Available Online
Journal of Education and Social Studies
ISSN: 2789-8075 (Online), 2789-8067 (Print)
http://www.scienceimpactpub.com/jess

ANALYZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING WITH RELATED OUTCOMES AT PAKISTANI HIGHER EDUCATION

Asia Zulfqar [1], Martin Valcke [2], Bashir Hussain [1,*], Geert Devos [2]

[1] *Department of Education, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan*
[2] *Department of Educational Studies, Ghent University, Belgium*

ABSTRACT

It is evident from the literature that transformational leadership [TL] and participative decision-making [PDM] is currently considered very dominating approaches in academia and significantly affect universities' performance. Both of these are also likely to be associated with other variables in the context of universities, such as teachers' self-efficacy, motivation, and job satisfaction. Considering the significance of these variables, not much research has been conducted to examine the relationship between these variables in the context of Pakistani higher education. This study thus intends to measure the link between transformational leadership and participative decision-making with related outcomes of teachers' self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. A survey was conducted to collect data from the teachers of four public and private universities in Pakistan. Through a stratified sampling technique, a sample of 218 teachers from public and private universities were collected to rate their leaders. Multiple regression analysis was carried out to conclude. Somewhat strange findings were inferred from the analyses. Our hypothesis is partially accepted as the impact of TL and PDM is associated with teachers' job satisfaction in public and private universities. Moreover, the impact on intrinsic motivation is weak. These findings, to some extent, corroborated with earlier research and developed explanations of why Pakistani universities are different from other higher education institutes in view of adopting leadership and decision-making practices. It is, therefore, recommended that universities need to promote transformational leadership and engage teachers in participative decision-making to enhance their performance.

Keywords: Transformational leadership; Participative decision-making; Job satisfaction; Self-efficacy; Intrinsic motivation.
** Email: bashirhussain@bzu.edu.pk*

https://doi.org/10.52223/jess.20223312

INTRODUCTION

Higher education policies have been massively affecting the wider patterns of innovation in the global economy. The new paradigm of universities is increasingly adopting modern teaching and learning trends. These trends mainly emphasize adopting shared leadership approaches to building communities and developing knowledge-based economies (Fernandez, & Shaw, 2020; Khan et al., 2014; Sweeney et al., 2019). These drastic changes in higher education have also been introducing many challenges linked to the quality of teaching and learning, curriculum, enrolment, funding, infrastructure, resources, accountability and leadership (Tanveer et al., 2020).

Pakistan is confronted with a challenging situation in higher education with growing literacy rates (59%), and access to higher education has become critical in view of the country's development (Batul et al., 2019). However, the higher education commission (HEC) is committed to facilitating youth with higher education opportunities and continuously working on establishing new public and private universities across the

country. Both types of universities – public and private – are different from each other in terms of implementing educational policies. Certain examples of these dissimilarities can be seen in faculty hiring and firing, teaching and assessment and administrative policies (HEC, 2009, 2016).

Despite progress in addressing the above-mentioned challenges, the ineffective and praxis system of accountability and governance in higher education institutes and their power structure yet remain to be addressed (Subhani et al., 2012; Tanveer et al., 2020). Sustainable and visionary leadership is needed to tackle the above-mentioned daunting challenges in Pakistan's higher education. As mentioned elsewhere, the nature of leadership in an academic context is shared and collaborative (Bolden et al., 2015; Fernandez & Shaw, 2020). An enormous amount of literature is available in relation to shared and distributed leadership approaches; among these, transformational leadership is the most dominating approach in academia (Dinh et al., 2014; Evans, 2015; Sweeney et al., 2019).

Transformational leaders lead their teams with an inspiring vision, modelling, collaboration, motivation, and support by setting high-performance standards in the organization (Gmelch, 2013). Available evidence shows that shared leadership approaches stress involving subordinates in decision-making, which introduces the concept of participative decision-making. Through power sharing and autonomy, employees can feel motivated and more determined towards work (Hetland et al., 2011). Moreover, through certain transformational leadership behaviors, leaders influence the level of satisfaction and motivation of employees, which contributes to their job satisfaction, self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation (Aggarwal & Krishnan, 2013; Munir et al., 2012; Nugroho et al., 2020). The higher level of motivation, therefore, increases the level of satisfaction and self-efficacy.

