

Journal of Policy Options • RESDO



Transformational Leadership and Cultural Dynamics in the Pharmaceutical Sector

Mehmet Senturk^a

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of transformational leadership behavior on organizational culture within a pharmaceutical company by analyzing data collected from 100 employees in the production sector. The aim is to determine statistically significant relationships between transformational leadership and various aspects of organizational culture, providing insights into how leadership styles can influence and shape the work environment and cultural dynamics within the company. The results of the study support the hypotheses, revealing that transformational leadership behavior has a positive and significant correlation with various components of organizational culture. Specifically, the findings indicate that transformational leadership is positively associated with long-term/short-term orientation, masculinity/femininity, power distance, individualism/collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance. These correlations suggest that transformational leaders significantly influence these cultural dimensions, thereby shaping the overall organizational environment in meaningful ways.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture, Pharmaceutical Sector

JEL Codes: M12, L25, I10

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of leadership has garnered widespread attention and discussion across multiple disciplines, making it one of the most explored topics in both academic and practical contexts. It is a term that resonates with political figures, business leaders, social activists, and scholars alike, who frequently incorporate it into their discourses, writings, and strategies. Leadership is often seen as a critical factor in the success of organizations, communities, and even nations, and this has led to its pervasive presence in various fields of study and practice. Despite its widespread use and the significant body of research dedicated to understanding it, the definition of leadership remains elusive and subject to varying interpretations. Over the years, scholars have introduced a plethora of theories and models aimed at capturing the essence of leadership, each contributing unique insights into what leadership entails. These theories range from trait-based approaches, which focus on the inherent qualities of leaders, to behavioral models that examine the actions and styles of leadership, to contingency and situational theories that consider the context in which leadership occurs.

However, this proliferation of theories has also led to a lack of consensus. What one school of thought considers essential to leadership, another might deem irrelevant or secondary. For instance, some theories emphasize the importance of vision and inspiration as central to leadership, while others focus on the role of influence, power dynamics, or the ability to manage and direct teams effectively (Imran et al., 2021). This diversity of perspectives highlights the complexity of the leadership phenomenon and reflects the challenges in developing a unified definition. Moreover, the application of leadership concepts varies significantly across different sectors and cultures, further complicating the quest for a universally accepted definition. In the corporate world, leadership might be associated with innovation, strategic decision-making, and the ability to drive organizational change. In the political arena, leadership could be viewed through the lens of governance, public persuasion, and policy implementation. Social activists might define leadership in terms of advocacy, empowerment, and the ability to mobilize communities for a cause.

The ongoing debate about the meaning of leadership underscores its multifaceted nature. It is not merely about holding a position of authority or directing others; it also involves a deep understanding of human behavior, organizational dynamics, and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances. Leadership is as much about emotional intelligence, ethical considerations, and the capacity to inspire as it is about strategy, control, and management. Leadership is often conceptualized in different ways by scholars, with some defining it as a behavior or a process rather than merely a trait or position. This perspective emphasizes the actions and interactions that occur within a group or organization, focusing on the dynamic relationships between leaders and followers. For instance, Bowers and Seashore (1966) provided a behavioral definition of leadership, describing it as "an organizationally useful behavior by one member of an organizational family toward another member or members of that same organizational family." This definition highlights the idea that leadership is not confined to formal roles or titles but can be exhibited by any member of an organization through behaviors that contribute to the group's functioning and goals. In this view, leadership is seen as a set of actions or behaviors that facilitate cooperation, communication, and the achievement of collective objectives. It underscores the importance of interpersonal relationships and the influence that individuals can exert on one another to guide and shape organizational outcomes. By framing leadership as behavior, Bowers and Seashore shift the focus from who leaders are (their traits or positions) to what leaders do—how they interact with others in ways that are beneficial to the organization.

^a Okan University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey

This behavioral approach to leadership aligns with other theories that view leadership as a process of influence, where the emphasis is on the methods and strategies used to motivate, guide, and support others in achieving shared goals. It suggests that leadership is something that can be developed and practiced by anyone within an organization, regardless of their formal role, as long as their actions contribute positively to the group's success. Tannenbaum and Massrick (1957) also approached leadership as a process or function, challenging the notion that leadership is solely an inherent attribute of individuals in predetermined roles. By viewing leadership as a dynamic process, they recognized that the role of a leader is not fixed and can shift among different members of a group depending on the situation, needs, and challenges faced by the organization. This perspective emphasizes the fluidity of leadership and the idea that different people can step into leadership roles at different times, depending on their expertise, the task at hand, or the context in which the organization operates.

