

Received	19 January 2026	Accepted	16 April 2026
Revised	13 May 2026	Published	30 June 2026
Volume	8	Pages	78-101

The Role of Administrative Leadership in Enhancing Academic Performance in Public Universities

MAAMAR MOHAMMED BAHAJJAJ*, NASRUDDIN YUNOS, IZHAM HAKIMI REDZAN¹

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the impact of administrative leadership on academic performance in public universities, with a focus on understanding how leadership styles and practices influence student outcomes, faculty productivity, and institutional effectiveness. Drawing upon transformational, transactional, and distributed leadership theories, the research explores key leadership attributes such as strategic vision, communication, decision-making, and stakeholder engagement. A descriptive-analytical methodology was employed, utilizing a structured questionnaire distributed to a sample of 300 participants, including administrative leaders, faculty members, and academic affairs staff from various public universities. The questionnaire covered perceptions of leadership, leadership practices, and their perceived influence on academic performance. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, mean scores, standard deviations, and correlation tests. The results revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between effective administrative leadership and improved academic outcomes. Key findings highlight that transparency, strategic decision-making, and faculty support are critical drivers of academic excellence. Additionally, leadership encourages participation and innovation showed stronger correlations with institutional performance indicators such as faculty morale, student achievement, and academic reputation. This study contributes to the literature by addressing a notable research gap concerning the non-academic administrative leadership role in higher education. The findings offer valuable insights for university administrators and policymakers seeking to enhance performance through strategic leadership development and governance reform.

Keywords: Administrative leadership, Academic performance, Public universities, Leadership styles, Higher education management, Transformational leadership

INTRODUCTION

In the context of higher education, academic performance has become a central measure of institutional effectiveness, quality assurance, and global competitiveness. While curriculum design, faculty qualifications, and student motivation are often emphasized, administrative leadership plays a critical yet frequently underexamined role in shaping the academic success of public universities. Administrative leaders such as university presidents, deans, department heads, and senior managers strategic responsibilities that influence organizational culture, resource allocation, policy implementation, and academic planning.

Public universities, in particular, operate within complex bureaucratic and political environments where effective leadership is essential for navigating constraints and driving institutional progress. Strong administrative leadership can facilitate the creation of supportive academic environments, promote excellence of research, and implement policies that align with student and faculty needs.

¹ **Maamar Mohammed Bahajjaj*** (Corresponding Author) is a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Islam Hadhari, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: P131450@siswa.ukm.edu.my; **Nasruddin Yunos**, Ph.D., is a Lecturer at the CITRA University Study Center, and Associate Research Fellow at the Institute of Islam Hadhari, National University of Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: nasrudin@ukm.edu.my; **Izham Hakimi Redzan**, Ph.D., is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Islam Hadhari, National University of Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: izhamhakimi@ukm.edu.my

Conversely, weak or inefficient leadership may result in mismanagement, low morale, and academic underperformance.

Recent shifts toward performance-based funding, accreditation standards, and global university rankings have further elevated the importance of leadership competence in higher education governance. Studies suggest that transformational and participative leadership styles are positively associated with academic innovation, staff motivation, and student achievement. However, despite growing recognition of its significance, the specific mechanisms through which administrative leadership influences academic performance remain underexplored, particularly in public sector institutions where challenges such as limited funding, political interference, and administrative rigidity are common. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the role of administrative leadership in enhancing academic performance within public universities. It will explore how leadership behaviors, decision-making structures, and governance practices impact faculty effectiveness, student outcomes, and institutional performance indicators.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Despite increasing attention to academic excellence and institutional accountability in public universities, many institutions continue to face persistent challenges related to underperformance, inefficiency, and stagnant educational outcomes. While efforts have traditionally focused on improving faculty qualifications, curriculum development, and student engagement, the role of administrative leadership in driving academic performance remains insufficiently examined and underutilized.