After a careful literature review, it was confirmed that the related research is lacking in the field of higher education, with a special focus on the combination of these variables. To address the above-mentioned gaps in the literature, we planned this research to measure the link between TL and PDM with the combination of these key outcome variables.

Theoretical Framework

The following conceptual and hypothetical framework of variables were adopted to design this research:

Conceptualizing transformational leadership

Burns et al. (1978) initially introduced the theory of "transformational leadership" (TL), and later Bass (1985) refined its constructs. Like other leadership theories, transformational leadership was not developed for educational settings, but considering the nature of leadership in academic organizations, authors started applying the theory in educational settings. When it comes to academia in universities, Ramsden (1998) and Al-Mamary (2021) linked the concept of effective academic leadership with transformational leadership. He suggested that an academic leader should have all kind of attributes that comprises transformational leaders. Transformational leaders should be able to articulate his/her vision, support and motivate their followers for innovation and set high-performance standards for themselves (Bass, 1985). Literature provides evidence of the fact that the nature of academic leadership is usually shared, collaborative and engaging (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Sweeney et al., 2019). Transformational leadership has a variety of constructs, and authors are still working on developing its related constructs. Podsakoff et al. (1990) present six components of TL which are the focus of this study: *(1) Identifying and articulating a vision, (2) Providing an appropriate role model, (3) Fostering the acceptance of group goals, (4) High performance expectations, (5) Providing individual support, and (6) Intellectual stimulation.* Nextto sufficient consensus of the researchers on these six components of transformational leadership, there is a large dissonance as to others components.

Conceptualizing participative decision making

The concept of participative decision-making (PDM) is a commonly adopted approach in organizations; however, the concept is surrounded by confusion in view of its conceptualizations, construct and dimensions and yet failed to develop consensus (Black & Gregersen, 1997; Mimiasri & Idris, 2019). Participative leadership behavior empowers subordinates with autonomy and invites them to contribute to decision-making. This motivates subordinates to do more with fairness and respect, which ultimately develop trust between leader and subordinates and an overall conducive working environment in the organizations (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Mimiasri & Idris, 2019).

Link between transformational leadership and participative decision making

As mentioned, shared leadership approaches set up an environment of collaboration and trust in the organizations (Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). A transformational leader sets up an environment of collaboration and weightage the voice of their team members; resultantly, they decide and solve the organizational matters efficiently (Bouwmans et al., 2017; Owusu-Agyeman, 2021). Academic leaders engage their faculty to achieve various institutional goals, give them autonomy and develop a shared culture to support each other.

The key role of self-efficacy with transformational leadership and participative decision making

Over decades, self-efficacy has been in the limelight and studied in all kinds of organizations, including in university settings (Alimohammadi et al., 2020; Bandura, 2000; Ismayilova & Klassen, 2019). Self-efficacy means the capability of an individual to successfully complete certain tasks in the organizations (Bandura, 1997). Gist (1987) and Song et al. (2020) identified that transformational leaders could enhance the level of self-efficacy of their team members by giving them confidence and trust and supporting them in solving their problems. Literature provides support that transformational leaders contribute to the self-efficacy of their team members in the following ways: Bandura (1997) linked self-efficacy with mastership experience means skills in a certain area, e.g., teaching and research in an academic context; this can be further related to providing individualized support by a transformational leader. Strong support from the transformational leader can influence teachers' performance; they can do their best to achieve their targets. Secondly, Bandura (1997) linked self-efficacy with vicarious experience; the role of setting vision, modelling and intellectual stimulation in transformational leadership is related to vicarious experiences. When people see their leader doing the same in a successful way, they will feel the motivation to imitate that behavior.

As to studying the link with PDM, engaging teachers in power-sharing feel them autonomous, more responsible and productive in the organizations. Authors believe that participation in decision-making enhances the self-efficacy of employees (Lu et al., 2015).