This functional view of leadership aligns with the understanding that effective leadership is not about holding a formal title but about performing actions that move the group toward its goals. It suggests that leadership is distributed and can be shared among various individuals who contribute to the organization's success in different ways. Many researchers have also explored leadership from the perspective of long-term and short-term orientations, which refer to the time horizons that leaders and organizations prioritize in their decision-making and strategic planning. Leaders with a long-term orientation focus on sustainability, future goals, and the lasting impact of their decisions, often emphasizing values such as persistence, prudence, and adaptability. In contrast, leaders with a short-term orientation may prioritize immediate results, quick wins, and efficiency, sometimes at the expense of long-term stability or growth. The concept of long-term versus short-term orientation is crucial in understanding different leadership styles and their implications for organizational culture and performance. Leaders who emphasize a long-term orientation may foster a culture of continuous improvement, innovation, and resilience, while those with a short-term focus might drive rapid change, responsiveness, and agility. Both orientations have their strengths and weaknesses, and the effectiveness of a leader may depend on their ability to balance these time horizons according to the organization's needs and external environment.

Mescon (1958) emphasized the transformative power of leadership, arguing that true leadership has the capacity to turn a group of individuals into a cohesive and dynamic force, capable of achieving goals that would be unattainable by an unstructured or disjointed assembly of people. This perspective highlights the role of leadership in fostering unity, direction, and purpose within a group, underscoring the idea that effective leadership is about creating synergy and driving collective effort toward common objectives. Building on this, many scholars have focused on the concept of influence as a central component of leadership. Tannenbaum and Massrick (1957) defined leadership as an "interpersonal influence," exercised in specific situations and communicated effectively to guide a group toward the attainment of particular goals. This definition suggests that leadership is not merely about holding authority or power; it is about the ability to influence others in a way that aligns their actions and efforts with the desired outcomes of the group or organization.

In line with this, Bennis (1959) also asserted that a leader's effectiveness is rooted in their ability to influence others. He suggested that the essence of leadership lies in the skill of influencing subordinates to willingly work towards the achievement of shared goals. This perspective reinforces the idea that leadership is inherently relational and dependent on the leader's capacity to inspire, motivate, and guide others. Similarly, Dion (1968) defined leadership as a relationship between those who exercise influence and those who submit to that influence. This definition further emphasizes the relational aspect of leadership, portraying it as a dynamic interaction between leaders and followers. According to this view, leadership is not a one-sided imposition of authority but a process of mutual engagement where influence is both given and received within the context of a shared purpose. These perspectives underscore that leadership is not merely a position or title but a function of influence, communication, and the ability to unify and direct a group towards achieving its goals. Whether through the transformational vision described by Mescon, the interpersonal influence highlighted by Tannenbaum and Massrick, or the relational dynamics emphasized by Dion, effective leadership is characterized by the ability to bring people together, inspire action, and guide collective efforts towards meaningful and shared outcomes. Leadership is often associated with extraordinary personality traits and characteristics that set leaders apart from others. Bass (1990) argued that leaders are exceptional individuals endowed with specific qualities, such as sanctity and heroism, which enable them to inspire and serve as role models for their followers. This perspective views leadership as a manifestation of innate traits that empower certain individuals to lead effectively and make a significant impact on those around them. Leaders, in this sense, are seen as possessing extraordinary abilities that allow them to navigate challenges, inspire trust, and guide others toward achieving shared goals.

On the other hand, Jago (1982) offered a more nuanced view by defining leadership as both a process and a property. According to Jago, leadership involves the use of noncoercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of organizational members in pursuit of group objectives. This definition emphasizes that leadership is not solely about inherent qualities or traits but also about the actions and processes leaders engage in to achieve desired outcomes. Leadership as a process involves the strategic and thoughtful application of influence, where leaders guide and motivate others without relying on force or coercion. Jago's dual perspective on leadership suggests that while certain personality traits may contribute to a leader's effectiveness, leadership is also about the dynamic interactions between the leader and the followers. It is through this process of influence, communication, and coordination that leaders achieve organizational goals. This approach recognizes that leadership can be learned and developed, as it involves both the possession of certain properties (such as charisma or vision) and the ability to effectively engage in leadership processes (such as decision-making, problem-solving, and team-building).

