

African Journal of Education and Practice (AJEP)

**Investigating the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance
in Higher Education**

Chipozya Kosta Tembo, Karen Tabalasa and Franco Muleya

Investigating the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance in Higher Education



^{1*}Chipozya Kosta Tembo
Lecturer, School of Built Environment, Copperbelt University



²Karen Tabalasa
Student, School of Graduate Studies, Copperbelt University



³Franco Muleya
Lecturer, School of Built Environment, Copperbelt University

Article History

Received 2nd September 2024

Received in Revised Form 6th October 2024

Accepted 4th November 2024



How to cite in APA format:

Tembo, C., Tabalasa, K., & Muleya, F. (2024). Investigating the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance in Higher Education. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(5), 56–77. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.3081>

Abstract

Purpose: This research aimed to uncover the role of leadership style in the performance of higher education institutions (H.E.I.s) in Zambia.

Methodology: The study utilized a positivist philosophy and collected data randomly and using a census from various University leadership cross sectionally. Using ninety-seven self-administered questionnaires where sixty-nine questionnaires were collected representing a response rate of 71.11%. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to explain the Performance of H.E.I.s and uncover the relationship between performance and leadership style.

Findings: The most utilized leadership styles in H.E.I.s are transactional and transformational. Laissez-faire leadership was rarely used, with a higher utility in public universities where this mode of leadership was significantly correlated with research. The order of performance in descending order in H.E.I.s is teaching, size, prestige, impact, internationalization, and research. As mentioned earlier, inspirational motivation and contingent reward had weak to moderate significant positive correlation with performance.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy:

The research only focused on leadership style as a predictor of performance. Additionally, the research cannot be generalized as few Universities, both private and public, were part of the target population. The leaders in public and private universities should focus on inspirational motivation and contingent reward aspects of transactional and transformational leadership to improve underperforming performance areas, except for prestige in improving performance. This will increase the number of enrollment of students.

Keywords: *Higher Education Institutions (H.E.I.S), Leadership, Performance, Copperbelt*

JEL Codes: *C10, I23, M19, Z00*

©2024 by the Authors. This Article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

In the leadership of university education, there is a trend towards developing competencies and new leadership styles that promote proactive decision-making (Salazar-Rebaza, 2022). Leadership, in simple terms, means to guide or offer direction. Leadership is usually a prerequisite to Performance (Tierney, 1988; Ralph, 2017). For performance to be successful, the appropriate leadership style must be applied (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2002; Beakana, 2017; Esen 2021). Higher education institutions (H.E.I.s) are no exception regarding proper leadership and expected performance. Academic leaders motivate academics in universities, faculties, or departments, provide challenging opportunities, and create appropriate academic environments for academics to improve themselves (Esen, 2021; Makuve, 2024). Academic leaders are identified as deans, directors or principals, heads of departments, department chairs, and principal officers (Kinnunen *et al.*, 2022). Leslie *et al.* (2018) proposed that suitable leadership abilities must be embraced for H.E.I.s to work commendably and productively. Leadership abilities are typically found in different leadership styles. The H.E.I.s in most developing countries are marred with challenges (Ongiti, 2024) some resulting from poor leadership abilities emanating from leadership practice and style (Hassan *et al.*, 2018). Some of the difficulties identified include inferior quality of teaching, low levels of research and research output, and lowered access to higher Education (Henard, 2009; Fomba, 2023; Mba, 2017).

Additionally, Drape *et al.* (2016) identified inferior quality of Higher Education as the main challenge often caused by inadequate government infrastructure and lack of funding. As mentioned earlier, other factors contributing to the difficulties include a lack of employee motivation and a lack of autonomy where leadership and management are concerned (Mupeta, 2019).

Problem Statement

Many factors influence the performance of HEI. While various studies as mentioned have researched factors such as motivation, funding and infrastructure as factors affecting performance very few studies address then link between performance and leadership. The Republic of Zambia Vision 2030 visualizes a nation in which science, technology, and innovations are the driving forces in national development, and these must compete globally by the year 2030. For the above vision to be attained, sound leadership is needed in H.E.I. to meet the expected performance metrics, including but not limited to research, teaching, citations, industry income, and international outlook. However, it is unclear the impact leadership is having in the performance of H.E.I.

Worldmetres (2023) suggests that the population of Zambia is 19,907,243, yet Zambia only has a total of seven (8) public universities with a student capacity of 114,049 students, 50,634 were enrolled in public universities while 63,415 studied at private universities as of 2020 (H.E.A. report, 2021). Most public universities face severe challenges, a lack of government funding, decreased enrollment rates, competition from other institutions, and increased student dropouts (H.E.A., 2017). However, despite immensely contributing to Zambia's National development by training vital human resources, the universities' capacity to absorb the thousands of secondary school graduates eligible for university education is limited. This limited capacity can be attributed to inadequate infrastructure and teaching staff as well as poor leadership management that is expected to facilitate the learning process. This study sought to investigate the Performance of

H.E.I.s in their leadership orientation to find ways of mitigating or minimizing some of the challenges in the performance parameters set by HEA. H.E.A. (2017) has indicated teaching, research, prestige, impact, size, and internationalization as performance indicators of H.E.I.s. The focus of this research was to assess the performance of HEI in the performance parameters by determining the relationship that exists between the various performance. This in turn will benefit leaders and policy makers for H.E.I in Zambia and improve the delivery of higher education as a whole.

Leadership Styles

Leadership is a relationship of influence between superiors and subordinates who intend valid changes and outcomes that reflect their shared goals. Common leadership styles in Education include transactional leadership, transformational leadership, authoritative leadership, democratic leadership, servant leadership, and laissez-faire leadership (Salehzadeh, 2017). Past studies in H.E.I. indicate transactional leadership, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership as common leadership styles; hence, the focus of this research.

Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

Laissez-faire leadership is a type of management style that allows employees to have more autonomy in their roles. This is so because the leader trusts and relies more on their employees. Employees determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems independently (Sharma & Singh, 2013). The leadership style is anchored on a hands-off approach, training and support, trust, and delegated decision-making (Deluga,1990). These merits encourage personal growth, creativity, learning and development, and faster decision-making (Sharma & Singh, 2013; Sosik Jung, 2010). However, this may result in a lack of role clarity for employees, avoidance of responsibility by leaders, and isolation of employees. The mode of leadership is best utilized when employees are highly skilled, experienced, educated, and trustworthy (Sharma & Singh, 2013). The qualities of highly qualified, professional, and educated are expected in H.E.I. Leaders must observe the group members as they work (Wu & Shiu, 2009; Sosik and Jung, 2010) to ensure they work well. Additionally, leaders who employ this leadership style provide all the necessary resources to facilitate staff functional performance. Therefore, help must be provided so the employees can perform (Wu & Shiu, 2009). This style in higher education provides faculty with autonomy to manage their work, fostering an environment of independence and creativity, though it may lack direction for those needing more guidance.

