P-ISSN 2664-0422	Pakistan Social Sciences Review	Jan-March 2025, Vol. 9, No. 1
O-ISSN 2664-0430	https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2025(9-I)39	[493-506]

Pakistan Social Sciences Review
www.pssr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Effect of Shared Leadership Behavior of Heads on Subordinate's Performance at University Level

[1]Rabia Shafique, [2]Farah Naz Bashir*and [3]Muhammad Ramzan

1. PhD Scholar, Division of Education ,University of Education Lahore & Research Associate (CRIMA), Minhaj University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. PhD Scholar Education department Punjab University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. PhD Scholar Division of Education ,University of Education Lahore & Lecturer, Education Department, Dar-ul-Madina International University, Islamabad, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** farhikhan5260@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study sought to evaluate the influence of shared leadership behavior demonstrated by university leaders on the performance of their subordinates, with a particular emphasis on academic staff at the university level. The study was undertaken in the context of growing interest in collaborative leadership models and their potential to improve organizational results in higher education institutions. The study used a quantitative research approach to investigate this issue. A cross-sectional survey was used to gather information on the factors of interest, such as shared leadership behaviors and subordinate performance. The sample included 800 Teachers from four universities in Lahore, Pakistan: two public (University of Education and Punjab University) and two privates (University of Lahore and University of Engineering and Technology), as well as their affiliated colleges. Participants were chosen using a convenience sampling method. The study used a three-part instrument that comprised the Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) and the Teacher Performance Scale (TPS). The SLS had a dependability coefficient of α =.81, whereas the TPS had α =.83, indicating good internal consistency. Pilot tests proved the instruments' validity and reliability. This study adds to the increasing body of literature on shared leadership by offering empirical evidence of its influence on subordinate performance in higher education. This study also provides practical insights for university administrators looking to create collaborative leadership techniques that will improve organizational effectiveness and staff performance.

KEYWORDS Shared Leadership, Behavior of Heads, Subordinate's Performance

Introduction

Leaders are viewed as change agents since there is a significant link between educational advancement and leadership development (Khan & Mahmoud, 2020). Dominguez (2019) defines a successful leader-follower relationship as one in which both sides have a vision, are motivated by ethics, and can collaborate to create change. Leaders must promote a genuine commitment to the mission of higher education by providing clear leadership standards for conceiving, implementing, and achieving these goals (Oyegoke, 2012).

Because of the rising complexity of today's higher education institutions, it is no longer possible for a single person to address all of the difficulties that occur inside them alone. Principals cannot execute their duties as if they were putting on a "one-man show" any longer. They must share responsibilities and authority, which implies that different situations and persons need different behaviors and interactions. As a result, the concept

of a single leader is rejected on college campuses. Domnguez (2019) argues that shared leadership is replacing the conventional idea of a single, legendary leader.

Shared leadership happens when team members take turns as leaders rather than one individual taking on all of the job obligations (Carson et al., 2007). Shared leadership, as described by Ensley et al. (2006), is a team dynamic in which decisions are made collaboratively rather than by a single leader. Leadership has always been regarded as critical to achieving collective goals (Randeree & Ninan, 2011).

"Head" shared leadership behaviors, a distinguishing feature of participative decision-making, identify the university's "collaboration of the leadership group, leadership assistance, leadership supervisory, and approaches for accomplishing these objectives," thereby involving all higher education representatives in leadership roles and decision-making processes (Hulpia & Devos, 2009). Additionally, shared leadership allows instructors to hone their talents and prepare for long-term leadership jobs.

Research results on shared leadership have had a substantial impact on topics such as organizational performance, educational outcomes, organizational transformation, university democracy, and involvement in decision-making. So, researchers believe that this examination into shared leadership and subordinate performance will assist to bridge some of the gaps in both studies and their implementation. It will also make a substantial contribution to encouraging principals or heads to embrace and use a shared leadership perspective.

So, the purpose of this study is to investigate the shared leadership behavior of university leaders as viewed by subordinates or professors. Investigate how subordinates or professors' job performance is regarded by teachers at the university level. Determine the impact of shared leadership behavior by heads on subordinates' or instructors' performance at the university level. To determine whether there is any variation in perceptions of shared leadership behavior among heads depending on demographic characteristics. To investigate the difference in perceptions of teachers' work performance depending on demographic characteristics. To attain these objectives, "quantitative research" was used in this study. The study included a cause-and-effect analysis. In the current study, questions were gathered via a cross-sectional survey.