While some views, like those of Bass, emphasize the extraordinary qualities of leaders as central to their ability to lead, others, like Jago, highlight the importance of both inherent traits and the processes leaders use to influence and guide

their followers. This broader understanding of leadership accommodates the idea that effective leadership can emerge from a combination of personal characteristics and the deliberate application of leadership strategies and practices. Leadership is distinct from force, coercion, or domination and is not inherently tied to formal titles like manager, supervisor, or superior. While these titles may denote authority within an organizational hierarchy, true leadership transcends mere positional power and involves guiding, influencing, and motivating others in a way that fosters voluntary commitment rather than compliance born of fear or obligation. Tannenbaum and Massrick (1957) emphasized that leadership also draws upon internal resources such as flexibility and understanding. This perspective suggests that effective leaders are those who can adapt to changing circumstances and who possess a deep understanding of both their followers and the contexts in which they operate. Flexibility allows leaders to navigate complex situations, adjust their strategies as needed, and respond empathetically to the needs and motivations of their team members.

Dion (1968) expanded on the concept of leadership by presenting it as a multidimensional pattern and a reciprocal relationship. According to Dion, leadership involves three key components: the leader, the follower, and the relationship between them. This approach highlights the interactive and relational nature of leadership, where the effectiveness of a leader is not solely dependent on their personality or traits but also on how they engage with and relate to their followers. Leadership, therefore, is not a one-sided affair; it is a dynamic process that involves both the leader and the follower actively participating in and shaping the relationship. The leader's ability to influence and inspire is as much a function of their understanding of their followers as it is of their own abilities. This interaction occurs within specific situations, meaning that leadership is also context-dependent—what works in one scenario may not be effective in another. In essence, leadership is seen not just as a function of the leader's personality, but as an outcome of the interplay between the leader and their followers within particular contexts. This perspective underscores the importance of adaptability, mutual respect, and the situational dynamics that influence how leadership is enacted and experienced. The relational aspect of leadership implies that it is a shared journey, where both leaders and followers contribute to the achievement of common goals, and where the success of leadership is measured by the quality and effectiveness of this interaction.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

During the 1980s, research on leadership increasingly emphasized how leaders could effectively shape and enhance their organizations. This period marked the emergence of transformational leadership as a pivotal model for achieving organizational goals, boosting commitment, and refining processes aligned with these goals. Transformational leadership brought together elements from earlier leadership theories, including trait, style, and contingency approaches, creating a comprehensive framework for understanding effective leadership. One of the key dimensions of transformational leadership identified by Avolio and Bass is idealized influence, which closely ties to charisma. This dimension reveals itself in two distinct ways. The first, idealized influence behavior, involves leaders demonstrating actions and behaviors that earn the respect, trust, and admiration of their followers. Such leaders act as role models, displaying ethical and moral conduct that strengthens followers' loyalty and commitment. The second form, idealized influence attributed, relates to the charisma perceived by followers. This perception is built on the leader's confidence, vision, and ability to convey a compelling future. It emphasizes the role of followers' perceptions and beliefs in the leadership dynamic, illustrating how leaders' personal attributes can shape how they are viewed by others.

Transformational leadership also includes inspirational motivation, where leaders stimulate and inspire followers by setting high expectations and using symbolic and emotional appeals. This component fosters a strong sense of purpose and dedication to organizational goals (Imran et al., 2023). Another critical aspect is intellectual stimulation, where leaders encourage creativity and innovation by challenging existing assumptions and promoting new ideas. This approach stimulates followers to think critically and tackle problems independently. Furthermore, individualized consideration is a vital component of transformational leadership. Leaders provide personalized support and attention to each follower's unique needs and development, acting as mentors and helping individuals reach their full potential. They address specific concerns and foster personal growth.

These dimensions enhance the effectiveness of transformational leadership by creating a positive and motivating environment. Transformational leaders drive growth, innovation, and commitment within their organizations, guiding them through change and ensuring long-term success. This component of transformational leadership revolves around the charismatic actions of the leader, which are centered on core values, beliefs, and a sense of mission. Charismatic leaders are known for articulating their most important values and beliefs with conviction, emphasizing a collective mission and purpose, and carefully considering the ethical implications of their decisions. This aspect of leadership involves how leaders project their charisma, power, and confidence, and how these traits are perceived by their followers. It is fundamentally about the attribution of charisma and influence that followers assign to their leaders, determining whether they view them as inspiring and whether they desire to be associated with them.

