AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL LOYALTY AMONG ACADEMICS AT A SAUDI UNIVERSITY

Nasser Saud Alrayes [a1], Yasser Abdulsalam Rady [b], Ahmed Ramadan Khatiry [c]

[a] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5733-4162

[a b] *Self-Development Department, Deanship of Preparatory Year & Supporting Studies, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Dammam, KSA.*

[c] *Foundations of Education Department, College of Education, Fayoum University, Egypt.*

Abstract

The recent changes in leadership and administration in higher education institutions have undergone a significant increase in the occupational roles and responsibilities of leaders. The present study is an extension of prior studies in investigating transformational leadership by analyzing the impact of transformational leadership on the level of academics' loyalty to the university. Moreover, how the academic and demographic variables can influence faculty perspectives of transformational leadership practices among their leaders and their level of loyalty. The study sample included 108 faculty in Deanship of preparatory year at IAU. Means, standard deviations, ANOVA, and correlations tests were used to analyse the data collection. The findings concluded a high level of transformational leadership among academic leaders from faculty point of view and a medium level of organizational loyalty. The study provided insights that all the components of transformational leadership affect positively on organizational loyalty. The results concluded a significant impact of academic rank and years of experiences on normative loyalty and continuous loyalty, respectively. A significant impact of academic

---

[1] Corresponding author.
E-mail address: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5733-4162

rank on all components of transformational leadership was reported with no influences of faculty gender on their analysis of transformative leadership of leaders and their level of organizational loyalty.

Keywords: transformative leadership; organizational loyalty; academic and demographic variables.

1. Introduction

The educational system around the world has been faced with many challenges that cause new roles of the educational administration and leadership. Undoubtedly, the future opening up has an impact on the leadership style to be able to keep pace with social, economic, scientific, and technological dynamics. These changes and challenges have examined how the institutions can model apprised and cooperative interactions with the broader society. Such new factors of the institutional success prompt the need to support high levels of transformational leadership and staff organizational loyalty. Recently, among an extensive range of leadership styles by human resource management and higher education studies, transformational leadership has obtained widespread attention to analyze how certain academic leaders are able to inspire faculty members by stimulating higher-level needs of trust, respect, and admire them. Moreover, to explore its unique approach and effectiveness in motivating subordinates to be part of institutional change, development, and innovation (Khasawneh et al., 2012; Mokhber et al., 2015).

Ideally, the leaders through their transformational leadership can build social and individual identification among institution members with the organization's mission and goals. Moreover, transformational leadership can be a source of enhancing their feelings of involvement, cohesiveness, obligation, potency, and performance (Bass et al., 2003). The findings of previous studies concluded that the effectual transformational leadership has a positive influence on many organizational indicators namely, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, knowledge-sharing practices, and organizational trust (Dayani et al., 2020; Khasawneh et al., 2012; Ugwu et al., 2020; Top et al., 2013). Lately, many researchers addressed that transformational leaders get their teams' contribution to innovative problem solving, decision making, and be involved in setting role models by expressing concerns about their developmental needs (Huang et al., 2020) and how they acquire a high level of consistency with the institution which associated with their desire to make the greatest degree of organizational loyalty (Arqawi, et al., 2018).

Consequently, organizational loyalty indicates how the staff appeal for social interaction to support their organization with the power of development. It reflects a state of comprehensive conviction for staff to engage for the benefit of the organization and sacrifice for its goals. In other words, it can be defined as the employee being committed to the institution's achievement and believing that joining this organization is their best choice (Iqbal et al., 2015). As such, organizational loyalty, through institutions' strategic influences, takes a long time to be realized and significant on faculty performance (Wu et al., 2019). Many debated questions have been raised, in educational and administration literature,

concerning the ways exert influences which academic leadership in higher education institutions on faculty members' attitudes towards change, development, and organizational commitment (Huang et al., 2020; Dowling-Hetherington, 2016; Abahussain & Alsubaie, 2020). Likewise, Dowling-Hetherington (2016) argued that the motivation of institutional development and their loyalty to the university has been affected negatively as a consequence of the top-down behavior in which change was conducted.