Literature Review

A leader has influence in a social setting by guiding his followers' efforts towards a common goal and motivating them with a shared vision. Spillane (2016) defines good educational leadership as a means of encouraging individuals inside an organisations to cooperate based on their enthusiasm, expertise, and previous experiences. Similarly, Norris et al. (2017) claim that a leader's role is to act as the focal point for improving team production by leading members to more effective means of instruction. He says that this approach is either inherited or may be taught.

The principal must enforce pledges to guarantee that all teachers collaborate and work hard (Courtney, 2018). The network services allow for reflection on both leadership positions and participant interdependence (Moolenaar et al., 2015). Everyone in this group cares about the organization’s success and relies on one another to perform their part.

The prevalent wisdom is that leaders exclusively utilize their power and influence in a downward direction. However, leadership is "more sophisticated than treating a team as

a mere sum of its elements" (D'Innocenzo et al., 2014), and it entails far more than the leader's interactions with his subordinates. Recent research has changed our sympathy for success away from a single figure at the top and towards a more diffused, bottom-up model (Wang et al. 2014). Collective leadership is a topic that has received a lot of attention recently.

The notion behind shared leadership is that different members on a team may take command. We discovered similarities across the many interpretations of shared leadership provided by researchers in recent years (Carson et al., 2017; Pearce & Conger, 2013). According to D'Innocenzo et al. (2014), "joint accomplishment, shared accountability, and the value of cooperation" are characteristics of shared leaders who recognize linked management.

According to Boies et al. (2010), shared leadership is "an emerging group attribute that comes from the spread of shared leadership between many members of the team." According to Pearce and Conger (2013): "Leadership is widely diffused across a collection of persons rather than concentrated in the control of one person who operates in the position of a greater." The phrase "shared leadership" refers to how various contributors to an organizational structure collaborate (Pearce & Conger, 2013). People in shared leadership styles serve as both supervisors and subordinates, often simultaneously. This technique recognizes network leaders and encourages them to influence other users and system contributors (Muethel & Hoegl, 2012).

Shared leadership is described as "a team characteristic in which decision-making authority is shared between members of the team instead of invested in a single individual" (Wang et al., 2019). In terms of shared leadership, institutional leadership serves a distinct role in particular contexts. A leader's responsibility is to monitor their team's development, issue orders, and provide assistance as required. As a result, managers and their interactions maintain influence over the organization's effectiveness (Werther, 2016).

Organizational structure and shared leadership have mutual influence. Shared leadership may be established inside an organisation if certain circumstances are satisfied, such as the availability of organizational authority, assurance, and internal accountability (Angell, 2010). Employees are more likely to take initiative while working in a "supportive" environment where leadership is divided equitably (Erkutlu, 2012). Because of the pleasant atmosphere created by shared leadership, more individuals can contribute and their competence is recognized. Although the notion that "we are greater together than apart" is a core premise of shared leadership, it accomplishes nothing to further that potential. The reason for this is that, unlike managers, a successful leader's obligations extend to his or her subordinates. (Zhou et al. 2015).

Every member of the community possesses leadership potential and is expected to contribute to the school's growth and development. Collective leadership relies on both adapted and quantitative behavioral components. Whereas executive function requires all divisions to coordinate their efforts, quantitative activity ensures that everyone has an equal opportunity to become a leader at some point (Goksoy, 2016). An organisation can only flourish if its members collaborate in carrying out their respective responsibilities. When power is distributed to many rather than centralized in the hands of a single monarch. Leadership fosters a culture of trust among team members, allowing them to cooperate freely.

There are three central ideas associated with shared leadership: management is treated as a commodity that allows people to interact with one another; leadership's boundaries are porous, allowing followers to seek advice from any legitimate source; and diversification is embraced by many or all of the group's members. It is known that at some point, someone will be entrusted with assuming command, and that everyone participating must ensure that their portion of the leadership obligations is being met. There can be no real equality in collaboration if all distribution duties are assigned to one individual or one person in a position of power (Gronn, 2019).