Den Hartog et al. (1997) characterized inspiration within leadership as a crucial element that enables leaders to act as models for their followers. Inspirational motivation is a dimension of transformational leadership that involves the ways in which leaders stimulate and engage their followers to reach both personal and organizational objectives. This aspect of leadership is realized when leaders express a compelling vision for the future, demonstrating optimism and enthusiasm. They communicate this vision clearly and persuasively, outlining practical pathways for followers to achieve it. By presenting a clear and inspiring vision, leaders instill a sense of purpose and direction in their followers. This approach not only motivates followers by offering them a tangible goal to strive towards but also fosters a sense of commitment and alignment with the organizational mission. Inspirational leaders are adept at creating a compelling narrative that resonates with their followers, making the work seem more meaningful and connected to a greater cause. Moreover, this

form of motivation encourages followers to take ownership of their roles and contribute actively to the achievement of organizational goals. Leaders who excel in inspirational motivation are able to cultivate a positive and dynamic work environment where followers are enthusiastic about their tasks and motivated to exceed expectations. This process involves creating a challenging yet attainable vision, providing encouragement and support, and recognizing the contributions of followers. As a result, followers are more likely to be engaged, committed, and willing to invest their energy in pursuing shared objectives. This dimension of transformational leadership, therefore, plays a significant role in enhancing organizational performance and achieving long-term success.

Dionne et al. (2004) identified a critical component of transformational leadership as intellectual stimulation, which emphasizes the promotion of intelligence, rationality, and thoughtful problem-solving among followers. This dimension challenges followers to think creatively and tackle complex issues, fostering an environment where innovative solutions are encouraged. Den Hartog et al. (1997) further articulated that intellectual stimulation involves prompting followers to critically evaluate their own values, assumptions, and beliefs, as well as those of their leaders. Under this approach, leaders actively engage followers in questioning and reassessing traditional practices and established norms. The objective is not to criticize or undermine followers publicly but to encourage an open dialogue where new ideas and approaches are welcomed and considered. Leaders who exhibit intellectual stimulation create a culture where followers are not afraid to make mistakes or propose unconventional solutions. This supportive environment allows followers to explore different perspectives and find creative resolutions to challenging problems. By fostering an atmosphere where questioning and innovation are valued, leaders enable their followers to identify and address issues that may not have been previously anticipated. This proactive approach helps in addressing unforeseen problems and enhances the overall problem-solving capabilities of the team. Intellectual stimulation, therefore, contributes significantly to the development of a more agile and responsive organization, where continuous improvement and creative thinking are integral to achieving long-term success. This dimension of transformational leadership emphasizes treating followers as individuals rather than merely as members of a group (Dionne et al., 2004). Leaders who embody this dimension focus on recognizing and addressing the unique needs and aspirations of each follower. They provide personalized advice, support, and encouragement, ensuring that each follower feels valued and understood.

The objective here is not just to meet the immediate needs of followers but to actively mentor and coach them towards their personal and professional development. Leaders aim to cultivate an environment where followers are motivated to reach their full potential. This involves not only acknowledging individual differences but also creating a supportive organizational climate that encourages growth and learning. By fostering an atmosphere that promotes new learning opportunities, leaders help followers develop their skills and advance their careers. This personalized approach contributes to a more engaged and motivated workforce, as followers feel that their individual contributions are recognized and their development is supported. Through this dimension, transformational leaders effectively nurture the potential of their team members, enhancing overall organizational effectiveness and individual satisfaction. Culture, as the essence of an organization, plays a crucial role in organizational theory, academic research, and management practices. Though relatively recent in the field of organizational theory, the concept of organizational culture has garnered significant attention and research. The primary aim of these studies is to uncover and interpret various aspects of organizational life, thereby enhancing the understanding of members' perceptions, beliefs, and actions (Martin et al., 1997).