The key role of job satisfaction with transformational leadership and participative decision making

The satisfaction of employees with their jobs generally depends on a conducive working environment. A conducive and pleasurable working environment enhances the level of job satisfaction of employees (Adenike, 2011). Particularly in educational organizations, if teachers are not satisfied with their jobs, their dissatisfaction will impact their teaching, commitment, motivation and productivity (Huang et al., 2010). Moreover, such teachers can also face/suffer some serious psychological problems, stress and burnout (Karavas, 2010). This will ultimately affect students' performance and school outcomes.

As to the participatory approach, such leaders enhance the level of job satisfaction of their team members, which also increases their confidence and trust in the leader (Shedd, 1987). This helps to reduce the stress and burnout of teachers in the organization. Later authors also confirm the relationship between PDM and job satisfaction (Sukirno & Siengthai, 2011).

The key role of intrinsic motivation in transformational leadership and participative decision making

Enhancing the work motivation of subordinates is important in the workplace. When employees' behaviors are regulated by intrinsic motivation, their performance is more stable and persistence (Gagne et al., 2017). Such people are interested in involving themselves in work-related tasks, challenging themselves and satisfying their level of motivation by achieving the organizational task (Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009); this is linked to the self-determination theory of intrinsic motivation. This theory is based on three key components, autonomy, competence and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

The research presents an evidence that transformational leaders invoke intrinsic motivation among their followers (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008). Transformational leadership has a positive impact on the intrinsic motivation of followers (Bo, 2014). Similarly, intrinsic motivation is also influenced by the participatory behavior of leaders; participation in decision-making invokes intrinsic motivation in subordinates (Deci et al., 1989).

Differences in public and private universities

HEC Pakistan developed professional standards and standard operating procedures for public and private universities. However, private universities are independent in their policy formulation and decision-making regarding funding and opting standards. They are bound to follow HEC. The following leadership and decision-making dimensions distinguish between both types of universities:

(1) The aims and objectives of public and private universities are different in the following way, public universities will focus on objectives that emphasize quality of services, whereas private universities will emphasize financial return and profit (Chaston, 2011). This can be related to leadership responsibilities linked to developing a "vision".

(2) Public universities are mainly run by external stakeholders in view of designing policies and making decisions. However, in private universities, rather internal stakeholders play a role (Diefenbach, 2011). The impact of stakeholders can be linked to decision-making elements, as explained above see, Sashkin (1984).

(3) In public universities, there will be strong public scrutiny of the spending of public money; the case is different in private universities (Van Dooren et al., 2015).

(4) Public universities will be much more sensitive to political influences and will engage more with the general audience. Private universities will rather be bound to changes and fluctuations in the market. Nevertheless, in the Pakistani case, business tycoons or investors define the quality standards of private initiatives. This is clearly linked to the leadership dimension.

(5) Lamo et al. (2012) stress that differences between both types of universities are deep-grained when it comes to motivation. In public universities, teachers have job security and, to some extent, autonomy, whereas private universities motivate their teachers' monetary rewards, recognition, and career possibilities. The link with decision-making elements cannot be underestimated in this context without looking at both types of universities (Sashkin, 1984).

Thach (2012) also highlighted differences in leadership in both universities. These differences are consistent with the analysis of Andersen (2010):

- Public universities are usually more structured and have refined policies and procedures, which results in stronger leadership.
- These also distinguish between leadership and decision-making styles of leaders in both types of universities.

Nevertheless, empirical research is lacking when it comes to distinguishing between public and private universities and linking these differences with leadership and decision-making styles (Andersen, 2010; Dudovsky, 2013). Considering the above-mentioned gaps in the literature, we propose the following hypotheses to study this relationship among variables in Pakistani higher education.

METHODOLOGY

Hypothesis

The following research hypothesis was designed to drive this research:

Academic leaders' transformational leadership and the level of participative decision-making are significantly associated with teachers' self-efficacy [SE], job satisfaction [JS] and intrinsic motivation [IM] in Pakistani public and private universities.

Procedure

The quantitative research methodology was adopted to conduct a survey involving teachers from both public and private universities in Pakistan. Participants were contacted before formal data collection to seek their willingness to participate in this research. Appointments were made with every individual faculty member to collect data. Participants were asked to rate their leaders that how they impact their SE, IM and JS.