Transactional Leadership Style or Managerial Leadership

Transactional leadership is a leadership style where leaders rely on rewards and punishments to achieve the best performance from their juniors. Thus, it is argued that there is an association between the degree of output and the expected rewards (DuBrin, 2012). The leadership style focuses on the basic management process of controlling, organizing, and short-term planning (Ahmet, 2015). Various exchanges occur between leader and follower: contingent rewards, active management by exception, and passive management by exception (Lutkevich and Pratt, 2023). The leadership style posits that employees are motivated by reward and punishment. Other assumptions are: Firstly, that subordinates must obey the superior's orders; secondly, that subordinates are not initiative-taking; and third, that subordinates are to be closely monitored and controlled to get the work done (DuBrin, 2012). Lastly, subordinates must follow clearly defined

goals to perform (Hijazi, Kasim, and Daud, 2017). The benefits of this type of leadership are clearly defined success, clear expectations and roles, ease in making cost-effective decisions, easy-to-identify performing employees, individual motivation of employees to compete and succeed, and rewarding of high-performing employees (Deluga, 1990; Salehzadeh, 2017). Demerits include reduced creativity, collaboration, communication, and morale (Ahmet, 2015). Additionally, there is increased conflict, and work needs to be approved before it can be done; feedback is only given when there is no success or high turnover of employees, and the focus is on short-term goals (Nwanne, 2023). This approach provides faculty and staff with defined expectations and recognition, fostering a disciplined and results-oriented environment.

Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership is a management theory that emphasizes motivation, encouragement, inspiration, and guidance (Deluga, 1990). This leadership style concentrates on the leaders' ability to help their followers establish the meaning of their work and the importance and value of achieving objectives (DuBrin, 2012). Transformational leadership can be categorized into the following attributes: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Chege and Gakobu, 2017). Transformational leaders motivate and empower employees to achieve the company's objectives by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. Leadership is proactive, and the work to change the organizational culture is done by implementing innovative ideas (Mullins, 2007). The subordinates are motivated by being encouraged to transcend their interests for those of the group (Deluga, 1990; Chege and Gakobu, 2017). The four main components of transformational leadership are individualized consideration, inspiration motivation, individualized influence, and intellectual stimulation; the transformational leader has the following traits: self-awareness, open-mindedness, adaptability and innovation, humility, and proactive (Deluga, 1990; Indeed, editorial team, 2022). According to Mullins (2007), subordinates need motivation, development, and guidance to perform well in the right areas. Disadvantages of transformational leadership include prioritization of long-term rather than short-term goals, the need for continuous communication resulting in a slow decision-making process, and increased potential for burnout (Ullah et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the leadership style promotes communication, eases the transition, and encourages passion for the work by the worker (Indeed editorial team, 2022). In higher education, transformational leadership inspires faculty and students by promoting innovation, encouraging professional development, and aligning personal goals with the institution's vision.

Transformational and transactional leadership styles have been measured as essential traits for employees' Performance (Khan *et al.*, 2021) in H.E.I. (Feliciano, 2019). This would imply that the Laissez-faire leadership style is not advocated for. However, given that subordinates are expected to be highly skilled, experienced, educated, and trustworthy in most academic institutions, this could be a preferred leadership style in some instances.

Leadership Theories

Leadership theories exist, such as the traits theory of leadership, behavior theory, contingency theory of leadership, style theory of leadership, great man theory of leadership, Path-Goal Theory (Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014), and the Full Range Leadership Model (F.R.L.M.) (Ryan & Tipu, 2013). The evidence above of the utility of a theory in H.E.I.s was for traits leadership theory,

behavior theory, and F.R.L.M. For this reason, these are the only leadership theories that will be briefly discussed.

The traits leadership theory posits that leaders are born with distinct characteristics and acquire. These include intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability. Indicators of this leadership style in the leader include a leader with an extraverted personality as they are social, open-minded, and conscious of new experiences and ideas, have empathy, communicate well, are achievement-oriented, are highly responsible for decisions, are goal-oriented and are task competent & efficient traits (Gehring, 2007). The strength of this theory is its focus on the leader rather than the follower's situation; however, the theory needs to clarify the relationship between the leader's traits, behavior, and performance (Ryan & Tipu, 2013). Consequently, the theory needs to focus on subordinates, who are essential in measuring and achieving performance. This research is interested in measuring performance and hence found this theory unsuitable for the study.

Luthans (2011) suggests that specific behaviors distinguish leaders from non-leaders under the behavior's leadership model. The assumption is that to be an effective leader, one must learn a particular set of behaviors rather than possessing specific natural attributes (Harrison, 2018). The behaviors are based on their actions in the workplace, which assumes that humans are like animals, thereby ignoring the internal cognitive process (Denison *et al.* 1995). This leadership model promotes directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership (Harrison, 2018). The leadership model focuses more on actions at the point of problem-solving, has predictable outcomes, and can be measured and tested; however, it does not consider the environment and is extrapolative of animal behavior to humans (Andrew, 2013). This leadership style has been used to explain learning rather than the Performance of H.E.I.S.; hence, it will not be used in this study. Additionally, it works well in controlled environments where the follower is viewed as a passive individual and the leader as a supervisor with all the authority to judge and command (Mullins, 2010), which is not the case in H.E.I.

Arena, Connelly, and Williams (2017) indicate that F.R.L.M. includes transactional (passive, active management, and contingent reward), transformation leadership styles (individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) but also includes Laissez-faire (hand-off leadership) (See Table 1). Full-range leadership model (F.R.L.M.) is said to be among the most researched and widely discussed models in various research communities as far as leadership is concerned (Bodla & Nawaz, 2010), with evidence of being utilized in H.E.I. (Sosik & Jung, 2010), hence its utility in this study. Moreover, the model capitalizes on the strengths and weaknesses of various leadership styles.