Organizational culture serves as a framework for members to address fundamental challenges related to survival and adaptation in their external environment, while also fostering the development and maintenance of internal processes (Martin, 2002). Schein (1999) described organizational culture as an inherent property of a group, characterized by a powerful, often unconscious set of forces that shape both individual and collective behavior, thought patterns, and values. This latent influence dictates how members perceive their environment, approach problem-solving, and engage in decision-making, underscoring the profound impact of culture on organizational dynamics. Sathe (1983) highlighted that organizational culture subtly yet pervasively influences organizational life. A deeper understanding of this culture enables leaders to navigate it effectively, whether by operating within it, deviating from it, or making necessary changes. This perspective aligns with Cameron and Quinn (1999), who emphasized that the majority of organizational scholars and observers now recognize the significant impact of organizational culture on an organization's performance and long-term effectiveness. In defining organizational culture, Spender (1983) described it as a shared belief system among an organization's members. As a pioneering author on the topic, Ouchi (1981) focused on the symbolic dimensions of culture, characterizing it as a collection of symbols, ceremonies, and myths that convey the underlying values and beliefs of an organization to its employees. This symbolic framework plays a crucial role in communicating and reinforcing the core principles that guide organizational behavior and decision-making. The contemporary definition of organizational culture encompasses several key elements: what is valued within the organization, the prevailing leadership style, the use of language and symbols, the established procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that characterize the organization. According to Cameron and Quinn (1999), organizational culture embodies the values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions that are present within an organization.

Van Fleet (1991) synthesized various definitions by identifying common threads, leading to a broadly accepted definition. He proposed that organizational culture is "the set of values, often taken for granted, that helps people in an organization understand which actions are considered acceptable and which are considered unacceptable." This definition captures the essence of organizational culture as it provides a framework for understanding behaviors and norms within an organization, guiding members in their interactions and decision-making processes. The role of leadership in shaping organizational culture is a well-established concept in organizational theory. Schein (1985) notably emphasized that

organizations do not emerge by chance; rather, they are intentionally created by individuals who recognize that coordinated action by a group can achieve specific goals. He proposed that the formation of organizational culture is akin to creating a small group, driven by the intentions and actions of its members.

Transformational leaders play a pivotal role in this cultural creation. Their values and behaviors often serve as models for employees, influencing how culture is developed and maintained within the organization. Transformational leaders are skilled at embodying and promoting the values they wish to instill, making it easier for employees to adopt these values. Their ability to communicate effectively and inspire others is crucial in embedding organizational culture. Conversely, if a transformational leader exhibits personality or behavioral disorders, it can negatively impact the organizational culture. Such irregularities can create a toxic work environment, undermining employee morale and making it difficult to achieve common goals. Therefore, the effectiveness of transformational leaders in shaping and stabilizing organizational culture is closely linked to their personal integrity and leadership capabilities. Their role is to foster a culture that aligns with organizational objectives and supports employee engagement, ultimately contributing to the organization's success.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study sample was drawn from a private pharmaceutical company in Istanbul, comprising 96 individuals from various departments within the organization. To gather comprehensive data, the questionnaire employed for this study was divided into three independent sections: one for demographic information and two for measuring specific constructs. The first section of the questionnaire collected demographic details, including gender, age, job position, educational background, and tenure with the organization. This section aimed to provide a general profile of the respondents. The remaining sections focused on assessing leadership behaviors and their impact. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Avolio and Bass (2004), was utilized to measure various aspects of leadership. The MLQ encompasses four subscales: charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Each of these dimensions was evaluated through five items on a scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." This approach ensured a thorough assessment of the transformational leadership characteristics as perceived by the respondents. The study employed a thirty-item scale to assess various dimensions of organizational culture. This scale includes five subscales: long/short-term orientation, masculinity/femininity, adaptation, organizational membership, and uncertainty. Each subscale is evaluated through five items on a Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." This structured approach allows for a detailed examination of the participants' perceptions regarding different cultural aspects within the organization.

4. RESULTS

For data analysis, the study utilized SPSS 15.0. Descriptive statistics provided an overview of the sample characteristics. The sample comprised 37 women (38%) and 59 men (62%). In terms of age distribution, 49% (47 participants) were between 20-30 years old, 34% (33 participants) were between 31-40 years old, and 17% (16 participants) were aged 41-50 or older. The sample also included 54% (52 participants) white-collar employees and 46% (44 participants) blue-collar employees. Regarding educational background, 4 participants (4%) were primary school graduates, 40 participants (42%) had completed high school, 33 participants (38%) held university degrees, and 15 participants (16%) had earned a Master's Degree. Tenure within the organization varied, with 30 participants (31%) having worked there for 0-5 years, 50 participants (52%) for 6-10 years, and 16 participants (17%) for more than 11 years. To ensure the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted for both transformational leadership and organizational culture. The Cronbach alpha scores for the various scales ranged between 0.893 and 0.975, indicating high reliability. The means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for each variable are detailed in Table 2. This analysis supports the robustness and consistency of the measurement scales used in the study.