Ultimately, the influence of the transformational practices of leadership on organizational loyalty has been extensively examined in different professional contexts. Nonetheless, this investigation has not been extended adequately to higher educational institutions. Recently, few studies have been argued the impact of academic transformational leadership on job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion (Neen et al., 2020), knowledge sharing and organizational culture (Dayani et al., 2020), and organizational commitment (Huang et al., 2020). The mutual impact of organizational loyalty and some institutional factors has been covered in other studies to investigate its relationship with faculty's organizational commitment, and distributed leadership (Arqawi, et al., 2018; Iqbal et al., 2015; Abahussain & Alsubaie, 2020). The findings of a study among heads of academic departments to investigate the impact of Kouzes and Posner's model of transformational leadership behavior reveals that the adoption of encouraging based on four main approaches namely, challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart shows a 55% direct positive impact on academics' organizational commitment (Tahir et al., 2014).

Given that the impact of social indicators on a number of important organizational achievements, it is important to explore the relationship between leadership trends in the social context and the power of organizational development, to increase understanding of how leaders affect social interactions between staff and their behaviors towards institution to encourage positive organizational outcomes (Ashkanasy et al., 2010). In the Arab context, it can be argued that this impact will be more significant, especially, if we analyze the leadership and staff motivation of organizational change from a social perspective. As recently investigated by Obeidat (2020), Arab culture is generally both directive and supportive, and this is also founded in institutions that appear to be caring i.e., coaching, or affiliative types of leadership. Abahussain & Alsubaie (2020) concluded in their study at one of the Arab universities that the academic leaders e.g., heads of academic departments need a horizontal organizational structure to support innovated practices of leadership and high levels of achievement. They need to be motivated by new leadership roles to give academics new responsibilities based on their experiences and the power of standing accountability.

The current study primarily aims to extend the exploration of how the leadership of heads of academic departments, in Arab universities, through the aspects of transformational practices can affect positively enhance faculty's feelings of involvement and obligation towards institutional development. More precisely, the study attempts to investigate the impact of four main transformational leadership practices namely, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized

consideration on the level of faculty loyalty to the organization in affective, continuous, and normative dimensions. This investigation might help the leaders of higher education institutions, especially in the Arab context, with a deep understanding of how their practices can enhance the psychological attachment of academics, their commitment to the organization, and their job satisfaction.

2. Background

2.1. Transformational leadership and academic challenges

Transformational leadership is a pattern that builds commitment and motivation for change among academics by improving their belief in the possibility of planning, managing, and reflecting on their professional development. It proved a successful model along with motivating staff for improving institutional performance through adoption of the organization's behavioral norms which depend upon the ethical manner and interactions of the environmental variables to adjust the academic practices (Neen et al., 2020). Previous researchers have predominantly paid attention to the impact of negative work characteristics on nonsuppurative attitudes toward organizational change. They argued that transformational leadership is a significant indication of constructing the collective confidence or strength needed of groups to be more successful when dealing with institutional challenges (Bass et al., 2003, WU et al., 2019). Although the leaders in transformational leadership play a pivotal role in accelerating the change, their impact could not be overstated without a significant impact of staff commitment to the development processes.

Indeed, heads of the academic departments often face academic challenges in making critical decisions related to institutional changes, academic practices, and establish positive relationships between faculty members. Despite the need for a large and effective role for the head of the academic department in the success of the educational institution, we do not find only a few studies that determine effective leadership behavior at the level of department heads and faculty deans. Largely, charismatic leaders in higher education institutions could provoke the motivation of followers, and this stimulation could have significant effects on their attitudes towards the vision and mission of the institution. This can also be useful in terms of inspiring and persuading academics to adopt the new required changes of higher education institutions (Chipunza & Matsumunyane, 2018).