Table 1: Leadership Styles and Their Attributes

Leadership style	Attributes of concern
Transactional leadership	<p>Management by exception- this was measured in terms of how often leaders were satisfied when followers met agreed-upon targets, how often they avoided getting involved when organizational activities were moving smoothly, and the frequency with which they informed followers of the standards that they needed to adopt to carry out their work.</p> <p>Contingent rewards were measured in how often leaders tell their followers what to do to be rewarded and provide recognition when followers meet set objectives.</p>
Transformation leadership	<p>Individual consideration is measured in terms of how much attention the leader gives to their followers who feel rejected; it is also concerned with the frequency with which the leader provides feedback to his followers regarding their performance, as well as how often the leader helps their followers to develop themselves as far as achieving the objectives is concerned.</p> <p>Idealized influence- this was measured in terms of the leader's ability to create a comfortable environment with their followers and how often their followers can form close associations with them.</p> <p>Inspirational motivation- this was measured in terms of the leader's ability to express themselves in ways easily understood by their followers and the frequency with which they can give illustrative guidelines that are easy to follow. This is also concerned with how often leaders help their followers establish or find meaning in their work.</p> <p>Intellectual stimulation- this was measured in terms of the leader's ability to allow their followers to think about solving problems using existing and new ideas.</p>
Laissez-faire leadership	<p>Hands-off leadership- this was measured in terms of how often the leaders were content to let their followers work in the same way consistently, how often they felt every need of the followers was all right, and how often they avoided asking for more from their followers than what is essential.</p>

Trait Theory, Behaviour Theory, and the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) provide useful frameworks for leadership within higher education institutions (HEIs) because of their emphasis on situational flexibility, interpersonal skills, and adaptability qualities essential for managing the intricate demands of academic environment. The significance of innate leadership traits, such as resilience, which are crucial in academia, is highlighted by trait theory. To promote educational advancement, behaviour theory places a strong emphasis on successful leadership behaviours such as encouraging mentoring. FRLM offers a flexible method that combines transactional and transformational components. However, because they lack the flexibility required for academia's dynamic, multifaceted difficulties, theories like Contingency and Path-Goal Theory, which place a higher priority on structured, predictable settings, are less appropriate to HEIs. For this study only the FRLM was used.

Conceptual Framework

The higher education authority in Zambia has identified six areas that need to be measured to gauge the performance of an institution (H.E.A., 2017). These are teaching, Internationalization, research, institution size, impact, and prestige. They offer a comprehensive view that encompasses educational quality, global engagement, scholarly output, institutional capacity, societal influence, and reputation. These factors collectively represent an institution's overall contribution to academia and society. The factors are represented in Figure 1 in the conceptual model, showing each leadership style's effect in determining organizational performance. Additionally, Table 3 shows the detailed attributes of each.

The attributes will be briefly explained based on H.E.A.'s (2017) explanation of each. Internationalization refers to the ability of the university to attract students and faculty members from around the globe. Teaching refers to the learning environment for learners and teaching staff, the availability of quality infrastructure, technology, and many others. Prestige refers to institutions' academic achievements regarding the ability to place their doctoral recipients and the number of Nobel Prize awards they have received. Size of the institution improvement of campus life for students, working conditions for staff, and providing adequate teaching facilities. Impact: This performance indicator focuses on supporting integrity and service to the community. Iriqat (2017) identified three independent variables (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and Laissez-faire leadership) and a dependent variable regarding performance. The same reasoning has been adopted in this research, as shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 is a multiple linear model where leadership styles are independent variables, the attributes are the dependent variables, and the organizational performance is the outcome expected.



Figure 1: Conceptual Model

From the above depicted model, the hypothesis being evaluated was “The is no relationship between leadership style (transactional, transformational, Laissez-faire) on performance of HEI on (research, impact, prestige, size, teaching, internationalization).”

METHODOLOGY

Leadership affects performance through diverse leadership styles. In H.E.I., the academic leadership should promote the size of the institution's teaching, research, impact, internationalization, and prestige, among other things, under the Higher Education Authority's (2017) goals for H.E.I. This study used a positivist philosophy to study the leadership styles utilized and the resultant performance, as the literature suggests a direct relationship between leadership style and performance, as shown in Figure 1. Table 3 shows the measurable and observable parameters in an objective manner quantitatively. The study, therefore, was deductive. A survey was done on H.E.I.s targeting registrars, Deans, principals, heads of department, and Coordinators as identified heads of various units in H.E.I. based on the Copperbelt Province of

Zambia, as shown in Table 1. The idea was to conduct a census; however, the institutions represented in Table 2 were the only ones consented to participate. The aim was to determine the leadership styles utilized by those above and relate them to the performance of the earlier indicated parameters. The data was collected in a cross-sectional manner after informed consent was obtained and pilot testing of the instrument was done from the relevant universities. Permission was obtained from the department of construction, economics and management and school of graduate studies that provided introductory letters to respondents at Copperbelt University. A prior email was sent to the Registrars of the Universities comprising information about the study, its voluntary nature, respondents' anonymity, and confidentiality. Self-administered questionnaires were sent to H.E.I.s in the Copperbelt province of Zambia to the universities that consented to take part in the study most had indicated that other institutions were collecting data and that they were overwhelmed hence the sample comprising only institutions in the Copperbelt region. Nevertheless, most of the participating universities have presence in other parts of the country with similar leadership models. A census was conducted for all target populations below 30 as guided by Saunders et al (2016). For Copperbelt University a systematic random sampling was used comprising of School and University leadership.

Table 2: Target population of H.E.I.s in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia

Name of institution	Nature of institution	Target Population	Sample size
Rusangu University	Private	13	13
Mukuba University	Public	21	21
Copperbelt university	Public	63	55
Zambia Catholic university	Private	8	8
Total		105	97