When leaders give responsibility to their subordinates, they promote interdependence rather than mindless compliance. One may argue that when authority is distributed among more people, subordinate roles become more dispersed. When an organization's success is disseminated, it benefits more members in the group. Shared leadership is achieved by making all types of collaborative effort and interest inside the organisation necessary. It has become an integral element of classroom practices and the educational system (Grönn, 2019).

The leader establishes a team to accelerate the change process through human efforts. Understanding team dynamics and effectiveness entails first settling on a project and then determining who will be working on it. The capacity to function as an orderly and harmonic unit is the sole criterion for team selection. A team's growth is mostly determined by the importance of shared objectives and the incentives of its members to work together to achieve those goals. Organizational members have an important role, and the organization's productivity is dependent on their skills and collaboration (Leithwood et al., 2019).

Material and Methods

This research included 800 public and private sector instructors from the University of Education, PU, UET, and UOL and from their affiliated colleges. To determine which samples to gather data from, a random sampling approach was used. A convenient sampling strategy was used to choose the research sample. It entailed picking a representative sample from the entire population, with 40% of the total selected for this specific study. Gay et al. (2008) indicate that when the population size is about 800, 40% must be gathered. This information was obtained from the university's website.In this study, the researcher employed a closed-ended questionnaire that had been amended with the author's permission. Each component of the instrument fits into one of three parts.

The first component of the questionnaire includes generic questions regarding instructors' gender, age, credentials, and university.

A second component of the set of questions assesses the study's independent variable (the head's shared leadership behavior). The section comprised of 21 Likert scale items ranging from Strongly Disagree (coded as 1) to Strongly Agree (coded as 5). The Instrument for Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) was divided into four SLS indicators.

The final portion of the questions examines the research's dependent component (teacher or subordinate performance). Amin et al. established the Teachers Performance Scale (2013). The portion consisted of 22 items on a Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (coded as 1) to Strongly Agree (5). The tool on Teachers Job Performance Scale was divided into four indications of TPS.

Pilot Testing

According to Gall et al.'s (1996) results, this examination may have included a pilot study to assess the instrument's dependability. According to Frankel et al. (2012), "validity" refers to the quality, relevance, correctness, and practicality of a researcher's results. A pilot research will assess a team's skills. Four local university lecturers from Gujranwala discussed the tool to assure its usefulness. The precision and consistency of the data influenced our assessment of each component. In the context of measuring equipment, "reliability" refers to the consistency of measurements from one run to the next. The study was finished in March 2023, with 75 more participants who were not included in the sample.

An acceptable reliability coefficient in social sciences research is at least.70 (Mallery, 2013). As a measure of reliability, Cronbach's alpha was used.

Table 1
Alpha Reliability Coefficients by Factors

Variable	Scale	*N*	Items	α
Shared Leadership Scale	SLS	75	21	.81
Teacher Performance Scale	TPS	75	22	.83
Overall		75	43	.84

The reliability coefficients were determined by doing the reliability analysis. The most trustworthy scale was SLS (α =.81), followed by TPS (α =.83). In general, the instrument's consistency should be 0.84, indicating high-quality dependability.

Data Collection

The researcher used a closed-ended questionnaire to gather data from teachers. The researcher collected the data on his own by visiting the campus. Researchers also reassure individuals that their information will not be leaked or shared. It took around five to ten minutes to read the survey, distribute it, and process the findings. The entire process of analyzing the assertions took the tool around fifteen to twenty minutes.

Results and Discussion

The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. These approaches were reported as mean, percentage, one-way ANOVA, standard deviation, frequency, linear regression, and independent sample t-test.

The dataset has been updated with the survey findings. The data was analyzed with SPSS, Version 24 of the Statistic Programme for Social Research. The dataset has been updated with the survey findings. We tested our statistical hypothesis and generated some basic data for descriptive purposes. A regression analysis was used to determine the positive connection between the variables.

Table 2
Gender Description of Participants

Gender	F	%
Male	350	43.75
Female	450	56.25
Total	800	100

Table 2 shows a gender-based description of the sample. The table displayed the number and percentage of responders categorized by gender. The gender of the 800 instructors that participated in the poll was revealed. Following this table, there were 350 male replies. (43.75%), and 450 female responders (56.25%).