Sample

There are, in total, 84 public and private sector universities located in Punjab province at the time of data collection. By applying a stratified sampling technique, four universities were sampled to collect data. Two universities from each public and private sector were selected. Universities have almost similar faculties, so three faculties from each university (faculty of sciences, faculty of social sciences and faculty of arts & humanities) and within these faculties, five departments from each faculty and all the available teachers from each department were contacted to take part in this research. It is also pertinent to mention that private universities have fewer teachers in contrast to public universities. Thus, 218 teachers showed their interest in participating in this research. The details of the participants from each university are as below. (Uni1: n=66; Uni2: n=75; Uni3: n=37; Uni4: n=40)

Measures

Careful thought was given to instrument selection. This research mainly relies on the existing research tools.

Transformational leadership inventory: Podsakoff et al. (1990) developed the TLI on a seven-point Likert scale. The calculated reliability was Cronbach's α: .95.

Participative decision-making: To map the perceived level of participative decision making, a scale was developed by Leithwood (1992). PDM is also based on a five-point Likert scale.

Job satisfaction: As to measuring job satisfaction, a 6-item scale was adopted, developed by Dewitte and Cuyper (2003) on a five-point Likert type scale. The calculated reliability of this scale was Cronbach' α: .84.

Intrinsic motivation: A 22-item scale was adopted and developed by Deci and Ryan (1985). The calculated reliability of this scale was Cronbach' α: .76.

Self-efficacy: After a thorough search, we decided to develop our own research tool to map university teachers' self-efficacy. Bandura (2006) provides us with a useful framework/guidelines to develop such self-efficacy tools. Thus a tool was developed based on the following scale "(0-100)" to map the perceived self-efficacy. The calculated reliability was Cronbach's α: .91.

Data Analyses

After preparing the file for data analysis, descriptive statistics were calculated for all research variables. Multiple regression techniques were applied. SPSS version 24 was used to carry out the analyses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics Results

After cleaning the data from missing values and outliers, descriptive statistics of all the research variables were calculated. Table 1 presents the results of the descriptive analysis in relation to each variable.

Table 1. Results of descriptive statistics in relation to each variable (N=218).

Variables	Public				Private			
	Uni1		Uni2		Uni3		Uni4	
N	*N=66*		*N=75*		*N=37*		*N=40*	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
TL	6.75	1.61	6.22	1.84	6.60	1.39	7.12	1.43
PDM	6.38	2.08	6.09	2.23	6.36	2.15	6.40	2.17
SE	72.05	14.86	65.93	18.51	72.24	13.05	74.21	12.97
JS	8.45	1.14	8.31	2.06	7.64	1.72	7.88	1.57
IM	6.18	.72	6.17	.74	6.25	.49	6.37	.69

Next to descriptive statistics, correlations among the predictor and dependent variables were calculated. A significant correlation was identified among variables. Both independent variables, TL and PDM, were significantly correlated (r = .69). Correlation analysis provides a base to run a regression. Table 2 presents the correlation analysis.

Table 2. Correlations between the research variables (N=218).

Variables	TL	PDM	SE	IMI
TL	1			
PDM	.69**	1		
SE	.06	.10	1	
JS	.25**	.32**	.04	1
IM	.16*	.20**	.27**	.34**

* p < .05

Regression Analysis

Linear regression was applied separately with both independent variables in combination with SE, JS and IM as dependent variables. The two independent variables, TL and PDM, present a small amount of variance. JS, F (2, 13.18); aR^2 = 10%, = p < .05, however, IM significantly explains for F (2, 4.77); aR^2 = 34%, = p < .05. Nevertheless, the predictor variables could not present a sufficient amount of variance. Both independent variables, TL and PDM, were significant predictors and explained 10.1% of the variance in JS and 3.4% in IM. On the basis of these results, we can conclude that our hypothesis is moderately accepted.

Table 3 presents the regression coefficient of dependent variables. As mentioned above, our hypothesis is not fully accepted; thus, we only found significant results in relation to participative decision-making with job satisfaction.

Table 3. The regression coefficient of dependent variables (N=218).