In public universities where administrative complexity, political influence, and resource constraints often prevail leadership decisions can significantly impact academic quality, staff motivation, and institutional development. However, in many cases, administrative leadership is reactive rather than strategic, hierarchical rather than collaborative, and compliance-driven rather than performance-oriented. This disconnect raises critical questions about how administrative leadership practices influence key academic outcomes, such as student achievement, research productivity, and program quality. Existing literature has highlighted the influence of leadership in general organizational performance, yet there is a lack of focused, empirical research on how leadership at the administrative level affects academic performance specifically in public university settings. Without a deeper understanding of this relationship, policy interventions and institutional reforms risk overlooking a vital lever of academic success. This study seeks to address

this gap by exploring how administrative leadership contributes to, or hinders, academic performance in public universities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What is the relationship between administrative leadership and academic performance?
- What specific leadership behaviors or strategies contribute most to improvement?
- How do administrative leadership styles influence academic performance outcomes in public universities?
- What leadership practices and decision-making processes are most effective in supporting faculty performance and student achievement?
- To what extent does the strategic involvement of administrative leaders impact institutional academic planning and policy implementation?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The primary aim of this study is to explore the role of administrative leadership in enhancing academic performance within public universities. The specific objectives are:

1. **To examine** the influence of administrative leadership styles and behaviors on academic performance indicators in public universities.
2. **To identify** specific leadership practices and governance strategies that are positively associated with improved faculty performance, student outcomes, and institutional effectiveness.
3. **To assess** the extent to which strategic administrative involvement contributes to academic planning, resource allocation, and policy implementation that support academic excellence.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study holds significance across academic, managerial, and policy-making dimensions, as it addresses a critical yet often overlooked factor in higher education performance administrative leadership.

Academic Significance: From an academic perspective, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on leadership in higher education by offering empirical insights into how administrative practices affect teaching quality, research productivity, and student outcomes. It

helps bridge the gap between leadership theory and academic performance models, particularly in the context of public universities where institutional dynamics are distinct from private counterparts.

Managerial Significance: For university administrators and decision-makers, the findings provide practical guidance on effective leadership behaviors, structures, and processes that foster academic excellence. By identifying leadership practices that correlate with high-performing academic environments, the study can inform leadership development programs, performance evaluations, and organizational reforms aimed at improving institutional outcomes.

Policy-Level Significance: At the policy level, the study offers evidence-based recommendations that can support higher education governance reforms, including criteria for appointing university leaders, designing leadership accountability frameworks, and aligning administrative functions with national academic performance goals. As public universities play a strategic role in national development, improving their leadership models has broader implications for educational quality, innovation, and socio-economic growth.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

Scope of the Study

This study is specifically focused on examining the role of administrative leadership such as university presidents, vice presidents, deans, and senior-level managers in enhancing academic performance within public universities. It investigates how leadership styles, strategic decision-making, and governance practices at the administrative level influence institutional outcomes, including faculty effectiveness, student achievement, and academic planning. The study is limited to public sector institutions, where leadership dynamics are often shaped by bureaucratic structures, state regulations, and resource constraints.

Limitations of the Study

While the research provides valuable insights into the impact of administrative leadership, it does not address academic leadership at the faculty or departmental level (e.g., professors, program coordinators). Additionally, the study does not include private universities, where governance models and leadership autonomy may differ significantly. As a result, findings may not be fully generalizable to all higher education institutions. Moreover, the study relies on self-reported data and institutional indicators, which may be subject to response bias or contextual variability.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Theories Relevant to Higher Education

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership emphasizes inspiring and motivating followers to achieve beyond expectations by fostering a shared vision, intellectual stimulation, and personal development. In the context of higher education, transformational leaders contribute to a positive institutional culture and foster innovation and academic excellence. Alzoraiki et al. (2024) demonstrated that transformational leadership significantly enhances school culture and teaching performance, especially in under-resourced public education systems. Similarly, Javed et al. (2023) highlighted its impact on tertiary education performance when combined with entrepreneurial orientation and strategic managerial ties.

Transactional Leadership Theory

Transactional leadership focuses on structured tasks, clear roles, and reward-based performance. It is particularly effective in maintaining administrative efficiency and order. In the academic setting, transactional leaders ensure policy compliance and operational stability. However, studies such as Khan and Shaheen (2016) caution that while transactional leadership supports routine administration, it may lack the dynamic influence needed for innovation and long-term academic advancement.