Table 3
Age description of Participants

Age	F	%
16-25	23	2.875
26-35	363	45.375
36-45	369	46.125
46-50	30	3.75
51 and older	15	1.875

Table 3 shows an age-based description of the sample. The table indicated the number and percentage of participants based on their age. In this table, 23 (2.875%) participants were aged 16-25. 363 (45.375%) of the participants were aged 26-35. A total of 369 (46.125%) participants were under the age of 36-45. 30 (3.75%) of the participants were under the age of 46-50. 15 (1.875%) participants were under the age of 51 or older. Table 2 shows a gender-based description of the sample. The table displayed the number and percentage of responders categorized by gender. The gender of the 800 instructors that participated in the poll was revealed. Following this table, there were 350 male replies. (43.75%), and 450 female responders (56.25%).

Table 4
Qualification Description of Participants

Qualification	F	%
M.A/MSC	240	30.0
M.PHIL	360	45.0
PHD	200	25.0
Total	800	100.0

Table 4 shows a description of the sample based on qualifications. The table indicated the number and proportion of participants according to their qualifications. There were 240 instructors (30%) with an M.A./M.Sc. certificate. There were 360 (45%) instructors who qualified for an M.Phil., and 200 (25%) teachers who were qualified for a PhD or were Pursuing PhD.

Table 5
University and their affiliated colleges Description of Participants

Department	F	%
University of Education	80	10.0
PU	290	36.25
UOL	300	37.5
UET	130	16.25

Table 5 describes the sample by university. The table indicated the number of participants and their percentages by university. This table showed that responders from the University of Education were 80 (10.0%), PU 290 (36.25%), UOL 300 (37.5%), and UET 130 (16.25%).

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of head shared leadership behavior

Scale	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Team Leadership (TL)	800	15.36	1.75
Supervision Leadership (SL1)	800	11.07	1.61
Supportive Leadership (SL2)	800	14.18	1.78
Participative Decision-Making Leadership (PDML)	800	18.83	1.89
Shared Leadership Scale (SLS)	800	74.80	4.58

Table 6 depicted the Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) on the basis of specific responses. It also explained the sub-factors of the SLS Scales, including Team Leadership, Supervision Leadership, Supportive Leadership, Participatory Decision-Making Leadership, and their total SLS. The mean and standard deviation of the Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) were 74.80 and 4.58, respectively. The mean and SD score for team leadership (TL) is (M= 15.36, SD=1.75), which is the somewhat higher score. The mean score for Supervision Leadership (SL) is (M=11.07, SD=1.61), which is the lowest score. Supportive Leadership replies (mean = 14.18, SD = 1.78). The mean and SD scores for Participative Decision-Making Leadership are (M=18.83, SD=1.89), indicating that teachers have the highest mean score on this scale.

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics of Teacher or Subordinate Performance

Scale	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Skills of Teaching (TS)	800	18.89	2.33
Skills of Management (MS)	800	11.93	1.55
Regularity and Discipline (RD)	800	23.46	2.19
Interpersonal Relations (IR)	800	15.47	1.92
Teacher Performance Scale (TPS)	800	54.28	3.27

Table 7 displays a depiction of the Teacher Performance Scale (TPS) based on specific replies. It also explained the sub-factors of the (TPS) Scales, including teaching skills, management skills, regularity and discipline, interpersonal relations, and total TPS. The Teacher's mean and standard deviation scores. TPS (mean = 54.28, standard deviation = 3.27). The mean and standard deviation score for Teaching Skills (TS) is (M=18.89, SD=2.33), which is the somewhat higher score. While the mean score for Management Skills (M=11.93, SD=1.55) is the lowest. The results for Regularity and Discipline (M= 23.46, SD=2.19) revealed that instructors had the highest mean score on the scale. The mean and SD score for Interpersonal Relations are (M=15.47, SD=1.92).

Table 8
Model Summary[b] (N = 800)

Model	R	*R2*	Adj. R^2	St. Error	F	*p*
1	.699	.474	.455	.40877	16.23	.00

Predictor: (constant) =shared leadership. Dependent: Variable = Teacher Performance

Table 8 shows the regression analysis using the SL score as a predictor of the TP score. The findings revealed how considerable changes in TP (Dependent Variable) are explained by SL (Independent Variable). According to the model, the score is.47, indicating that SL clarifies a 47% modification in the TP (dependent variable). The results were statistically significant (R2=.474, Adjusted R2=.455, F=16.23, p=.00). TP showed statistical significance (β=.681, p<.05).