SE				JS			IM		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*B*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SEB*	*β*
TL	-.222	.907	-.023	.050	.092	.048	.023	.039	.055
PDM	.921	.696	.125	.233	.071	.295*	.053	.030	.164

* p <.05.

Differences between public and private universities

Table 4 shows the results of public and private universities. TL and PDM accounted for 32% variance in relation to job satisfaction in private universities in contrast to public universities (6.6%). Next, IM has a significant *F*-value and explains 6.1% of the variance in TL and PDM in public universities. Nevertheless, SE hardly has an impact on TL and PDM in both types of universities.

Table 4. Regression analysis of TL and PDM in public and private universities.

Universities	Stat.	SE	JS	IM
Public	*F (df=2)*	1.03	4.87*	4.46*
	Adjusted R^2	1.5%	6.6%	6.1%
Private	*F (df=2)*	.372	17.41*	.444
	Adjusted R^2	1%	32.0%	1.2%

$p < .05$*

Table 5 presents the regression coefficients. A significant link was found between PDM, JS and IM in public universities, which shows an increase in participative decision-making would result in an increase in job satisfaction (.21) and intrinsic motivation (.08).

As to private universities, TL and PDM have an impact on JS which means an increase in TL would result in an increase of 0.39 in JS, and an increase in PDM would result in an increase of 0.22 in JS.

Table 5. Regression analysis results in relation to differences in public and private universities.

Universities		SE			JS			IM		
	Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*B*	*B*	*SEB*	*β*	*B*	*SEB*	*B*
Public	TL	-.770	1.20	-.079	-.020	.116	-.020	.002	.050	.004
	PDM	1.31	.977	.166	.213	.094	.271*	.082	.041	.243*
Private	TL	.076	1.355	.008	.394	.142	.343*	.025	.063	.060
	PDM	.568	.900	.094	.216	.095	.283*	.017	.042	.061

$p < .05$*

The findings of our research show the partial acceptability of research hypotheses. However, the impact of participative decision-making on intrinsic motivation was only reflected in public universities. As to the link between TL and PDM with self-efficacy, no significant results were identified in public or private universities.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study confirm that transformational leadership and participative decision-making have a link with teachers' job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation in Pakistani universities. However, no link was identified with the self-efficacy of university teachers with TL and PDM in both types of universities. Partially our results are in line with the available research findings, which helps to build this model (McCann, 2011).

First, transformational leadership and participative decision-making have a strong correlation with each, which is consistent with earlier research (Huang et al., 2010). Moreover, TL and PDM have a strong link with teachers' job satisfaction in public and private universities, which is also corroborated by existing research. Choi et al. (2016) found in their research that empowered staff enjoy and feel satisfied with their job. The same is the case with mapping the link between PDM and JS; both variables strongly regress to each other, which is again aligned with earlier research (Somech, 2010).

As to studying the relationship between intrinsic motivation and both predictor variables, the existing researchers found a positive link between these variables; however, our findings contrast this. Teachers

from public universities rate that their leaders' PDM style stimulates them to show performance, but this is not the case in the private sector. Our significant findings are aligned with the study results of Huang et al. (2010). Private universities may have a different style of motivation, or some other variables could contribute to their motivation.

In the case of examining the link between self-efficacy, TL and PDM, no significant results were found in relation to the combination of these variables. This is not consistent with earlier research. Potential reasons for these strange can be built on the current working standards in Pakistani universities. We could not find any research in a combination of these variables in the Pakistani context, so it was quite difficult to corroborate our findings in the Pakistani context. Nevertheless, our findings underpin these relationships in a very thought-provoking way which opens new ways for further research.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although our study reaches a maximum extent, there are certain limitations that need to be stressed in view of future research. First, we have only involved university teachers in this research in taking their opinion about their leaders. This reflected a one-sided story of the phenomenon. Future research could engage academic leaders (deans and heads) to get insight into their leadership and decision-making practices. Secondly, we have adopted the available research instruments for all the variables, which were designed in the western context, and this can be one of the reasons for our partial results. Future research can focus on instrument development, specifically in the Pakistani context, where the landscape of leadership and decision-making differs from other countries and is mainly based on 'power structure.' Third, our selected sample was inadequate to map the variance in the results and apply complex statistical techniques, e.g., multilevel analysis and path analyses. Future research can engage more public and private universities for a better presentation of the results.