It is of note that transformational leadership can be referred to as a higher-order construct of four components, which have been adapted in the present study, i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and Individualized consideration (Bass et al., 2003). First, at the level of idealized influence, prior studies concluded that the transformational leaders show an idealized influence on their teams to maintain a behavioral consistency which can be developed in positive empowerment through participating in risks to improve their organization's performance and feeling more trust (Kevin Kelloway et al., 2003; Cetin & Kinik, 2015). Nonetheless, as considered by Huang et

al. (2020), there is a critical need to investigate the mechanisms of psychological confidence-building through which academic leaders influence faculty's organizational commitment. The second component i.e., inspirational motivation forces the academic staff to be motivated by providing challenges of the institutional development. The leaders in this approach seek to share feelings and emotional appeals with staff to encourage the communication of collectively by evoking their supportive awareness of mutually desired goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The challenge of this is how the leaders achieve a high level of faculty performance by raising their changeable criteria for academic success, considering their diverse academic roles e.g., teaching, researching, and community services.

For intellectual stimulation, transformational leadership can enhance the level of creativity and innovation of faculty by emphasizing the integration of knowledge into university (Militaru, 2014). The challenge of this line of leadership, especially in the Arab context, that universities need to focus on promoting and decide on individuals for upper-level academic positions with specific features, not any other factors as age or academic rank, to align with the requirements of this type of leadership. The fourth component of transformational leadership, i.e., individualized consideration reflects the competencies of academic leaders, by acting as mentors, to give heed to academics who got a higher level of achievement. By this type of leaders, new learning chances are created along with a supportive institutional climate in terms of desired and recognized staff needs (Bass et al., 2003). The challenge of this approach is the conflict of interests in the academic professional environments which have several aspects in terms of the objectives and perspectives of students, faculty, and leaders.

2.2. Organizational loyalty versus organizational commitment

Organizational loyalty, theoretically, reflects staff feelings as core members and contributors to the organization's achievements and success. Prior studies presented both organizational commitment and organizational loyalty as the same concepts, levels, and types. This similarity can be one of the challenges to measuring the impact of other organizational factors on staff performance. It is of importance that organizational loyalty, as a virtue, is more than commitment that involves being staff firm and more stable in their organization. In other words, the staff who has a high level of loyalty does not give up their support to the organization when things go either favorably or unfavorably, especially during difficult and critical crises (Opatha, 2015). In their study of Chinese employees, Chen et al. (2002) concluded that loyalty to supervisor appears to be more significant than organizational commitment in accounting for employees' in-role and the performance of the additional role.

Meanwhile, the controversy between loyalty to the organization and staff's commitment has been covered by some researchers to investigate the level of each of them between organizations' members. Iqbal et al. (2015) investigated the positive impact of organizational commitment on employee loyalty in Pakistani organizations. Ammari et al. (2017) argued that the division of organizational commitment to attitudinal and behavioral commitment can emphasize staff identification and involvement by

representing the strength of staff loyalty to the organization. Conversely, it can also reflect the process whereby staff links themselves to their organization, because of the costs involved in leaving it.

The findings of previous studies concluded that both organizational commitment and loyalty are positively associated with the level of institutional performance. Brown et al. (2011) determined that the leaders may be able to force some control over staff loyalty and commitment of their organization, specifically, human resource practices and provoking their trust which, in turn, may enhance its performance. Consequently, universities have a duty to provide an appropriate environment to faculty that capable of developing their loyalty that remains one of the indicators of the successful achievement of its objectives and recognizing the factors of positive organizational climate in its institutional construction (Arqawi, et al., 2018). More precisely in the Arabic context, organizational loyalty has a significant impact on such professional environments suffered by academics, especially in governmental institutions, from the effects of intention to leave, job strain, and academic productivity (Abdulrahman, 2015).