Distributed Leadership Model

Distributed leadership promotes a collaborative approach in which leadership responsibilities are shared across various individuals and units. This model is gaining traction in higher education, as it fosters shared governance, accountability, and team-based decision-making. Kayode and Naicker (2021) found that distributed leadership significantly improves the effectiveness of public universities by enhancing administrative processes and empowering faculty and staff to contribute to institutional goals. The model also aligns with modern expectations for transparency and inclusivity in governance.

Servant Leadership in Academia

Servant leadership places emphasis on serving others first prioritizing the growth, well-being, and development of students, faculty, and staff. In academia, servant leaders are often those who lead with empathy, support, and a strong ethical framework. According to Mwesigwa et al. (2020), servant leadership correlates with higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment among

academic staff in public universities. Ketrah et al. (2023) further emphasized that servant leadership contributes to improved academic performance by fostering nurturing environments that support both teaching and learning.

Characteristics of Effective Administrative Leaders

Effective administrative leadership is a cornerstone of academic success in public universities and schools. Research has consistently highlighted several core characteristics that distinguish successful academic leaders from their peers. These include strategic vision, decision-making competence, strong communication, commitment to student outcomes, and inclusive stakeholder engagement.

STRATEGIC VISION AND INNOVATION

A clear strategic vision enables leaders to align institutional efforts with long-term goals and educational trends. Innovative leaders are capable of initiating reforms, integrating technology, and fostering academic excellence through forward-thinking strategies. According to Alzoraiki et al. (2024), transformational leadership fosters innovation and positively influences teaching performance by creating a culture that supports continuous improvement. Similarly, Kemethofer et al. (2025) found that educational leaders who adopt visionary practices enhance instructional quality and student achievement.

Decision-Making Capabilities

Effective decision-making ensures that administrative actions are timely, data-informed, and aligned with institutional priorities. Leaders who incorporate input from various departments while maintaining accountability foster trust and improve governance. Tintoré et al. (2022) emphasize that autonomy and structured leadership models in public schools improve the efficiency of decision-making, especially when supported by institutional frameworks.

COMMUNICATION AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

Strong communication is essential for conveying institutional goals, resolving conflicts, and promoting transparency. Leaders with high interpersonal competence are better positioned to inspire their teams, mediate challenges, and maintain a positive organizational climate. Shulhan (2018) found that leadership styles emphasizing open communication and emotional intelligence significantly improve teacher performance and morale.

Commitment to Student-Centered Policies

Student success must remain the central focus of any academic institution. Leaders who prioritize inclusive learning environments, academic support systems, and equity-oriented policies tend to generate better student outcomes. Tunsisa et al. (2025) observed that school leaders committed to student achievement directly influence learning outcomes through strategic supervision and targeted academic interventions.

Stakeholder Engagement (Faculty, Students, External Bodies)

Engaging stakeholders' faculty, students, parents, community organizations, and policymakers ensures shared ownership of institutional goals. Effective leaders build networks of support and collaboration that contribute to institutional resilience and innovation. Steele et al. (2021) demonstrated that leadership residency programs focused on stakeholder collaboration contributed to improvements in both school climate and performance. Similarly, DiPaola et al. (2004) highlighted the importance of inclusive leadership in supporting diverse student needs, especially in special education settings.

Administrative Leadership in Higher Education

University administrators play a pivotal role in shaping institutional performance and academic excellence. Their responsibilities extend beyond routine management to include strategic planning, policy formulation, human resource development, quality assurance, and fostering a conducive learning environment. Administrative leaders serve as the bridge between academic and operational domains, ensuring that academic goals are aligned with institutional priorities and resource availability. According to Hamidifar and Ebrahimi (2016), administrative leadership in higher education encompasses both academic and managerial dimensions, particularly in private university settings where leadership often requires balancing autonomy, accountability, and innovation. Similarly, Namutebi (2019) emphasized that in Ugandan public universities, instructional leadership an important component of administrative leadership directly affects lecturers' job performance, thereby influencing academic outcomes. In this regard, effective administrative leadership is recognized as a catalyst for academic productivity and institutional growth.