Table 3: Detailed Attributes for Performance Indicators

Research	RSCH1	The institution has adequately awarded research grants to deserving peers in various fields of study
	RSCH2	The institution has prioritized research through research funding
	RSCH3	Research publications have featured in the world's top journals in the last five years
	RSCH4	The institution has a recognized Nobel prize winner in the last five years
	RSCH5	The institution's publications have attracted more than 500 citations annually in the last five years
	RSCH6	The institution participates in the public of studies in international research network
	RSCH7	The institutions has lecturers who not only engage in teaching but are researchers and drivers of change too(innovative)
Teaching	TLE1	Teaching and learning environment: The institution has adequate security measures
	TLE2	The institutions has adequate classrooms
	TLE3	The institution has adequate laboratory space
	TLE4	The institution has adequate, top quality technology support for both teaching and learning
	TLE5	The institution has adequate, quality technology system to support management and operational functions
	TLE6	The institution has created adequate facilities for learner support such as bookstores, adequate bed spaces, bookshops, communication services such as a post office or internet cafe
	TLE7	The institution has employed adequate number of full-time academic staff for the number of students enrolled
	TLE8	The institution adequately provides health and safety facilities such as a fully operational clinic, fire alarm service and motor traffic control systems within the institution for both members of staff and students
	TLE9	The institution has developed learner support system to enhance learning
Impact	IMP1	Impact: Members of staff's salaries are credited on time
	IMP2	Members of staff salaries are revised and improved annually as well as their working conditions
	IMP3	The institution is actively in cooperate social responsibility for its community
	IMP4	The institution is actively involved in strengthening university-industry linkages
	IMP5	The institution has partnered with various stakeholders to promote and support sustainable community development
Prestige	IP1	Institution prestige: The institution has developed recruitment mechanisms which are highly competitive for both student recruitment and staff recruitment
	IP2	The institution has the ability to place its doctoral recipient, thus recording a desirable number of staff with doctorate qualification
	IP3	The institution has a rich organisational culture to which members staff easily conform with normal challenges
	IP4	The institution has employed qualified academic staff who have shown productivity through their ability to achieve the organizations' set objective
	IP5	The institution has developed innovative mechanisms for registration of students which are timely and error-free such as online registration
	IP6	The institution has developed mechanisms for improved and quality learning which are innovative such as virtue-learning
	IP7	The institution has developed innovative devices through which members of staff can remain up to date with the institution's affairs
	IP8	The institution has the capacity to develop tracking system that collect data on success rates, students dropouts and employment after graduation
Size	SI1	Size of institution: The institution has adequate computers in the student computer lab according to the recommended ratio which are up to date and fully functional
	SI2	The institution offers accessibility to the internet for both the students and members of staff
	SI3	In the past years, the institution has witnessed growth in terms of enrollment levels in the last five years
	SI4	The institution has constructed adequate classes and bed spaces for the number of enrolled students
	SI5	The institution has experienced growth in the staffing levels according to the recommendations of the higher education authority in the five years
	SI6	The institution has increased the number of accredited programs in the last five years
Internationalization	ISMS1	Internationalization of students and members of staff: The institution trains citizen-student to prepare them to deal with global conflicts based on their understanding of other people's cultures
	ISMS2	The institution engages in the exchange of students, professors and staff or all knowledge management purposes every academic year.
	ISMS3	The institution promotes the insertion of global curricula in courses offered in various schools
	ISMS4	The institution is involved in the organization of courses and events abroad in partnership with other universities
	ISMS5	The university has created other campuses in other countries

This study used the Full-range leadership model (F.R.L.M.) which considered transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The main reason for F.R.L.M. is due to utility HEIs (Sosik & Jung, 2010). A six-point Likert scale was used to decipher practices concerning the size of institution teaching, research, impact, internationalization, and prestige with the various indicators shown in Table 3. In this case a score of 1-3 could indicate no utility or consideration to minimal utility or consideration and vice versa for score of 4-6 e.g., for the mean. The Likert scale constitutes one Strongly disagree, two Disagree, three Slightly disagree, four Slightly agree, 5 Agree, and six strongly agree. While for leadership styles, a five-point Likert scale was used, namely one- never, two occasionally, three sometimes, four fairly often, and five always developed by Bies, and Hunt (2005).

Before instrument administration, the questionnaire was pre-tested to ensure content validity within one H.E.I. The data analysis used both descriptive (means, standard deviations, and frequencies) and inferential statistics (regression analysis and correlations). For the correlation analysis, the following guide was used to describe the strength of statistically significant relationships: coefficient values between 0 and ± 0.20 very weak; between ± 0.20 and ± 0.40 soft; between ± 0.40 and ± 0.60 moderate; between ± 0.60 and ± 0.80 strong and between ± 0.80 and ± 1.00 very strong (Rovai *et al*, 2013). Regression analysis was used to understand the various relationships between variables in terms of quantifying the strength, the direction, and the various impacts of the independent variable on the dependent variables (Kothari, 2014). Structural equation modeling was considered but was not utilized due to nature of the relationships under study which are linear and simple in nature in nature, the sample size was found to be inadequate. The study of latent variables or indirect effects was not part of the study design but rather the direct relation of the dependent and the various independent variables.

RESULTS

Before any tests could be conducted, a reliability test of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha was computed. This constituted items in table 3 (the performance parameters) and Table 5 (the leadership attributes) among others. Cronbach's alpha is a function of the average inter-correlations of items, including the number of items in the scale. The test showed an Alpha value of 0.832, which is a proficient level of internal consistency and reliability of the instrument with sixty-four items. The response rate overall was acceptable at 71.11%. Using the Shapiro-Wilk test, the independent variables of Transactional, Transformational and Laissez-faire leadership styles were normally distributed for the leaders in both private and public institutions as p-value was found to be >0.05 . In terms of data preparation there were no outliers, and missing data. For multicollinearity correlation tests were done and were found to range from 0.026 to 0.549 suggesting acceptable correlation coefficients as the values were below 0.8 (Kothari, 2014)

Characteristics of the Respondents

The H.E.I.s are male-dominated, with males accounting for two-thirds of the respondents, as shown in Table 4. Therefore, it can be deduced that males are more likely to be in leadership positions. Nearly half of the respondents have had more than five years in leadership positions, and over half have had less than five years. This is because most leadership positions, such as Dean, Head of department, and coordinator, are typically held on a rotational basis by faculty or school members. Over half of the leaders are Ph.D. holders, suggesting that the qualification may

have a bearing on one's possibility of holding leadership office. Although there are an equal number of universities, most of the respondents are from public Universities, which have more students due to government input in offering student loans. Transformational and transactional leadership are the common leadership styles, with Laissez-faire used by registrars and coordinators to some extent, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Respondent Characteristics

Leadership Role	No.	Leadership Style Used	Gender		Instit.		Years Served		Level Of Education		
			M	F	Pri	Pub	> 5	< 5	DEG	MS	PhD
Registrar	7	TrFL, TrL, LF	6	1	2	5	4	3	0	5	2
Dean	16	TrFL, TrL	11	5	5	11	8	8	0	5	11
Principle	8	TrFL, TrL	6	2	3	5	6	2	0	3	5
H.O.D.	17	TrFL, TrL	10	7	4	13	9	8	4	7	6
Coordinator	21	TrFL, TrL, LF	12	9	7	14	7	14	1	9	11
Frequency	69		45	24	21	48	34	35	5	29	35
Percentage (%)	100		65.2	34.8	30.4	69.6	49.3	50.7	7.3	42	50.7

TrFL-Transformational, TrL-Transactional, LF- Laissez-faire

The respondents have various capacities in their leadership roles, as shown in Table 4. There was a need to establish what they were responsible for collectively in the various H.E.I.s. Table 5 shows that nearly 70% are concerned with leading issues related to teaching. So much of the attention is on teaching, and the minor focus is on providing leadership in enhancing infrastructure development and expanding the university's activities. With much of the attention on teaching, one would expect that quality control and assurance systems and processes would equally have corresponding leadership, but this is not the case in H.E.I.s in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia, which has several campuses in other parts of the country. Research is an essential aspect of any H.E.I. One notes that research in H.E.I. needs to get the leadership required, given that it is an indicator of performance. From the respondent's research leadership accounts for 11.6%, Teaching 69.6%, Enhancement of internal quality control & assurance system and processes 15.9%, and Enhancement of infrastructure development & expansion of the University activities was found to be at 2.9%.