Table 9
Gender Comparison regarding perception of Head shared leadership behavior

Scale	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*Df*	*t*	*p*
Team Leadership (TL)	Male	15.35	1.74	798	-.18	.85
	Female	15.37	1.75			
Supervision Leadership (SL1)	Male	11.09	1.66	798	-2.68	.05
	Female	12.04	1.56			
Supportive Leadership (SL2)	Male	14.12	1.81	798	- 1.12	.26
	Female	14.26	1.74			
Participative decision Making Leadership (PDML)	Male	18.78	1.96	798	-2.68	.001
	Female	19.87	1.80			
Shared Leadership Scale (SLS)	Male	74.76	4.61	798	.395	.004
	Female	75.93	4.55			

To compare the mean of shared leadership behavior ratings between male and female participants, an independent sample t-test was utilized. Table 09 shows that female teachers rated shared leadership behavior substantially higher (M=75.93, SD=4.55) than male instructors (M=74.76, SD=4.61). The p-value (>0.04) indicates that male and female professors have significantly different perspectives. Female instructors were more aware of PDML (M=19.87, SD=1.80) than male teachers (M=18.78, SD=1.90). Men and women have significantly different mean PDML scores. In addition, there is a considerable variation in impression of Supervision Leadership (SL1). Female instructors are regarded higher in this region (M=12.09, SD=1.56) than male respondents (M=11.09, SD=1.66).

Table 10
Gender Comparison regarding the perception of teacher or subordinates performance

Scale	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*T*	*p*
Skills of Teaching (TS)	Male	15.36	1.89	798	2.58	.004
	Female	16.60	1.95			
Skills of Management (MS)	Male	15.41	1.68	798	.591	.555
	Female	15.32	1.80			
Regularity and Discipline (RD)	Male	15.90	1.43	798	.197	.846
	Female	15.88	1.58			
Interpersonal Relations (IR)	Male	15.22	1.33	798	.173	.32
	Female	15.32	1.43			
Teacher Performance Scale (TPS)	Male	46.68	2.92	798	.456	.005
	Female	47.82	3.04			

A t-test was used to compare the mean teacher performance scales, teaching abilities, management skills, consistency and discipline, and interpersonal relations scores of male and female instructors from different groups. T-test results are presented. Table 10 shows that female instructors (M=47.8, SD=3.04) expressed their opinions on the TPS Scale much more than male teachers. It is possible that there is a statistically significant difference in TPS mean scores between men and women. It also explains the subfactors of TPS Scales. It was discovered that female instructors reported somewhat higher views on TS (M=16.60, SD=1.95) than men (M=15.36, SD=1.89).The score of male teachers and female teachers did not differ on MS, RD, IR.

Table 11
Mean and SD of TLS

Scales	Age	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Skills of Teaching (TS)	16-25	23	14.87	1.77
	26-35	363	15.46	1.91
	36-45	369	15.46	1.93
	46-50	30	16.34	1.94
	51 and older	15	15.44	1.09
Skills of Management (MS)	16-25	23	15.27	1.39
	26-35	363	15.42	1.87
	36-45	369	15.36	1.66
	46-50	30	15.07	1.58
	51 and older	15	15.70	1.37
Regularity and Discipline (RD)	16-25	23	16.41	1.55
	26-35	363	15.86	1.55
	36-45	369	15.96	1.48
	46-50	30	15.41	1.20
	51 and older	15	15.83	1.73
Interpersonal Relations (IR)	16-25	23	15.65	1.22
	26-35	363	15.54	1.56
	36-45	369	15.35	1.68
	46-50	30	15.12	1.67
	51 and older	15	15.33	1.36
Teacher Performance Scale (TPS)	16-25	23	55.54	3.36
	26-35	363	54.73	3.31
	36-45	369	53.93	3.26
	46-50	30	53.24	2.91
	51 and older	15	53.83	2.66

Table 11 displays the participants' age groups as indicated in the research. Of the 800 responses, 23 are between the ages of 16 and 25. The bulk of teacher participants (N=369) were between the ages of 36 and 45. 363 contributions were under the age of 35 (N=363), 30 were between the ages of 46 and 50, and 15 were 51 or older. It also clarifies the sub-factors in TPS scales. It was found that item number has a high mean score (M=16.41, SD=1.55). The low score (M=14.83; SD=1.74).