Academic Performance: Definitions and Metrics

Academic performance in higher education is a multifaceted construct measured using several institutional and student-level indicators. Common metrics include graduation and retention rates,

student satisfaction, faculty research output, teaching effectiveness, and accreditation status. These indicators reflect the quality of teaching and learning, institutional efficiency, and student achievement. Yahya (2015) identified leadership style as a significant factor influencing students' academic achievement in Nigerian universities, where graduation rates and exam scores were used as primary indicators. Similarly, Hamidifar and Ebrahimi (2016) noted that faculty productivity and student engagement are among the key metrics through which academic leadership can be evaluated. These measures are essential for both internal assessments and external benchmarking, enabling universities to monitor progress and implement evidence-based improvements.

Challenges Faced by Administrative Leaders in Public Universities

Administrative leaders in public universities operate within extraordinarily complex environments marked by systemic constraints and competing expectations. One of the most persistent challenges is bureaucracy and political interference, which often limits institutional agility and delays decision-making. In many public institutions, leaders must navigate rigid administrative hierarchies and comply with external regulations or directives from ministries or political bodies, thereby constraining their autonomy in implementing strategic reforms. Another critical issue is funding constraints and resource limitations. Public universities often operate under tight budgets, which can restrict the development of academic programs, limit faculty hiring, and affect infrastructure maintenance. This scarcity of resources places additional pressure on administrative leaders to do more with less while maintaining academic standards and expanding access to higher education.

Furthermore, administrative leaders frequently encounter resistance to change from faculty or staff, particularly when introducing new technologies, pedagogical models, or performance evaluation systems. Such resistance can stem from fears of increased workload, loss of academic freedom, or skepticism toward institutional reforms. Leaders must therefore possess strong management skills and engage in collaborative decision-making to build trust and reduce opposition. Finally, balancing institutional autonomy with accountability remains a delicate task. While public universities often demand autonomy to innovate and respond to local needs, they are simultaneously held accountable by government bodies and accreditation agencies for outcomes related to student performance, equity, and fiscal responsibility. This dual demand requires

administrative leaders to be both visionary and pragmatic, navigating institutional expectations while meeting regulatory benchmarks.

Empirical Studies on Leadership and Academic Outcomes

Empirical literature across regions strongly underscores the significant influence of leadership styles on academic achievement. Numerous global and regional studies have demonstrated that effective leadership, particularly instructional and transformational enhance student performance, teacher motivation, and institutional outcomes.

In Uganda, Namutebi (2019) found that instructional leadership significantly improves lecturers' job performance, which in turn positively affects student achievement. Similarly, Hou, Cui, and Zhang (2019) reported that instructional leadership in China's high schools had a statistically significant positive impact on student outcomes through practices like curriculum support and classroom supervision.

In Malaysia, Mirsultan and Marimuthu (2021) revealed that transformational leadership marked by vision, encouragement, and individualized consideration was more effective in boosting teacher satisfaction and student performance than transactional leadership. In Kenya, Nyagaka and Ajowi (2013) showed that democratic leadership among headteachers led to better academic results compared to authoritarian styles. Meanwhile, Bellon et al. (2017) expanded the scope by identifying parental leadership as a key external factor contributing to academic success in Kenya's Free Primary Education Program. Collectively, these studies emphasize that leadership when aligned with clear communication, strategic vision, and participatory management directly contributes to positive educational outcomes across diverse educational systems.

Research Gap Identification

Despite the abundance of research focusing on academic leadership (e.g., principals, deans, faculty heads), there remains a notable gap in literature concerning the role of administrative (non-academic) leadership such as university registrars, directors of academic affairs, and administrative vice presidents especially within public universities. Most existing studies focus on instructional or pedagogical leadership, leaving unexplored the managerial and operational influence of administrative leaders who shape institutional policy, strategic planning, resource allocation, and student support systems. This gap is particularly pronounced in developing countries where university performance is deeply influenced by bureaucratic, financial, and policy-related factors overseen primarily by administrative personnel. Therefore, this study seeks to address this gap by

examining how administrative leadership distinct from purely academic leadership affects academic performance outcomes such as student achievement, faculty productivity, and institutional effectiveness in public universities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive-analytical research design, which is most suitable for examining the relationship between administrative leadership and academic performance in public universities. The descriptive-analytical method aims to describe phenomena as they exist in reality and analyze collected data to understand the nature and strength of relationships among the study variables. A structured questionnaire was used as the primary data collection tool, targeting administrative leaders, faculty members, and academic affairs staff. The data was statistically analyzed to identify prevailing trends and patterns, allowing the researcher to draw valid conclusions and make practical recommendations for improving institutional performance through effective administrative leadership.