REFERENCES

Adenike, A. (2011). Organizational climate as a predictor of employee job satisfaction: Evidence from Covenant University. Business Intelligence Journal, 4(1), 151-165.

Aggarwal, J., & Krishnan, V. R. (2013). Impact of transformational leadership on follower's self-efficacy: Moderating role of follower's impression management. Management and Labour Studies, 38(4), 297-313.

Alimohammadi, L., Zarei, F., & Mirghafourvand, M. (2020). The effect of counseling based on Bandura's self-efficacy theory on sexual self-efficacy and quality of sexual life. Women & Health, 60(4), 473-486.

Al-Mamary, Y. H. S. (2021). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour: Evidence from Malaysian higher education context. Human Systems Management, 40(5), 737-749.

Andersen, J. A. (2010). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. Public Administration Review, 70(1), 131-141.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. Macmillan.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. Current directions in psychological science, 9(3), 75-78.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents, 307-337.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. Organizational dynamics, 13(3), 26-40.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership. Psychology press.

Batul, E., Haseeb, M. A., & Sattar, S. A. (2019). Examining the relationship between literacy rate and poverty in Pakistan. Kashmir Economic Review, 28(1), 115-131.

Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. (1997). Participative decision-making: An integration of multiple dimensions. Human Relations, 50(7), 859-878.

Bolden, R., Jones, S., Davis, H., & Gentle, P. (2015). Developing and sustaining shared leadership in higher education. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Available at https://academic-cms.prd.the-internal.com/sites/default/files/breaking_news_files/developing_and_sustaining_shared_leadership_in_higher_education.pdf

Bouwmans, M., Runhaar, P., Wesselink, R., & Mulder, M. (2017). Fostering teachers' team learning: An interplay between transformational leadership and participative decision-making?. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 65*(1), 71-80.

Burns, J. M., Looney, A., Casey, N., & O'Donnell, M. L. (1978). Leader.

Chaston, I. (2011). Public sector management, Mission impossible? Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Choi, S. L., Goh, C. F., Adam, M. B. H., & Tan, O. K. (2016). Transformational leadership, empowerment, and job satisfaction: the mediating role of employee empowerment. Human Resources for Health, 14(1), 1-14.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. 537 Plenum: New York.

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(4), 580.

Dewitte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2003). Towards a positive perspective on well-being: Investigating the positive engagement of the Flemish employee. The Flemish Labour Market: Report Flemish Labour Market Day, Leuven University Press, Leuven.

Diefenbach, F. E. (2011). Entrepreneurship in the public sector. In Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector (pp. 31-64). Gabler.

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. The Leadership Quarterly, 25(1), 36-62.

Dudovsky, J. (2013). Leadership differences between private and public sector organisations: literature review. Pridobljeno, 15(3), 2018.

Evans, L. (2015). What academics want from their professors: findings from a study of professorial academic leadership in the UK. In Forming, recruiting and managing the academic profession (pp. 51-78). Springer, Cham.

Fernandez, A. A., & Shaw, G. P. (2020). Academic leadership in a time of crisis: The Coronavirus and COVID-19. Journal of leadership Studies, 14(1), 39-45.

Gagne, M., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory applied to work motivation and organizational behavior. In Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology. Volume 2: Organizational Psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 97-121). SAGE.

Gist, M. E. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. Academy of Management Review, 12(3), 472-485.

Gmelch, W. H. (2013). The development of campus academic leaders. International Journal of Leadership and Change, 1(1), 7.

Gumusluoglu, L., & Ilsev, A. (2009). Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation. Journal of Business Research, 62(4), 461-473.

HEC. (2009). Annual report 2008-09. Retrieved online from: https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/AnnualReports/ANNUAL%20REPORT%202007-08.pdf

HEC. (2016). Statistical Information Unit, Higher Education Commission Pakistan. 4-10. Retrieved from http://www.hec.gov.pk/InsideHEC/Divisions/QALI/Others/Pages/StatisticalInformationUnit.aspx.