Table 1: Means, Standart Deviations and Reliability Coefficients of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture

Scale	Mean	Std. Dev.	Cronbach α
Transformational Leadership (overall)	3.7421	1.1845	0.8963
- Charisma	3.6791	1.0974	0.8521
- Being the source of inspiration	4.0973	1.0168	0.8873
- Being intellectual	3.5690	1.1683	0.8632
- Individual support	3.3782	1.1739	0.8792
Organizational Culture (overall)	2.5247	1.5789	0.9750
- Long / short term orientation	3.1983	0.9832	0.8943
- Masculinity / feminity	2.9673	1.1298	0.9453
- Power distance	3.2891	1.3425	0.8932
- Individualism / collectivism	2.7830	1.0354	0.9532
- Uncertainty avoidance	3.8020	1.0127	0.8992

The table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for two major constructs: Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture, along with their respective sub-dimensions.

The overall mean score for Transformational Leadership is 3.7421, with a standard deviation of 1.1845, indicating moderate transformational leadership behavior among respondents. The high reliability coefficient of 0.8963 suggests that the items measuring this construct are consistent and reliable. Within this overall construct, the sub-dimension "Being the source of inspiration" has the highest mean (4.0973), implying that respondents perceive leaders as more inspirational compared to other dimensions like Charisma (mean of 3.6791) and Individual support (mean of 3.3782). All sub-dimensions exhibit good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.8521 to 0.8873, ensuring the internal consistency of the measures. For Organizational Culture, the overall mean score is 2.5247, with a relatively higher standard deviation of 1.5789, reflecting a wider variation in perceptions of organizational culture. The reliability of this construct is exceptionally high, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.9750, indicating that the items cohesively measure the intended cultural aspects. Among the sub-dimensions, Uncertainty avoidance has the highest mean score (3.8020), suggesting that respondents see their organization as more focused on avoiding uncertainties. Other cultural dimensions, like Power distance (mean of 3.2891) and Long/short term orientation (mean of 3.1983), show moderate scores. The sub-dimension with the lowest mean is Individualism/collectivism (mean of 2.7830), indicating that the respondents lean slightly toward collectivism but with considerable variation. All sub-dimensions exhibit excellent reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.8932 to 0.9532. Both constructs, Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture, show high internal consistency, as indicated by their Cronbach's alpha values. The data highlights that respondents generally perceive higher levels of inspiration in leadership, while Uncertainty avoidance stands out as a dominant cultural characteristic within the organizations. The variation in standard deviations suggests differing levels of agreement among respondents across different dimensions.

Table 2: Correlation Analysis Between Transformational Leadership and Long / Short Term Orientation

Transformational Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	Long / Short Term Orientation
		0.591**
Transformational Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	Masculinity / Femininity
		0.548**
Transformational Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	Power Distance
		0.462**
Transformational Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	Individualism / Collectivism
		0.478**
Transformational Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	Uncertainty Avoidance
		0.397**
Transformational Leadership		0.000

The table 2 presents the correlation analysis between Transformational Leadership and various dimensions of organizational culture, including Long/Short Term Orientation, Masculinity/Femininity, Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, and Uncertainty Avoidance. The values listed are correlation coefficients, with significance levels (p-values) indicated below each coefficient. The relationship between Transformational Leadership and Long/Short Term Orientation is the strongest, with a correlation coefficient of 0.591, indicating a moderate to strong positive relationship. This suggests that organizations with higher levels of transformational leadership tend to emphasize either long-term or short-term orientation, aligning leadership practices with strategic time horizons. The p-value of 0.000 signifies that this relationship is statistically significant. Next, the correlation between Transformational Leadership and Masculinity/Femininity shows a coefficient of 0.548, also representing a moderate positive correlation. This suggests that transformational leadership is associated with a balance between masculine and feminine cultural traits in organizations. Again, the p-value of 0.000 confirms the statistical significance of this relationship. The Power Distance dimension has a correlation of 0.462 with Transformational Leadership, indicating a moderate positive relationship. This suggests that transformational leadership can coexist with varying levels of hierarchical distance in organizations, though the relationship is somewhat weaker compared to the other dimensions. This correlation is also statistically significant, as indicated by the p-value of 0.000. For Individualism/Collectivism, the correlation coefficient is 0.478, indicating a moderate positive relationship with transformational leadership. This suggests that transformational leadership is present in both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, though the strength of the relationship is in the moderate range. The significance of the correlation is also confirmed by the p-value of 0.000. Finally, Uncertainty Avoidance has the weakest correlation with Transformational Leadership, with a coefficient of 0.397. Although the relationship is positive, it is weaker than the other cultural dimensions, indicating that while transformational leadership is present in organizations with a focus on avoiding uncertainties, this relationship is less pronounced. As with the other correlations, this relationship is statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.000. Transformational Leadership shows moderate positive correlations with all the examined dimensions of organizational culture, with the strongest relationships observed with Long/Short