Results and Discussion

This study investigated how the head's shared leadership behavior influences the performance of teachers and subordinates at the university level. It was required to investigate teacher attitudes about head-shared leadership behavior.

Yusuf (2004) supports the current study's conclusions that heads' shared leadership behavior favorably affects instructors' or subordinates' performance. In the previous study, shared leadership was found to have a significant impact on teacher performance at the University of the Port of Klang Zone. In the current study, teachers' productivity in the workplace increased dramatically when they were given additional leadership duties. These findings are congruent with those of Najib (2004), who discovered a positive relationship between the leadership behavior of university heads in the Kedah region and the performance of their subordinates or teachers.

Ori Eyal and Guy Roth (2011) found that principals' leadership styles had a substantial impact on teacher morale and productivity. Harris (2008) stated that shared

leadership may influence organizational change and that continual education for instructors or subordinates is an important avenue for growth. Previous research has addressed the relationship between shared leadership and organizational success, despite the fact that the issue of shared leadership has received a lot of attention.

The current study discovered that instructors had a positive opinion of head-shared leadership behavior at the university level. The Shared Leadership Scale was demonstrated to be based on clear replies. The explanation of the sub-factors of SLS Scales, namely Team Leadership, Supervision Leadership, Supportive Leadership, Participatory Decision-Making Leadership, and their total SLS. The mean and SD score of team leadership is the somewhat highest score. The mean score of Supervision Leadership is the lowest. The mean and SD scores of Participative Decision-Making Leadership revealed that teachers had the highest mean score on this scale. Additional research (Yımaz, 2014; Kormaz, 2012; Ulu and Beyciolu, 2013; Sarek, 2012; Bakr, 2013; Asan, 2014; Güler, 2015; Oruç, 2014; Sarıcı, 2013; Kelkçi, 2016; Şahi, 2015) has expanded on this study's findings regarding shared leadership behaviour and constructive subordinate performance.

Teachers' perceptions of Teacher Performance at the university level resulted in the depiction of the Teacher Performance Scale based on specific replies. It also provided explanations for sub-factors such as teaching skills, management skills, regularity and discipline, and interpersonal relationships. The mean and SD scores for Teaching Skills (TS) are somewhat higher. The average score for Management Skills is the lowest. Teachers had the highest mean score on the Regularity and Discipline measure. However, there are other research with comparable findings on the sub-dimensions of shared leadership. Several research have been analyzed (Kurt, 2015; Tian, 2012; Sheppard, Hurley, and Dibbon, 2011) and found that shared leadership predicts the teacher performance subdimension. Several research (Yılmaz and Kurşun, 2016; Çetin et al., 2013; Schermerhorn et al., 1990; Mascall et al., 2009) suggest that shared leadership improves teacher or subordinate performance.

Conclusion

The study examined how head-shared leadership behavior affects teacher performance. To achieve the study objectives, percentages, frequencies, descriptive analysis, inferential analysis, or independent sample t-tests, analysis of variance, and regression were employed to answer the research questions. The current study concluded that head shared leadership behavior has a beneficial influence on teacher performance. The independent sample t-test found that women outperformed men. One-way ANOVA was described using demographic factors such as age, qualification, and university. It found that shared leadership behavior was not significantly connected to age or qualification. Furthermore, there were no variations in shared leadership behavior between universities. Another conclusion from the study indicated that teacher performance was unrelated to age and qualification. It was determined that there was no difference in departmental and university-wide perspectives on teacher performance.

Recommendations

To improve the efficacy of shared leadership in higher education, institutions should cultivate a collaborative culture that honors multiple opinions and promotes open communication among professors, staff, and students. This may be accomplished by creating comprehensive leadership training programs that provide a wider spectrum of

stakeholders with the skills required for effective collaborative decision-making. Furthermore, developing supporting frameworks that explain duties while allowing team members to take on leadership tasks is critical. Institutions could also promote accountability by linking individual contributions with common organizational goals, so that all members are involved in the group's success.

References

Adams, D., Samat, S. N. A., & Samah, H. A. (2018). Teacher leadership: Going beyond classroom. *International Online Journal of Educational Leadership*, *2*(1), 1-3.

