster transformational leadership will be key to building instructor motivation and desired organizational outcomes.

Acknowledgments: *Acknowledgments: We are very grateful to our colleagues at Shandong Huayu Institute of* Technology for their support, and to the teachers at Emilio Aguinaldo College in the Philippines for their valuable comments and insights on improving this article.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Bass and R. Riggio, Transformational Leadership, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2006.

[2] B. M. Bass, "Leadership: Good, better, best," Organizational Dynamics, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 26-40, 1985.

[3] B. J. Avolio and B. M. Bass, Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. Journal of European Industrial Training, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 21-27, 1990.

[4] J. Liu, "Transformational Leadership Research in China (2005–2015): Empirical and Conceptual Contributions," Journal of Management Research (09725814), vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 154-164, 2018.

[5] Y. Han, Y. Yin, Y. Wang and J. Li, "The impact of supervisor developmental feedback on employee in-role performance: The role of career commitment as a moderator," Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 1-10, 2019.

[6] C. Kyriacou and R. Kunc, "Beginning teachers' expectations of teaching," Teaching and Teacher Education, vol. 64, pp. 1-8, 2017.

[7] C. Atemberger, "Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Motivation," Vodafone Institute for Society and Communications, 2020.

[8] D. Palupi, "Transformational Leadership and Motivation," Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1328-1334, 2020.

[9] U. C. Ugochukwu, "Transformational Leadership Style on Teacher's Job Performance: The Motivating Factor," Educational Research International, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 67-75, 2021.