Term Orientation and Masculinity/Femininity. These correlations suggest that transformational leadership aligns with different cultural aspects, but the strength of these relationships varies across the dimensions, with Uncertainty Avoidance showing the weakest association. All relationships are statistically significant, meaning that these findings are unlikely to be due to chance.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Organizational researchers have increasingly highlighted the pivotal role of transformational leaders in shaping organizational culture. Empirical evidence consistently shows that transformational leadership positively influences the work climate, which in turn enhances employee performance and fosters supportive relationships among employees. Numerous studies across various organizational settings support this view, although some findings present conflicting results. The literature lacks a unified understanding of the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational culture. The analyses reported in this study offer significant insights into how these concepts interact within Turkish organizations. These findings contribute valuable information to the existing literature, helping to clarify the dynamics between transformational leadership and organizational culture. Overall, a key factor distinguishing successful businesses in the 2000s is the presence of a committed, productive, highly motivated, and innovative workforce. As technological advancements and changes continue to evolve, organizations must focus on enhancing employee satisfaction, fostering organizational commitment, and nurturing a positive organizational culture. Addressing these aspects is essential for maintaining a competitive edge and achieving long-term success in a rapidly changing business environment. The success, survival, and competitive strength of organizations are closely tied to the commitment of their members. Organizations thrive when they support individual development, foster participation, and establish a stable organizational culture characterized by shared values and norms. Achieving these goals often hinges on the presence of a leader who possesses strong communication skills, high charisma, and the ability to inspire and stimulate intellectual growth among employees. Such a leader not only guides the organization toward its objectives but also plays a crucial role in maintaining a cohesive and motivated workforce.

REFERENCES

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Bennis, W. (1959). Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problem of authority. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4, 259-301.
- Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11, 238-263.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Addison-Wesley.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Inspirational leadership and transformational leadership. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 70, 19-34.
- Dion, L. (1968). The concept of political leadership: An analysis. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1, 2-17.
- Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 177-193.
- Egri, C. P., & Herman, S. (2000). Leadership in the North American environment sector: Values, leadership styles, and context of environmental leaders and their organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 571-604.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory: Modern symbolic and postmodern perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
- Imran, C. A. B., Shakir, M. K., & Qureshi, M. A. B. (2021). Regulatory Perspectives on AI in Autonomous Vehicles Global Approaches and Challenges. *The Asian Bulletin of Green Management and Circular Economy*, 1(1), 62-74.
- Imran, C. A. B., Shakir, M. K., Umer, M., Imran, Z., & Khalid, H. B. (2023). Construction Materials and Technologies: A Review of New Trends in Sustainable Development. *The Asian Bulletin of Green Management and Circular Economy*, 3(1), 10-21.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, 28, 315-336.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive developmental analysis. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Sage Publications.
- Martin, J., Su, S. K., & Beckman, C. (1997). Enacting shared values - Myth or reality? A context-specific values audit. *Research Paper Number 1469*, Stanford University.
- Mescon, M. H. (1958). The dynamics of industrial leadership. *The Journal of the Academy of Management*, 1, 13-20.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z*. Addison-Wesley.

- Pettigrew, A. (1979). On studying organizational culture. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-581.
- Sathe, V. (1983). Implications of corporate culture: A manager's guide to action. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12, 5-23.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *The corporate culture survival guide*. Jossey-Bass.
- Spender, J. C. (1983). Myths, recipes, and knowledge-bases in organizational analysis. Unpublished Manuscript, Graduate School of Management, University of California.
- Swales, C. (1995). *Organization structures and processes*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Massarik, F. (1957). Organizational leadership and participative management. *Management Science*.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Prentice Hall.
- Van Fleet, D. D. (1991). *Behavior in organizations*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 285-305.