The faculty in the Arab university will have more degree of organizational loyalty, in its three dimensions i.e., affective, continuous, and normative, when they have been reinforced by the perceived organizational support and developing a system of incentives that enhance their bounty (Al-Adayleh, 2007). It is thus in a university's interest to foster such features which can highlight a potential avenue for productivity at the institution level. Accordingly, the attitudes of the academic suggest not only a role for staff characteristics, but also for the institution features, particularly, human resource practices and producing trust in their university. The current study contributes to the literature on transformational leadership theory and organizational loyalty to investigate the relationship between affiliation and loyalty to the university and thus appears clear differences in views between heads of departments and members. likewise, the study seeks to reveal that the levels of organizational loyalty are significantly influenced by the leadership practices of the heads of academic departments.

3. Method

3.1. Study Design

This study adopted a cross-sectional data questionnaire, with an electronic questionnaire via QuestionPro distributed to the teaching staff members of a Saudi public university. The teaching staff members were full-time instructors from Deanship of preparatory year and supporting studies (DPYSS) at Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University (IAU), and they were divided by gender into 52 (48%) male instructors and 56 (52%) female instructors. The study data collection procedure was carried out over two months. The variables in the self-administered questionnaires were measured through two scales, each adopted from prior studies, with responses measured on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) as the following:

- 30 items for transformational leadership were divided into four components: idealized influence (7 items), inspirational motivation (8 items), intellectual stimulation (8 items), and individualized consideration (7 items), with a high level of reliability (Cronbach's α = 0.985).

- 24 items to measure the level of staff's organizational loyalty which were divided into three components i.e., affective, continuous, and normative (by 8 items for each component) with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.932 which indicates a good reliability of the items.

Accordingly, the major purposes of the study are briefly stated as follows:

- To describe the transformational leadership behavior of heads of academic departments and the level of organizational loyalty among faculty in KSA.

- To determine the relationship between academic department heads' transformational leadership behavior and their followers' level of organizational loyalty.

- To determine the impact of academic and demographic variables of faculty on their perspective of transformational leadership components of academic leaders and their level of organizational loyalty. The transformational leadership scale was utilized to assess the level of heads of academic departments in DPYSS to build commitment and motivation for change among academics. Examples of items, for idealized influence, are "The head of your department has a high level of self-confident", and "The deeds of the head of your department align with his words". For inspirational motivation, some sample items include, "The head of your department has great confidence in his team competencies", and "The head of your department discuss with faculty their performance and progress as a part of the professional motivation". With regards to intellectual stimulation, 8 items were adopted to measure how the head of academic departments enhance the level of creativity and innovation of faculty e.g. "The head of your department encourages faculty for new approaches of academic strategies", and "The head of your department growths the value of optimism for the future among faculty". Lastly, individualized consideration was measured by items like "The head of your department provides to faculty a positive reinforcement which makes them feel appreciated", and "The head of your department encourages faculty to share their perspectives even if they contradict his opinion".

The organizational loyalty scale aimed to measure how the head of departments can share with academics that they are firmer and more stable in their university, and the needed support for them to not give up in either favorable or unfavorable situations. Three different components were used to measure the organizational loyalty level of the study sample. For the affective loyalty, the scale included some items e.g., "The organizational climate reflects family emotions among department members", and "I feel proud when I share with others my affiliation to IAU". At the level of continuous loyalty, it was measured by 8 items like "I am motivated to work in any task assigned to me in order to carry on my work at IAU", and "My work encourages me to do my best job performance and duties". Some items like "I am committed to correcting my errors and resolving problems to reach my best professional performance", and "I believe that my university reputation one of my concerns that affects my professional performance" are used to measure the level of normative loyalty.

3.2. Participants

A total number of 108 faculty participated in the study with some academic and demographic variables of gender, years of experience, and academic rank. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the study sample.