Hetland, H., Hetland, J., Andreassen, C. S., Pallesen, S., & Notelaers, G. (2011). Leadership and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs at work. Career Development International, 16(5), 507-523.

Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., & Gong, Y. (2010). Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31(1), 122-143.

Ismayilova, K., & Klassen, R. M. (2019). Research and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty: Relations with job satisfaction. International Journal of Educational Research, 98(1), 55-66.

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(8), 949-964.

Karavas, E. (2010). How satisfied are Greek EFL teachers with their work?: investigating the motivation and job satisfaction levels of Greek EFL teachers. Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras, 14(1), 59-78.

Khan, M., Janjua, S. Y., Naeem, A., & Kayani, F. N. (2014). United States agency for international development's role in reforming higher education in Pakistan. Business Education & Accreditation, 6(1), 73-80.

Kinicki, A., & Kreitner, R. (2008). Organizational behavior. International Edition. New York. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lamo, A., Pérez, J. J., & Schuknecht, L. (2012). Public or private sector wage leadership? An international perspective. The Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 114(1), 228-244.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The Move toward Transformational Leadership. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. School effectiveness and school improvement, 17(2), 201-227.

Lu, J., Jiang, X., Yu, H., & Li, D. (2015). Building collaborative structures for teachers' autonomy and self-efficacy: The mediating role of participative management and learning culture. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 26(2), 240-257.

McCann, E. J. (2011). Transformational leadership: Increasing institutional effectiveness through participative decision making. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1791924 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssm.1791924

Mimiasri, F., & Idris, S. (2019). The influence of participative leadership and teamwork on employee job satisfaction and its impact on organizational performance at the University of Muhammadiyah Aceh, province of Aceh, Indonesia. International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research, 4(7), 5077-5098.

Munir, R. I. S., Rahman, R. A., Malik, A. M. A., & Ma'amor, H. (2012). Relationship between transformational leadership and employees' job satisfaction among the academic staff. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 65(1), 885-890.

Nugroho, Y. A., Asbari, M., Purwanto, A., Basuki, S., Sudiyono, R. N., Fikri, M. A. A., & Xavir, Y. (2020). Transformational leadership and employees' performances: The mediating role of motivation and work environment. EduPsyCouns: Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling, 2(1), 438-460.

Owusu-Agyeman, Y. (2021). Transformational leadership and innovation in higher education: A participative process approach. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 24(5), 694-716.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 1(2), 107-142.

Ramsden, P. (1998). Learning to Lead in Higher Education. London: Routledge.

Sashkin, M. (1984). Participative management is an ethical imperative. Organizational Dynamics, 12(4), 5-22.

Shedd, J. (1987). Involving teachers in school and district decision making. Ithaca: New York. NY: Organizational Analysis and Practice.

Somech, A. (2010). Participative decision making in schools: A mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly, 46(2), 174-209.

Song, J., He, C., Wu, W., & Zhai, X. (2020). Roles of self-efficacy and transformational leadership in explaining voice-job satisfaction relationship. Current Psychology, 39(3), 975-986.

Subhani, I. M., Akif, H., Osman, A., & Fouzia, S. (2012). Political domination in higher education universities. Empirical evidence from Pakistan. American Journal of Academic Research, 22(2), 91-88.

Sukirno, D. S., & Siengthai, S. (2011). Does Participative Decision Making Affect Lecturer Performance in Higher Education?. International Journal of Educational Management, 25(5), 494-508.

Sweeney, A., Clarke, N., & Higgs, M. (2019). Shared leadership in commercial organizations: A systematic review of definitions, theoretical frameworks and organizational outcomes. International Journal of Management Reviews, 21(1), 115-136.

Tanveer, M., Bhaumik, A., & Haq, I. U. (2020). Pakistani universities and leadership reconnoitering the prospects of furtherance. Journal of Seybold Report, 15(10), 1-17.

Thach, L. (2012). Managerial perceptions of crisis leadership in public and private organizations: An interview study in the United States. International Journal of Management, 29(2), 712.

Van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2015). Performance management in the public sector. Routledge.