Adewuya, A. O., Oseni, S. B., & Okeniyi, J. A. (2006). School performance of Nigerian adolescents with epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, *47*(2), 415-420.

Baker, J. A., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher-student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School psychology quarterly*, *23*(1), 3.

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International journal of management reviews*, *13*(3), 251-269.

Cammock, P., (2011). Leadership for emergence: Exploring organisations through a living system lens. *Leading and Managing*, *17*(1), 59-74.

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of management Journal*, *50*(5), 1217-1234.

Clifford, M., Behrstock-Sherratt, E., & Fetters, J. (2012). The Ripple Effect: A Synthesis of Research on Principal Influence to Inform Performance Evaluation Design. A Quality School Leadership Issue Brief. *American Institutes for Research*.

Coleman, A. (2011). Towards a blended model of leadership for school-based collaborations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *39*(3), 296-316.

Courtney, S. J. (2018). Privatising educational leadership through technology in the Trumpian era. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *50*(1), 23- 31.

Dinham, S. (2007). How schools get moving and keep improving: Leadership for teacher learning, student success and school renewal. *Australian journal of education*, *51*(3), 263-275.

Goksoy, S. (2016). Analysis of the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *16*(65), 295-312.

Hoch, J. E. (2013). Shared leadership and innovation: The role of vertical leadership and employee integrity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *28*, 159-174.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *69*(6), 1013-1034.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2009). The influence of distributed leadership on teachers' organizational commitment: A multilevel approach. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(1), 40-52.

Humphreys, J. H., Oyler, J. D., Haden, S. S. P., & Novicevic, M. M. (2013). interventions and members' collective personalities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *32*(5), 101499.

Kearney, R. C., & Hays, S. W. (2019). Labor-Management Relations and Participative Decision Making: Toward a New Paradigm. In *Handbook of Public Quality Management* (pp. 532-544). Routledge.

Khan, A., & Mahmood, M. K. (2020). Effects of Distributed Leadership on Teachers' Commitment and Job Satisfaction at Secondary Level. *Journal of Secondary Education and Research*, *2*(2), 31-42.

Khasawneh, S. (2011). Shared leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in Jordanian public universities: Developing a global workforce for the 21stCentury. *Educational management administration & leadership*, *39*(5), 621- 634.

Liu, S., Hu, J., Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Lin, X. (2014). Examining the cross-level relationship between shared leadership and learning in teams: Evidence from China. *The leadership quarterly*, *25*(2), 282-295.

Mofuoa, K. (2015). The exemplary ethical leadership of King Moshoeshoe of Basotho of Lesotho in the nineteenth century southern Africa. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *5*(3), 21-35.

Muthoni, M. P. (2015). Shared Leadership and Students' Performance in Secondary Schools. In *Information and Knowledge Management* (Vol. 5, No. 7).

Okoth, U. A. (2018). Transformational leadership practices in curriculum implementation (environmental education) in secondary schools in Siaya County, Kenya. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, *14*(10), 320-331.

Pearce, C. L., & Manz, C. C. (2011). Leadership centrality and corporate social ir-responsibility (CSIR): The potential ameliorating effects of self and shared leadership on CSIR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *102*, 563-579.

Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Akanno, S. (2013). Searching for the holy grail of management development and sustainability: is shared leadership development the answer?. *Journal of Management Development*, *32*(3), 247- 257.

Sekhar Bhattacharyya, S., & Jha, S. (2013). Explicating strategic shared leadership process. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, *5*(1), 57-71.

Sherer, D. (2021). Getting better at getting better: Improvement dispositions in education. *Teachers College Record*, *123*(4), 1-42.

Song, W., Jiang, H., Zhuang, W., & Shen, X. (2005). Resource management for QoS support in cellular/WLAN interworking. *IEEE network*, *19*(5), 12-18.

Tatlah, I. A., & Iqbal, M. Z. (2012). Leadership styles and school effectiveness: Empirical evidence from secondary level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *69*, 790-797.

Terry, R. W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z., & Ma, X. (2017). Shared leadership and team effectiveness: The examination of LMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership. *Human Performance*, *30*(4), 155-168.

Wang, P., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: the moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(2), 397-427.

Wheelan, S. A., & Kesselring, J. (2015). Link between faculty group: Development and elementary student performance on standardized tests. *The journal of educational research*, *98*(6), 323-330.