Table 1. *Characteristics of the faculty participated in the study.*

	No. of Respondents (%)
Academic Rank	
Lecturer	27 (25%)
Assistant Professor	59 (55%)
Associate Professor	10 (9%)
Full Professor	12 (11%)
Years of academic experience	
> 10	66 (61%)
5 - 10	19 (18%)
< 5	23 (21%)
Gender	
Male	52 (48%)
Female	56 (52%)

4. Findings

The study used SPSS to analyze the collected data, more specifically using internal consistency, descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression analysis of the transformational leadership and organizational loyalty components. Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of transformational leadership and organizational loyalty components. It shows that there is a high level of transformational leadership among heads of the academic departments of IAU. The individual item means a score of transformational leadership behaviors was first transformed into total mean scores. The descriptive analysis for the transformational leadership behaviors showed that the total mean score was 4.01 (SD = 0.77). Therefore, the findings accomplished that academic staff perceived their heads of department as a transformation leader while leading the academic practices. Table 2 also portrays that the lowest level of transformational leadership practices is intellectual stimulation (M=3.87, SD=0.81) and the highest component is individualized consideration with the same mean of idealized influence (M=4.01, SD=0.77) but less than idealized influence in standard deviation.

Table 2 . *Descriptive statistics for full sample (n = 108)*

Measure	M	SD
Transformational leadership	**4.01**	**0.771**
Idealized Influence	4.08	0.882
Inspirational Motivation	4.03	0.823
Intellectual Stimulation	3.87	0.813
Individualized Consideration	4.08	0.773
Organizational Loyalty	**3.78**	**0.521**
Affective Loyalty	3.97	0.719
Continuous Loyalty	3.23	0.499
Normative Loyalty	4.13	0.693

Further, the mean score for organizational loyalty among the study sample was considered as an above medium level of loyalty to university which was indicated at 3.78 (SD = 0.52). The findings mirror that the normative loyalty is the highest level of organizational loyalty components (M= 4.13, SD=0.69), then affective loyalty (M= 3.97, SD=0.71), and lastly continuous loyalty (M=3.23, SD=0.49). Likewise, the correlations between the components of transformational leadership in DPYSS and the organizational loyalty of faculty were analyzed in consideration of their gender, years of academic experiences, and academic rank. Table 3 shows the matrix of correlations values and 4-ANOVA test of academic and demographic variables to measure the variance between faculty in their perspectives of the transformational leadership practices of heads of departments and their organizational loyalty. The findings of 4-ANOVA test of the transformational leadership scale concluded that there were statistically significant differences between faculty's years of experience regarding their analysis of transformational leadership practices as determined by F = 0.019 (p ≤0.05). Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences between faculty responses regarding academic rank and gender. At the level of organizational loyalty, there were statistically significant differences between faculty experience and gender (at 0.01 level). Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences between faculty academic rank and their level of organizational loyalty.

Table 3 *4-ANOVA and correlation analysing of academic and demographic variables*

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational leadership					
Academic Rank	.746	3	.249	2.482	.067

Years of Experience	1.053		3	.351	3.501	.019*
Gender	.032		1	.032	.319	.574
Error	8.119		81	.100		
Total	1488.360		108			
Corrected Total	15.754		107			
Organizational Loyalty						
Academic Rank	.657		1	.657	1.309	.256
Years of Experience	7.959		2	3.980	7.930	.001*
Gender	13.445		3	4.482	8.931	.000*
Error	44.662		89	.502		
Total	1855.127		105			
Corrected Total	67.125		104			

Correlation Test

	Gender	Years of academic experience	Academic Rank
Transformational leadership			
Idealized Influence	.060	-.079	.254**
Inspirational Motivation	.043	-.172	.293**
Intellectual Stimulation	.001	-.117	.313**
Individualized Consideration	-.011	-.148	.328**
Organizational Loyalty			
Affective Loyalty	-.079	-.067	.189
Continuous Loyalty	-.062	-.210*	.188
Normative Loyalty	-.125	.003	.199*