Disciplines in the Higher Education Institutions

The disciplines at the H.E.I.s are Medicine accounts for 2.9%, social science and humanities 15.9%, education 40.6, business 17.4%, engineering 13% and Health sciences 10.1%. Notably, Education is widespread, and the least popular is Medicine. This might also be linked to establishing costs for running programs in the disciplines. It may be less expensive to set up a faculty or school offering Education compared to Medicine, and the demand for Education could be high compared to Medicine.

Leadership Styles Used in H.E.I.

The commonly used leadership style is transactional used by 54.7% in the private HEI and 49.4 %in the public HEI with a 52% probability of utility, followed by transformational leadership which is used by 40.6% in the private HEI and 38 % in the public HEI with an 82% probability of utility. The least common is the laissez-faire leadership style, though it has higher utility in public

universities than in private universities as follows used by 4.7% in the private HEI and 12.5% in the public HEI with a 6.1% probability of utility. Nonetheless, none of the leadership styles are dominant, as none were found to be significantly used. Transactional leadership attributes are in the top five attributes out of twelve leadership attributes overall as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Leadership Styles and Their Attributes

Code	Leadership style attribute	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Attribute Rank
STL1	Others have complete faith in me- Idealized influence [TRSFMTNAL]	69	3	5	4.52	.532	2
STL2	I express with a few simple words what we could and should do -Inspirational Motivation [TRSFMTNAL]	69	2	5	3.65	.921	7
STL3	I enable others to think about old problems in new ways -Intellectual Stimulation [TRSFMTNAL]	69	2	5	3.62	.956	8
STL4	I help others develop themselves -Individual Consideration [TRSFMTNAL]	69	2	5	3.83	.954	6
Average mean for leadership style					3.91		
STL5	I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work - Contingent Reward [TRSCTNAL]	69	2	5	4.30	.880	3
STL6	I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards -Management by exception [TRSCTNAL]	69	4	5	4.80	.405	1
STL11	I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish [TRSCTNAL]	69	1	5	4.03	1.248	5
STL8	I provide recognition/reward when others reach their goals [TRSCTNAL]	69	1	5	4.12	1.334	4
Average mean for leadership style					4.31		
STL9	As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything [L.F.L.F.]	69	1	5	2.99	1.064	10
STL10	What others want to do is okay with me [L.F.L.F.]	69	1	5	2.25	.946	12
STL7	I take Laissez-faire Leadership approach [LF]	69	1	5	2.87	1.533	11
STL12	I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential [L.F.L.F.]	69	1	5	3.26	1.133	9
Average mean for leadership style					2.84		

Key: LF- Laissez-faire, TRSCTNAL- Transactional, TRSFMTNAL- Transformational

To recap, H.E.I.'s performance indicators in Zambia are teaching, research, prestige, size, impact, and internationalization. The order of performance as perceived by respondents from most performing to least is teaching, size, prestige, impact, internationalization, and research. In teaching, the security measures for the learning and teaching environment account for the highest performance; therefore, the H.E.I. campuses are safe. Learner support systems and providing health and safety facilities also account for teaching performance. However, some institutions need adequate full-time staff, resulting in the non-availability of staff when learners require it due to the part-time nature of their employment. The size of H.E.I.s, according to Table 6, could be attributed to several accredited programs, internet access, and increased enrollment numbers, especially in the private sector.

Table 6: Performance attribute ranking

Performance Indicator	Code	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Attribute rank
Research (Mean Ave=3.36) Overall Rank=6	RSCH1	69	1	6	2.930	1.785	37
	RSCH2	69	1	6	2.970	1.774	36
	RSCH3	69	1	6	3.870	1.552	30
	RSCH4	69	1	5	2.070	1.252	39
	RSCH5	69	1	5	2.320	1.450	38
	RSCH6	69	1	6	4.290	1.226	24
	RSCH7	69	1	6	5.040	1.021	5
Teaching (Mean Ave=4.94) Overall Rank=1	TLE1	69	2	6	5.000	0.874	7
	TLE2	69	1	6	4.220	1.474	26
	TLE3	69	1	6	3.970	1.609	28
	TLE4	69	1	6	4.230	1.308	25
	TLE5	69	2	6	4.460	1.208	20
	TLE6	69	1	6	4.540	1.023	18
	TLE7	69	1	6	3.840	1.605	31
	TLE8	69	2	6	4.710	0.688	16
	TLE9	69	2	6	4.880	0.738	13
Internationalization (Mean Ave=3.48) Overall Rank=5	ISMS1	69	1	6	4.490	1.256	19
	ISMS2	69	1	6	3.540	1.539	35
	ISMS3	69	1	6	4.140	1.331	27
	ISMS4	69	1	6	3.720	1.599	34
	ISMS5	69	1	6	1.510	0.994	40
Prestige (Mean Ave=4.43) Overall Rank =3	IP1	69	2	6	5.000	0.939	8
	IP2	69	2	6	5.060	0.968	3
	IP3	69	2	6	4.970	0.785	10
	IP4	69	4	6	5.350	0.638	1
	IP5	69	2	6	4.990	1.022	9
	IP6	69	2	6	4.930	0.880	11
	IP7	69	2	6	4.900	1.002	12
	IP8	69	2	6	4.330	1.120	23
Size (Mean Ave=4.70) Overall Rank = 2	SI1	69	1	6	4.360	1.715	22
	SI2	69	1	6	5.010	0.931	6
	SI3	69	1	6	5.040	1.156	4
	SI4	69	1	6	3.910	1.704	29
	SI5	69	2	6	4.770	1.238	14
	SI6	69	2	6	5.090	1.025	2
Impact (Mean Ave=4.28) Overall Rank = 4	IMP1	69	1	6	3.810	1.734	32
	IMP2	69	1	6	3.740	1.550	33
	IMP3	69	1	6	4.460	0.979	21
	IMP4	69	1	6	4.720	0.938	15
	IMP5	69	1	6	4.680	1.007	17

Performance of Higher Education institutions

Table 6 Performance indicators and their attributes

Nevertheless, the H.E.I.s must construct more lecture rooms and bed spaces to increase their size. Prestige in H.E.I. is due to all the indicators under investigation, with the top three being the employment of qualified staff, placement of doctoral recipients as members of staff, and competitive recruitment mechanisms. The impacts of the H.E.I. are due to strengthened industry linkages and partnering with communities. Nevertheless, untimely payment of salaries and irregular revision of the same has had a negative impact on the Performance of H.E.I.s.

