

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR CHINESE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

Xiaotong WANG¹ and Thada SITHTHADA²

1 Student of Master in Educational Administration, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand; 512749034@qq.com

2 Graduate School, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand; Thada.si@ssru.ac.th

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 28 July 2026

Revised: 4 August 2026

Published: 28 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Transformational leadership is widely recognized as a critical enabler of institutional adaptability, faculty engagement, and organizational performance in higher education, yet most university administrators acquire this leadership orientation informally, if at all, through accumulated experience rather than through deliberate, structured development. This gap is particularly pronounced in regional and frontier institutions such as those in the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region (IMAR), where administrators face a distinctive combination of resource constraints, geographic dispersion, and cultural complexity that generic, centrally designed leadership-training programs are poorly equipped to address. Building on an antecedent framework that identifies organizational, professional, and contextual factors shaping transformational leadership, this paper develops an integrated development framework that translates these explanatory factors into a deliberate capacity-building model for university administrators. The framework organizes development activity into three interdependent tracks — organizational enablement, professional capacity-building, and contextual responsiveness — grounded respectively in Self-Determination Theory, positive organizational behavior theory, and contextual leadership theory. A four-stage implementation model, comprising diagnostic assessment, modular capacity-building, embedded organizational support, and continuous evaluation, operationalizes the framework for regional Chinese higher education settings. The paper argues that leadership-development interventions succeed only when paired with organizational conditions that permit their transfer into practice, and it offers a replicable, context-sensitive program design for institutions seeking to cultivate transformational leadership among administrators in resource-constrained and culturally distinctive environments.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership Development, University Administrators, Leadership Training Framework, Higher Education, Inner Mongolia, Capacity Building

CITATION INFORMATION: Wang, X., & Siththada, T. (2026). Development Of an Integrated Transformational Leadership for Chinese University Administrators. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(8), 39.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions are under mounting pressure to perform simultaneously as engines of research, custodians of teaching quality, and instruments of regional development, and the burden of reconciling these demands falls disproportionately on university administrators (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2021). Transformational leadership has been established as one of the leadership orientations best suited to these conditions, associated with stronger faculty engagement, departmental innovation, and institutional adaptability (Gao & Zhang, 2019; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Yet the pathway by which administrators actually come to exhibit transformational behaviors is rarely addressed with the same rigor as the outcomes those behaviors produce. In most Chinese universities, and particularly in regional institutions, administrators are promoted primarily on the strength of academic or technical achievement, and leadership capability is assumed to follow rather than being deliberately cultivated.

This assumption is increasingly untenable in frontier contexts such as the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region (IMAR), where administrators must simultaneously satisfy national excellence mandates, sustain minority and bilingual education commitments, and operate under conditions of geographic dispersion and resource scarcity (Dong & Liu, 2021; Li & Zhang, 2022). Where leadership development programs do exist, they tend to be short, centrally designed, and largely generic, offering technical or policy briefings rather than sustained capacity-building calibrated to local institutional and cultural realities. Training-transfer research has long shown that skills acquired in such programs rarely translate into sustained behavior change unless the surrounding organizational environment is also prepared to support their use (Baldwin & Ford, 1988) — a condition that generic programs, by design, cannot address.

This paper responds to that gap. Drawing on an antecedent framework that identifies organizational, professional, and contextual factors shaping transformational leadership in IMAR universities, it reframes those explanatory categories as levers for deliberate intervention and proposes an integrated development framework for cultivating transformational leadership among university administrators. The paper makes three contributions. Theoretically, it bridges the antecedent literature, which explains why transformational leadership arises, with the leadership-development literature, which asks how it can be deliberately built. Methodologically, it translates a three-factor antecedent structure into a phased, four-stage implementation model suited to empirical piloting. Practically, it offers institutions and regional policymakers a replicable program design for developing transformational leadership capacity among administrators serving in resource-constrained, culturally distinctive, and geographically dispersed higher education settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Transformational Leadership as a Developable Capacity

Transformational leadership, as operationalized by Bass (1985) through Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration, has traditionally been studied as a relatively stable leader disposition. A parallel body of research, however, treats it as a capacity that can be deliberately developed through structured intervention. Avolio and Hannah (2008) argue that leadership development is most effective when it targets identifiable psychological and behavioral building blocks rather than attempting to transmit leadership as an undifferentiated whole, while full-range leadership training built around Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) feedback has demonstrated measurable gains in transformational behaviors following structured coaching (Avolio & Bass, 2004). These findings support the premise that transformational leadership, though shaped by disposition, is substantially responsive to deliberate developmental effort — a premise that grounds the framework proposed in this paper.