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Closely related to these findings, the correlation test of study variables shows that there is no significant relationship between all the components of transformational leadership from faculty's point of view and their gender or years of academic experience. On the other hand, there are significant relationships (at 0.01 level) between the academic rank of faculty and their analysis of all the transformational leadership components i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (r= 0.254, 0.293, 0.313, and 0.328 respectively). At the level of organizational loyalty, there are significant relationships between only two components namely, continuous loyalty of faculty members and their years of academic experience (r=- 0.210, p>0.05), and normative loyalty of faculty with their academic rank (r=0.199, p>0.05). Finally, there was not any

significant relationship between the gender of faculty and the components of transformational leadership or their loyalty to the university.

Ultimately, the findings provided empirical evidence to indicate a significant relationship between transformational leadership of the head of departments and organizational loyalty among academics. Table 4 contains the correlation analysis results of the variables. From the table, it is clear that the affective loyalty of academics has a positive and significant relationship with the four components of transformational leadership i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration ($r = 0.435$, $p <.01$; $r = 0.412$, $p <.01$; $r = 0.426$, $p <.01$; $r = 0.445$, $p <.01$ respectively).

Table 4 *Correlations matrix between transformational leadership and organizational loyalty components*

		Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Transformational leadership	1	Idealized Influence	----						
	2	Inspirational Motivation	.896**	----					
	3	Intellectual Stimulation	.828**	.853**	----				
	4	Individualized Consideration	.720**	.801**	.867**	----			
Organizational Loyalty	5	Affective Loyalty	.435**	.412**	.426**	.445**	----		
	6	Continuous Loyalty	.334**	.338**	.399**	.280**	.258**	----	
	7	Normative Loyalty	.483**	.514**	.548**	.511**	.747**	.375**	----

Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In addition, the continuous loyalty ($r = 0.334$, $p >.01$; $r = 0.338$, $p. >01$; $r = 0.399$, $p <.01$; $r=0.280$, $p>0.01$ respectively) has a positive relationship with all transformational leadership components but with a lesser degree than the affective loyalty. Conversely, the normative loyalty has the highest level of a positive correlation with transformational leadership components ($r = 0.483$, $p >.01$; $r = 0.514$, $p. >01$; $r = 0.548$, $p <.01$; $r=0.511$, $p>0.01$ respectively).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of this study present a humble investigation of transformational leadership practices, from the faculty members' point of view, among heads of academic departments in a public Saudi university.

Moreover, how transformative leadership practices influence academics' loyalty to university considering some academic and demographic variables. The results show that the faculty reported a high level of transformational leadership among their academic leaders. More precisely, idealized influence reflects the highest level of transformative leadership practices that leading the positive empowerment of faculty through their participation during institutional threats and risks. For this consideration, the professors and associate professors conveyed an awareness of idealized influence practices more than assistant professors and lecturers. In line with the foregoing, the academic empowerment of professors leads them to be aware of idealized influence practices as a practice of transformational leadership. These findings mirror align with the results of a previous study (Cetin & Kinik, 2015) that concluded that Ph.D. graduates perceive their administrators' Idealized Influence higher than M.A. graduates. In agreement with another study (Clegg, 2008), it was found that the academic identities under threats, as a part of idealized influence practices of transformational leadership, were mostly not shaped and developed by a reference to the past, but based on different epistemological assumptions stemmed from other professionals and practices that reflect the academics loyalties in response to the changes in university structures.

Meanwhile, the sample of faculty signified all components of organizational loyalty to their academic departments with a significant impact of academic rank on the normative loyalty which was reported as the highest components of the organizational loyalty. Consequently, it is of note that the senior academics have formal opportunities to impact the institutional decisions that affect them, which gives them an opportunity to have their voices heard when talking about formal leadership (Shaw et al., 2013). Thus, this opportunity reflects positively in the level of normative loyalty because of their consciousness of their role on academic performance and institutional achievement. Bearing into consideration the impact of experience years, the academics with a low number of experience years appeared high level of continuous loyalty. It is of note that this conclusion can be illustrated considering the study sample represents contracted faculty with a temporary contract.