The H.E.I. has adopted international curricula for internationalization and focuses on training its students for global employment. However, the H.E.I. still needs to be able to have campuses in other countries. Research is the least performing indicator for several reasons: inadequate research grants, non-prioritization of research funding, and minimal engagement in international research. This has resulted in no Nobel Prize winners and minimal citations. However, the H.E.I. does not track their intuitions citations. The following section reports the relationship between leadership and performance.

Relationship between Leadership and Performance

Table 7 shows significant relationships between leadership attributes and performance indicators. Thirteen significant relations were found out of forty-two computations, none of which were strong, as shown in Table 7. The leadership style attributes accounting for the relationships were inspirational motivation and contingent reward. There was a positive moderate correlation between research and contingent reward, research and inspirational motivation, prestige and inspirational motivation, impact and inspirational motivation, size of the institution and inspirational motivation, size of the institution and contingent reward, and lastly impact and contingent reward. The results suggest that better performance in those mentioned above can be achieved by having more modes of motivation and more rewards for those responsible for the performance. The remainder of the relationships were significant but weak for teaching and inspirational motivation, internationalization, and inspirational motivation, teaching and contingent reward, Internationalization, and contingent reward, Prestige, and contingent reward, and lastly, between leadership and Laissez-faire Leadership. The results suggest that more performance in all the performance indicators can be achieved in the HEI by having more modes of motivation and more rewards for those responsible for the performance in the respective areas. Interestingly, research is impacted moderately by a Laissez-faire leadership approach. Given that research is ranked last of all the performance indicators, leadership is needed in this area.

Table 7: Correlation between Leadership and Performance Indicator

Leadership style	Performance Indicators					
	Research	Teaching	Size of Institution	Internationalization	Prestige	Impact
<i>Transformational leadership</i>						
Idealized influence	0.146	0.181	0.149	0.084	0.249	0.104
Inspirational Motivation	0.505*	0.327*	0.433*	0.354*	0.533*	0.549*
Intellectual Stimulation	0.192	0.261	0.161	0.119	0.261	0.295
Individual Consideration	0.245	0.168	0.214	0.224	0.214	0.251
<i>Transactional Leadership</i>						
Contingent reward	0.523*	0.353*	0.531*	0.353*	0.236	0.432*
Management by exception	0.163	0.088	0.037	0.035	0.132	0.055
<i>Laissez-faire Leadership</i>	0.333*	0.026	0.148	0.076	0.104	0.124

Significance Test =* at $P < 0.05$, N=69

Table 8: Regression Analysis for Leadership Style Attribute and Performance Attribute

Leadership	Attribute	Research		Size		Teaching		Internationalisation		Impact		Prestige	
		Coefficients	Sig.	Coefficients	Sig.	Coefficients	Sig.	Coefficients	Sig.	Coefficients	Sig.	Coefficients	Sig.
		B		B		B		B		B		B	
Item	(Constant)	0.683	0	0.683	0	0.483	0.072	2.421	0.04	0.521	0	0.212	0.613
Transformational leadership	Idealized influence	0.125	0.48	0.225	0.98	0.125	0.48	0.125	0.98	0.025	0.482	0.125	0.502
	Inspirational Motivation	0.518	0.004	0.518	0.013	0.454	0.01	0.258	0.143	0.528	0.023	0.325	0.056
	Intellectual Stimulation	0.119	0.245	0.219	0.145	0.231	0.245	0.119	0.35	0.519	0.035	0.219	0.165
Transactional leadership	Individual Consideration	0.169	0.1	0.09	0.131	0.409	0.131	0.169	0.151	0.149	0.171	0.249	0.171
	Contingent reward	0.487	0.008	0.617	0.000	0.447	0.02	0.301	0.102	0.617	0.005	0.489	0.043
	Management by exception	0.148	0.408	0.148	0.458	0.138	0.438	0.148	0.458	0.148	0.498	0.148	0.498
Laissez-faire Leadership	Laissez-faire Leadership	0.082	0.081	0.472	0.038	0.272	0.128	0.372	0.048	0.072	0.708	0.172	0.708

From the regression analysis significant findings are recorded for research and impact as the p-values ranged from 0.00-0.03, which were less than 0.05, indicating that the independent variables significantly affect the Performance of H.E.I.s. This observation revealed a strong positive correlation between leadership styles and performance in research. The R^2 derived in this model was 0.459, which showed that 45.9% of the changes in research input can be attributed to leadership styles. Adjusted R square indicates 0.374%, meaning that 37.4% of the changes in institutional performance in research can be predicted from the leadership attributes leaders use in H.E.I.s. In comparison, the observation for impact revealed a strong positive correlation between leadership styles and performance in terms of impact. The R^2 derived in this model was 0.389, which showed that 38.9% of the changes in impact input can be attributed to leadership styles.

Adjusted R square indicates 0.266, meaning that 26.6% of the changes in institutional performance in impact can be predicted from the leadership attributes leaders use in H.E.I.s. Prestige, teaching, size, and internationalization findings were not significant.

Table 8 shows significant relationships between inspirational leadership and all performance indicators except prestige and internationalization, with p ranging from 0.000 to 0.048. This entails leadership, which is needed to improve performance using transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is required to enhance performance in all performance indicators, as shown in Table 8. Laissez-faire leadership had a significant positive relationship with size ($p = 0.038$) and internationalization ($p = 0.048$).

Discussion

The literature using various researchers has established that the organization's performance depends on the leadership style used. This is also the case in H.E.I.s. The three leadership styles in the F.R.L.M. theoretical perspectives are used in the H.E.I. However, contingent reward, a transactional leadership attribute, is the most practiced, followed by inspirational motivation and tribute to transformational leadership. The Laissez-faire leadership style is sparingly utilized in H.E.I.s. This was congruent with the findings of (Simango, 2016) who found that this leadership style is avoided as most times solutions need to be sought by leaders. However, the utility of a Laissez-faire leadership style is more likely in a public H.E.I. compared to a private one. The utility of transformational and transactional leadership in H.E.I. is congruent with Khan *et al.*'s (2021) findings who found these widely used in HEI as they offer promoting innovation, encouraging professional development, & aligning personal goals with the institution's vision and defined expectations and recognition, fostering a disciplined and results-oriented environment for faculty members and students alike as required.