2.2 Existing Approaches to University Leadership Development and Their Limitations

Leadership development in Chinese higher education has historically been delivered through short administrative workshops, occasional external study visits, and informal mentoring arrangements, with little standardization across institutions (Day, 2000). These formats can raise awareness of leadership concepts but rarely sustain the kind of prolonged, feedback-rich engagement that behavioral change requires. More fundamentally, such programs are typically designed at the individual level, addressing knowledge and skill while leaving unexamined the organizational climate, governance structure, and resource conditions into which newly trained administrators return. Training-transfer research indicates that this omission is consequential: skills learned in isolation from a supportive work environment tend to decay rapidly, regardless of program quality (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). A leadership-development model for university administrators must therefore address organizational conditions alongside individual competencies if it is to produce durable change.

2.3 Toward an Integrated, Context-Sensitive Development Model

A separate line of antecedent research has identified the organizational, professional, and contextual factors that predict transformational leadership in IMAR universities, encompassing institutional climate, governance structure, and resource support at the organizational level; leadership experience, professional development, psychological capital, and role clarity at the professional level; and cultural environment, policy support, and socioeconomic-geographic conditions at the contextual level. While this framework explains what conditions are associated with transformational leadership, it does not, in its explanatory form, specify how institutions might deliberately cultivate those conditions and competencies among their administrators. The present paper closes this gap by converting each antecedent category into a corresponding development track, integrating them into a single implementation model suited to the distinctive realities of regional Chinese higher education.

THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

3.1 Framework Overview

The proposed framework organizes leadership-development activity into three interdependent tracks that mirror the organizational, professional, and contextual categories identified in the antecedent literature, but recast as domains for intervention rather than explanation. The Organizational Enablement Track addresses the institutional climate, governance latitude, and resource conditions that determine whether developed leadership behaviors can actually be exercised, drawing on Self-Determination Theory's account of the autonomy-, competence-, and relatedness-supportive conditions under which motivational engagement flourishes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The Professional Capacity-Building Track addresses the direct development of transformational competencies and the psychological resources — hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism — that sustain them under pressure, drawing on positive organizational behavior theory (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). The Contextual Responsiveness Track addresses the cultural and geographic realities specific to IMAR, ensuring that developed competencies are expressed in ways that are legible and effective within local relational norms, drawing on contextual leadership theory (Yukl, 2013).

3.2 Framework Components

The Integrated Development Framework consists of three mutually reinforcing tracks: Organizational Enablement, Professional Capacity-Building, and Contextual Responsiveness. These components recognize that leadership development cannot be achieved through individual training alone. Effective transformational leadership also requires supportive organizational structures, sufficient authority and resources, and leadership practices adapted to the cultural, geographic, and policy contexts of the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region (IMAR). Organizational Enablement establishes the climate and governance conditions required for administrators to apply their competencies in practice. Professional Capacity-Building strengthens

the knowledge, skills, psychological resources, and behaviors associated with transformational leadership. Contextual Responsiveness ensures that leadership practices are culturally appropriate, regionally relevant, and aligned with local educational policies. Together, the three tracks connect individual competency development with institutional readiness and contextual adaptability, creating an integrated pathway for sustainable leadership improvement. Table 1 details the development lever, target competency, and illustrative activities associated with each track, translating the conceptual framework into a form suitable for program design.

Table 1. Components of the Integrated Development Framework

Track	Development Lever	Target Competency	Illustrative Activities
Organizational Enablement	Climate and governance conditions that permit transformational behavior	Structural readiness to act on developed skills	Climate audits; decentralization pilots; transparent resource-allocation protocols
Professional Capacity-Building	Direct skill and competency development	Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration	MLQ-based feedback coaching; PsyCap modules; peer mentoring circles; role-clarity workshops
Contextual Responsiveness	Adaptation of leadership practice to IMAR's cultural and geographic realities	Cultural fluency and policy navigation	Bilingual case studies; regional cohort learning; league-level delivery hubs

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

4.1 A Four-Stage Program Design

Operationalizing the framework requires a phased implementation sequence rather than a single training event. Table 2 outlines a four-stage program design: diagnostic assessment establishes a baseline profile of each administrator's leadership behavior and institutional environment; modular capacity-building delivers the professional-track content identified by the diagnostic stage through sustained, cohort-based learning; embedded organizational support pairs this individual development with concrete governance and resource adjustments at the institutional level; and continuous evaluation feeds outcome data back into program refinement. This sequencing reflects the two-step logic recommended in structural intervention design, whereby individual capacity-building is deliberately coupled with organizational readiness rather than treated as a self-sufficient remedy (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Day et al., 2014).