With an attempt to provide insights into how transformational leadership practices can influence the components of organizational loyalty, the findings illustrated that all the components of transformational leadership affect positively on the three components of organizational loyalty. Notably, intellectual stimulation has the strongest impact on normative loyalty. Conversely, the individualized consideration aspect is the lowest component of transformational leadership in the relationship with academics' continuous loyalty to the university. The study results addressed that the transformational leadership behavior of the heads of academic departments raises the level of faculty awareness of the university's goals which facilitating their tasks and increasing their motivation that they exert maximum effort to achieve the institutional goals. This motivation makes faculty feel a strong intention to stay at university that represents a high level of organizational loyalty. The study is partly mirrored with the conclusions found in a previous study by Luton (2010) which showed the existence of a positive relationship with statistical significance between the head of academic departments' practices for transformative

leadership by its four components and the level of organizational loyalty among faculty. Moreover, the study concurs with the conclusion of Woodcock (2010) study that showed statistically significant moderation effects of perceived organizational support and individual level collectivism on the relationship between transformational leadership and staff loyalty.

The current study has some limitations, the first being that the study sample may not be considered as a representative of the general population owing to the fact that it was chosen from only a single Saudi university. This could limit the demographical and geographical generalization but, on this basis, future studies are furnished with avenues for research. Future studies can adopt the same design and framework but include all Saudi universities. The second limitation of this study concerns the quantitative data collection method adopted via the self-report approach. Participants had ample chances to manipulate their answers based on several reasons; they may have become bored with the questionnaire so they chose answers that they think would satisfy the researcher and get over with the answering as quickly as possible. Therefore, the respondents to the survey may have (voluntarily/involuntarily) chosen answers that were not true to their experiences. Therefore, it is recommended that future authors make use of the qualitative approach to provide deeper insight into the perception of lecturers in universities. One interesting area of future research entails exploring how the interaction between different types of faculty loyalty may influence academic performance, as well as how human resources practices influence different types of commitment.

References

Abahussain, S. A. & Alsubaie, O. A. (2020). Department heads' use of distributed leadership and its role in fostering organizational loyalty among academics at Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University. *The Scientific Journal of King Faisal University*, 21(2), 307-313.

Abdulrahman, E. (2015). Organizational loyalty among faculty in Jordanian universities from their perspective: a comparative study between public and private universities. *An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities),* 29(6).

Al-Adayleh, O. A. (2007). *The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational loyalty at Jordanian universities*. Mu'tah University.

Ammari, G., Alkurdi, B., Alshurideh, A., & Alrowwad, A. (2017). Investigating the impact of communication satisfaction on organizational commitment: a practical approach to increase employees' loyalty. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 9(2), 113-133.

Arqawi, S., Al hila, A., Abu Naser, S. & Al Shobaki, M. (2018). Degree of organizational loyalty among Palestinian universities staff case study on Palestine Technical University–(Kadoorei). *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(9), 1-10.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Peterson, M. F., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2010). *The handbook of organizational culture and climate*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Brown, S., McHardy, J., McNabb, R., & Taylor, K. (2011). Workplace performance, worker commitment, and loyalty. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 20(3), 925-955. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9134.2011.00306.x

Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, F. S. F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 519-527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.122

Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, F. S. F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207*, 519-527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.122

Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(3), 339-356. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369749

Chipunza, C., & Matsumunyane, L. L. (2018). Motivation sources and leadership styles among middle managers at a South African university. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(4), e1-e13. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v16i0.985

Clegg, S. (2008). Academic identities under threat? *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(3), 329-345. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701532269