Nonetheless, inspirational motivation and contingent reward are inhibited by poor funding of public institutions and inadequate finance in private institutions. Leadership preferences observed in Tables 5 and 7 suggest that leaders favored acknowledging persons who reached their objectives. This practice is a core for transactional leadership style, according to the F.R.L.M. Of the three leadership styles, they are only applied, according to Table 4. This is congruent with the findings of Feliciano (2019), who established that in education environments, leaders combine transactional and transformational leadership styles and sometimes apply Laissez-faire leadership styles dependent on the circumstances.

According to Table 7, leadership style and Performance recorded some significant transactional and transformational leadership findings for all the performance indicators. The laissez-faire leadership style only had a significant finding for a relationship with research. The attributes that positively affect Performance in H.E.I. are inspirational motivation (except for prestige and internationalization) and contingent reward (except for size and internationalization). This suggests that for performance to be improved in H.E.I., the need above must be enhanced for the relevant performance indicators. Motivation and rewards must be given to employees and leaders of academic institutions. It is suggestive from the findings that research will be done in the absence of leadership as it exhibited a positive significant relationship with the Laissez-faire leadership style, which mainly does not require the leaders to do anything. If one does not undertake research,

they will not be promoted or categorized as weak academics. This is a mismatch when two routes, namely research and teaching are apparent in the HEA framework.

The order of performance as perceived by respondents is teaching, size, Prestige, impact, Internationalization, and research in descending order (Table 6). All the performance needs to be improved upon more, especially in research. In research, inadequate research grants, non-prioritization of research funding, and minimal engagement in international research have contributed to deficient performance. This area needs leadership to improve as the H.E.I.s focus on teaching, marred with inadequate full-time staff, especially in private institutions. The H.E.I.s have the potential to perform better in terms of size if lecture rooms and bed spaces can be increased. The H.E.I.s need to be innovative in sourcing funding for infrastructure. Embracing clearly and tactfully crafted Public-Private-partnership projects (PPP) and other funding models would be beneficial to the H.E.I. While the staff are qualified and disseminates global curricula, paying employees promptly and regularly revising salaries and wages is necessary to ensure that staff are motivated and are satisfied in their respective roles.

Moreover, Kurniawaty *et al.* (2019) posited that employees are valuable assets for any organization as they facilitate its operations. Therefore, paying on time for wages and salaries and revising salaries and wages regularly would improve performance even for enrolment and recruitment. On internationalization, considerations could be made towards setting up campuses in other countries, though this is far-fetched with current funding patterns. However, it could be attained through collaboration. These would add to the performance indicators of prestige and size. Abubakar and Ahmed (2017) posited that management's support for transformational leadership positively affected the performance of the universities in terms of research activities, prestige, teaching/learner environment, and internationalization. In this study, the needs to be supported for prestige and internationalization.

F.R.L.M. asserts that transactional leadership is the most common leadership style (Antonakis *et al.*, 2003). The findings of this research support this view. Therefore, leadership success in H.E.I.s is shaped by respecting and meeting the obligations of both leaders and followers. Various leadership styles can be adopted depending on the situation, as H.E.I.s are dynamic in their needs and operations. Nonetheless, transactional, and transformational leadership should be practiced more to improve performance.

Conclusion

H.E.I. in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia uses a variety of leadership styles. Nevertheless, transformational, and transactional leadership are the standard modes practiced more than the Laissez-faire leadership. Nonetheless, the leadership styles are only somewhat used. Transformational and transactional leadership have a positive significant relationship ranging from weak to moderate with all performance indicators specifically for attributed inspirational motivation and contingent reward. The highest performance indicator in H.E.I. is teaching, and research is the least. Research is the only performance attribute with a significant positive relationship with all leadership styles. This research has identified areas where performance needs to be focused such as research and internationalization, but an in-depth study using qualitative data collection methods is required to understand how performance can be improved and to have an in-depth understanding of the attributes. This should be done at other HEI and in the region as findings

of this study are only generalizable to HEI in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia. Nevertheless, the Copperbelt H.E.I have presence in other provinces of Zambia. Additionally, more robust statistical methods like structural equation modeling can be used in future studies with a larger sample size and coverage possible covering more HEIs. Leaders in in HEI should deploy Transformational and transactional leadership styles to improve performance and formulate policies and procedures that promote the two leadership styles Policy makers of H.E.I should increase funding and invest in research infrastructure such as laboratories, equipment, software and other necessary requisites for research and development. Generally, a similar study can also be conducted in other H.E.I. s throughout the country and the region to be able to compare and position the performance of H.E.Is in order to map out areas of improvement.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, A. and Ahmed, S., (2017). "The effect of a transformational leadership style on the performance of universities in Nigeria." *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 2, 59-76.
- Ahmet Avci, (2015) "Investigation of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles of School Principals, and Evaluation of Them in Terms of Educational Administration", *Educational Research and Reviews* Oct 2015, , 10 (20) 2758-2767
- Andrew Sih, (2013) "Understanding variation in behavioral responses to human-induced rapid environmental change: a conceptual overview", *Animal Behavior*, 85(5), 1077-1088, ISSN 0003-3472, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.02.017>.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J. and 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(3), .261-295.
- Beakana, A.N., (2017). "Effects of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance in Ahantaman Rural Bank Limited." *Texila International Journal of Management*, 3(2), 131-146.
- Bies, R. P., & Hunt, W. G. (2005). *Beyond the Status Quo: New Developments in Leadership Theory and Research*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(1), 225-245.
- Bodla, M.A. and Nawaz, M.M., (2010), Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and Universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 208.
- Chege, M. E. & Gakobu, J. (2017), "Influence of Leadership Styles on Performance of Telecommunication Industry in Kenya". *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2(4), 256-281
- Deluga Ronald J. (1990), "The Effects of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez Faire Leadership Characteristics on Subordinate Influencing Behavior", *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 11:2, 191-203, DOI: [10.1207/s15324834basp1102_6](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1102_6)
- Denison DR, Hooijberg R, and Quinn RE (1995), "Paradox and performance: toward a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership". *Organization Science* 1995; **6:524-40**.[doi:10.1287/orsc.6.5.524](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.5.524)
- Drape, T.A., Rudd, R., Lopez, M. and Radford, D. (2016). "Challenges and solutions to higher education institutions in Africa." *International Journal of Education*, 8(1), pp.43-58.
- DuBrin, J.A. (2012). *Essentials of Management*, 9th ed. South-Western, U.S.A.
- Esen Ülkühan Bike (2021), "Leadership in Higher Education: Academic leadership, Redesigning Teaching, Leadership, and Indigenous Education in the 21st Century", Pages: 14, DOI: [10.4018/978-1-7998-5557-6.ch007](https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-5557-6.ch007)
- Fabrice Hénard (2009) "Learning our lesson: Review of Quality Teaching in Higher Education". accessed at <https://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/43961761.pdf> on 20 June 2023 OECD & -Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE)