Table 2. Four-Stage Implementation Model

Stage	Purpose	Representative Instruments
1. Diagnostic Assessment	Establish a baseline profile of each administrator's leadership behavior and the institutional conditions surrounding them	MLQ-5X self/rater ratings; institutional climate survey; PCQ-24

2. Modular Capacity-Building	Build the professional competencies identified in the diagnostic stage through structured, cohort-based learning	Blended online/regional modules; simulation-based leadership labs; mentoring pairings
3. Embedded Organizational Support	Create institutional conditions that allow newly developed behaviors to be exercised and sustained	Paired governance reforms; protected discretionary budget lines; sponsor-level advocacy
4. Continuous Evaluation	Track development outcomes and feed results back into program refinement	Pre-post MLQ comparison; climate re-survey; promotion and retention tracking; case interviews

4.2 Delivery Considerations for the IMAR Context

Implementation in IMAR must accommodate the region's approximately 1.18 million square kilometres of geographic expanse and the resulting isolation of league-level institutions from metropolitan professional networks (Li & Zhang, 2022). A regional cohort model, in which administrators from geographically proximate institutions are grouped for shared modular sessions delivered through a blend of online and periodic in-person formats, reduces the travel burden that has historically excluded remote-institution administrators from development opportunities. Bilingual delivery in Mandarin Chinese and Mongolian, together with case material drawn from IMAR's own dual national-regional mandate, ensures that professional-track content is culturally legible rather than imported wholesale from mainstream Chinese or Western leadership curricula (Li & Xin, 2019; Yang, Zheng, & Li, 2019).

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

Program evaluation should combine quantitative and qualitative indicators. Pre-post comparison of MLQ-5X scores captures change in the four transformational leadership dimensions directly; parallel administration of an institutional climate survey tracks whether organizational-track interventions are, in fact, shifting the conditions theorized to enable transformational behavior. Administrator retention and promotion outcomes provide a longer-horizon indicator of program impact, while structured case interviews with program participants and their faculty allow qualitative assessment of how developed behaviors are being expressed within IMAR's specific cultural and institutional context.

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This paper contributes to theory in two respects. First, it bridges the antecedent literature on transformational leadership, which explains the conditions under which it arises, with the leadership-development literature, which addresses how such conditions and competencies can be deliberately built, offering a template for converting explanatory frameworks into intervention designs more broadly. Second, it extends training-transfer theory (Baldwin & Ford, 1988) into the specific institutional terrain of regional Chinese higher education, demonstrating that individual capacity-building and organizational enablement must be treated as a single, coupled intervention rather than as sequential or independent efforts.

5.2 Practical Implications

For university administrators and governing boards, the framework argues against reliance on isolated training workshops and instead calls for parallel investment in governance and climate conditions that allow newly developed leadership behaviors to be exercised. For regional education policymakers, the four-stage implementation model offers a template that can be piloted across multiple IMAR institutions using shared regional cohorts, reducing per-institution delivery costs

while preserving contextual relevance. For leadership-development practitioners, the framework specifies concrete professional-track content — psychological capital modules, role-clarity workshops, and MLQ-based coaching — that can be assembled into a deliverable curriculum suited to blended regional delivery.

CONCLUSION

This paper has developed an integrated framework for the deliberate development of transformational leadership among university administrators, translating the organizational, professional, and contextual antecedents identified in prior research into three coordinated development tracks and a four-stage implementation model. The framework argues that leadership-development interventions succeed only when individual capacity-building is paired with organizational conditions that permit newly developed behaviors to be exercised, and that such interventions must be adapted to the cultural and geographic realities of the institutions they serve. Applied to the distinctive context of Inner Mongolia's regional universities, the framework offers a replicable and context-sensitive program design. The next steps in this research programme involve piloting the four-stage model with a small cohort of IMAR administrators, refining the diagnostic and evaluation instruments through expert review, and empirically assessing whether the coupling of organizational enablement with professional capacity-building produces measurably greater and more durable gains in transformational leadership than professional-track training delivered alone.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411–423.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2008). Developmental readiness: Accelerating leader development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 331–347.
- Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63–105.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581–613.
- Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 63–82.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Dong, Y., & Liu, X. (2021). Double First-Class initiative and its impact on university governance in China. *Chinese Education & Society*, 54(1), 45–62.
- Gao, L., & Zhang, H. (2019). Transformational leadership and innovation in Chinese universities: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1105.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.
- Li, J., & Xin, K. (2019). Leadership in China: The moderating role of cultural values. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(2), 56–73.
- Li, W., & Zhang, F. (2022). Regional disparities and higher education policy in Inner Mongolia, China. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 11(2), 178–193.

- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Yang, Y., Zheng, J., & Li, M. (2019). The influence of Confucian values on leadership style in Chinese organizations. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 26(3), 397–415.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).