Dayani, A. D., Asmony, T., & Hermanto. (2020). the effect of organizational culture and transformational leadership on knowledge sharing: A study in Bumigora university of west Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 103(7), 20-25. https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2020-07.03

Dowling-Hetherington, L. (2016). University change in Ireland: understanding the 'What', the 'Why' and the 'How'. Educational Management, Administration & Leadership, 44(2), 263-280. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549968

Huang, Y., Liu, H., & Huang, L. (2020). How transformational and contingent reward leaderships influence university faculty's organizational commitment: The mediating effect of psychological empowerment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/03075079.2020.1723534

Iqbal, A., Tufail, M. S. & Lodhi, R. N. (2015). Employee loyalty and organizational commitment in Pakistani organization. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management,* 3(1), 1-11.

Iqbal, A.A, Tufail, M. S & Lodhi, R. N. (2015). Employee loyalty and organizational commitment in Pakistani organization. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*. 3(1), 1–11.

Kevin Kelloway, E., Barling, J., Kelley, E., Comtois, J., & Gatien, B. (2003). Remote transformational leadership. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24(3), 163-171. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730310469589

Khasawneh, S., Omari, A., & Abu-Tineh, A. M. (2012). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment: The case for vocational teachers in Jordan. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership,* 40(4), 494-508. doi:10.1177/1741143212438217

Luton, B. (2010). *Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: A study of unc system business school department chairs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Militaru, G. (2014). The impact of transformational leadership on university performance through knowledge and innovation. In *Balkan Region Conference on Engineering and Business Education,* 1(1), 343-346. Sciendo.

Mokhber, M., Ismail, Wan Khairuzzaman bin Wan, & Vakilbashi, A. (2015). Effect of transformational leadership and its components on organizational innovation. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 8(2), 221.

Neen, G., Noshaba, A., & Akhter, Z. (2020). Exploring the relationship between transformational leadership style, job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and burnout: A case from universities of Lahore. *Journal of Educational Research*, 23(2), 161.

Neen, G., Noshaba, A., & Akhter, Z. (2020). Exploring the relationship between transformational leadership style, job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion and burnout: A case from universities of Lahore. *Journal of Educational Research*, 23(2), 161.

Obeidat, B. (2020). *A Critical Conceptualisation of Leadership and Organisational Change: The Case of Royal Jordanian Airline.* Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2015). *Organizational behavior: The human side of work*. Author Publication, Nugegoda, Colombo: Sri Lanka.

Shaw, M. A., Chapman, D. W., & Rumyantseva, N. L. (2013). Organizational culture in the adoption of the bologna process: A study of academic staff at a Ukrainian university. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(7), 989-1003. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.614336

Tahir, L., Abdullah, T., Ali, F., & Daud, K. (2014). Academics transformational leadership: An investigation of heads of department leadership behaviours in Malaysian public universities. *Educational Studies*, 40(5), 473-495. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2014.932272

Top, M., Tarcan, M., Tekingündüz, S., & Hikmet, N. (2013). An analysis of relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust in two Turkish hospitals. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 28(3), e217-e241. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2154

Trigueros, R., Padilla, A., Aguilar-Parra, J. M., Mercader, I., López-Liria, R., & Rocamora, P. (2020). The influence of transformational teacher leadership on academic motivation and resilience, burnout

and academic performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(20), 7687. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17207687

Ugwu, C. I., Onyancha, O. B., & Fombard, M. (2020). Transformational and transactional leadership and knowledge sharing in Nigerian university libraries. *IFLA Journal*, 46(3), 207-223. https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035220917987

Woodcock, Chelsea (2010). *Transformational leadership and employee commitment: The moderating role of perceived organizational support and individual level collectivism/individualism* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Illinois University. Illinois, IL.

Wu, T., Shen, Q., Liu, H., & Zheng, C. (2019). Work stress, perceived career opportunity, and organizational loyalty in organizational change: A moderated mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 47(4), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7824