- Feliciano, I.C.T., (2019) “Interlinking Public Schools’ Organizational Culture, Principals’ Leadership Styles and Performance”. *Global Scientific Journals*, 7(4).
- Fomba, B.K., Talla, D.F. and Ningaye, P. (2023). “Institutional Quality and Education Quality in Developing Countries: Effects and Transmission Channels.” *J Knowl Econ* 14, 86–115 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00869-9>
- Gehring, D. R. (2007). “Applying Traits Theory of Leadership to Project Management.” *Project Management Journal*, 38(1), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280703800105>
- Government of the Republic of Zambia, (2006). *Vision 2030*. A prosperous middle-income nation by 2030.
- Harrison, C. (2018). “Leadership Research and Theory. In: Leadership Theory and Research.” Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68672-1_2
- Hassan, A., Gallear, D. and Sivarajah, U. (2018), "Critical factors affecting leadership: a higher education context", *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 110-130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-12-2017-0075>
- Higher Education Authority (HEA). 2017. Higher Education Authority. Higher Education Authority Zambia <http://www.hea.org.zm/index.php>
- Hijazi, S., Kasim, A.L. and Daud, Y., (2017). “Leadership styles and their relationship with the private university employees’ job satisfaction in United Arab Emirates.” *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 6(4), pp.110-124.
- Indeed editorial Team (2022) “Pros and Cons of Transformational leadership” (with definitions) <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/pros-and-cons-of-transformational-leadership>
- Iriqat, R.A.M., (2017). “Gender Leadership Styles in Enhancing Workforce Performance in Palestinian Public Institutions: The Role of Mediating Organizational Citizenship Behavior.” *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 6(1), 93
- Khan Irfan Ullah, Muhammad Idris, and Rooh U Amin (2021)” Leadership style and performance in higher Education: the role of organizational justice”, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, DOI: [10.1080/13603124.2020.1854868](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1854868)
- Kinnunen Paivi, Ripatti-Torniainen Leena Ripatti-Torniainen, Mickwitz Asa and Haarala-Muhonen Anne (2022) “Bringing clarity to the leadership of teaching and learning in higher education: a systematic review”, *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 2050-7003 DOI [10.1108/JARHE-06-2022-0200](https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-06-2022-0200).
- Leslie, H., Abu-Rahma, A., & Jaleel, B. (2018).” In Retrospect: A Case of Merger in Higher Education.” *International Journal of Educational Management*,
- Luthans, F. 2011. “*Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach*.” 12th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill

- Lutkevich Ben, and Mary K. Pratt (2023) “*Transactional leadership*”, accessed from <https://www.techtarget.com/searchcio/definition/transactionalleadership#:~:text=Transactional%20leadership%2C%20also%20known%20as,on%20an%20exchange%20or%20transaction.> On 6 July 2023, Technical Features Writer.
- Makuve , N. (2024). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Diversity, Inclusion, Management and Governance. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.2487>
- Mba, J.C. (2017). “Challenges and prospects of Africa’s higher education.” *Global Partnership for Education*.
- Mullins, J.L. (2010).” *Management & Organisational Behaviour*.” 7thedn. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Mullins, J.L. ed., (2007). “*Library management and marketing in a multicultural world: proceedings of the 2006 I.F.L.A. Management and Marketing Section's Conference, Shanghai*”, 16-17 August 2006 (Vol. 125). Walter de Gruyter.
- Mupeta, S., (2019). “Implementation of Civic Entrepreneurship in the Governance of the University of Zambia.” *Unpublished M Ed Thesis, Lusaka: University of Zambia*.
- Nwanne Emerald (2023). “The pros and cons of transactional leadership” [“https://www.charma.com/resources/transactional-leadership](https://www.charma.com/resources/transactional-leadership), accessed on. On 6 July 2023, 593-598.
- Ongiti, O. (2024). Dilemma of African Higher Education Global Partnership on MDGS and SDGs. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.2246>
- Ralph A. Gigliotti, (2017),” An exploratory study of academic leadership education within the Association of American Universities ”, *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 9(2),. 196 - 210
- Ryan James C., and Syed A.A. Tipu, (2013) “Leadership effects on innovation propensity: A two-factor full range leadership model”, *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (10), 2116-2129, ISSN 0148-2963, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.038>.
- Salehzadeh, R. (2017), "Which types of leadership styles do followers prefer? A decision tree approach", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31 (7), 865-877. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2016-0079>
- Salazar-Rebaza, C., Zegarra-Alva, M., & Cordova-Buiza, F. (2022). Management and leadership in university education: Approaches and perspectives. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*. 20(3):130-141
- Sethuraman Kavitha and Suresh Jayshree (2014), “Effective Leadership Styles,” *International Business Research*; 7(9), ISSN 1913-9004 E-ISSN 1913-9012
- Simango, B., (2016). “*Leadership styles employed at Zambia's colleges of education*” (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa).

- Srikanthan. G. and John F. Dalrymple (2002) “Developing a Holistic Model for Quality in Higher Education”, *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(3), 215-224, DOI: [10.1080/1353832022000031656](https://doi.org/10.1080/1353832022000031656)
- Sosik, J.J and Jung, D.I.2010. Full-Range Leadership Development. New York: Psychology Press,
- Tierney William G. (1988) “Organizational Culture in Higher Education”, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21, DOI: [10.1080/00221546.1988.11778301](https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1988.11778301)
- Ullah, R., Latif, K.F. and Alam, W., (2018). “Role of transformational leadership style on employee job performance among high- and low-ranking institutions of higher Education of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.” *City University Research Journal*, 8(2), pp.168-189.
- Wu, F.Y. & Shiu, C. (2009). “The relationship between leadership styles and foreign English teachers job satisfaction in adult English Cram Schools: Evidence in Taiwan.” *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 14 (2).