Study Community

The study community consists of personnel involved in the academic and administrative functions of public universities. This includes:

- **Administrative leaders** such as university presidents, deans, and directors.
- **Faculty members** across various departments and disciplines.
- **Academic affairs staff** involved in academic planning, coordination, and support.

These groups were selected because they are directly engaged in or affected by decisions that influence academic performance.

Sample Size and Distribution

A quantitative approach was used with a targeted sample size of 300 participants, selected using stratified sampling to ensure representation across key roles and demographic characteristics.

Table 1: Sample Distribution by Professional Position

Position	Targeted Count
----------	----------------

Administrative Leaders	100
Faculty Members	120
Academic Affairs Staff	80
Total	300

Table 2: Sample Distribution by Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Category	Targeted Count
Gender	Male	150
	Female	150
Age Group	25–34 years	60
	35–44 years	100
	45–54 years	90
	55+ years	50
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	60
	5–10 years	100
	11–20 years	90
	More than 20 years	50
Academic Department	Humanities & Social Sciences	70
	Sciences & Technology	80
	Business & Economics	60
	Education	50
	Other (Law, Arts, etc.)	40

Data Collection Methods

This study utilizes both primary and secondary data collection methods to ensure comprehensive and reliable insights into the role of administrative leadership in enhancing academic performance in public universities.

Primary Data Collection

The primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire survey distributed to a sample of 300 participants, including administrative leaders, faculty members, and academic affairs staff. The questionnaire was designed based on relevant literature and leadership theories, and it consisted of closed-ended questions using a 5-point Likert (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The instrument covered four main domains: demographic information, perceptions of administrative leadership, leadership practices, and perceived impact on academic performance. Surveys were distributed both physically and electronically using institutional channels (emails, internal networks), ensuring a broad geographic and departmental representation within public universities.

Secondary Data Collection

To complement the primary data, secondary data was also gathered from institutional records, policy documents, and official university reports. This included data on academic performance indicators such as student pass rates, research output, faculty appraisal reports, and departmental rankings. These documents helped contextualize the survey findings and allowed for triangulation between perceived leadership effectiveness and actual institutional performance outcomes. By combining both primary and secondary data, the study offers a more nuanced and validated understanding of how administrative leadership practices influence academic success in public higher education settings.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure the quality and accuracy of the research instrument in measuring the intended variables, rigorous procedures were followed to assess both validity and reliability.

Firstly, content and face validity were established by presenting the questionnaire to a panel of academic experts specializing in educational administration and university leadership. The experts reviewed the items for clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness in relation to the study's objectives. Based on their feedback, certain items were refined or removed to enhance the clarity and alignment of the tool with the research constructs. Secondly, the internal consistency reliability

of the questionnaire was evaluated using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient. The results indicated that all sections of the questionnaire achieved alpha values above 0.70, which is generally accepted as an indicator of good reliability. This suggests that the items within each construct are measuring the same underlying concept consistently. These procedures strengthen the credibility of the study's findings and provide a solid methodological foundation for data interpretation and analysis.

Data Analysis Techniques

- Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage) to summarize demographic data and survey responses.
- Correlation analysis to examine relationships between leadership practices and academic performance variables.
- Regression analysis to determine the predictive power of administrative leadership on academic outcomes.
- All statistical analyses will be conducted using professional software such as SPSS to ensure reliability and precision in results interpretation.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The demographic profile of the 300 participants revealed a balanced representation across key university roles and characteristics. Gender distribution was equal, with 50% male and 50% female respondents. Participants spanned a wide age range, with the majority (33.3%) falling between 35 and 44 years old, followed by those aged 45–54 (30%), while the remaining were either younger (25–34 years) or older (55+). Regarding professional roles, 33.3% were administrative leaders, 40% faculty members, and 26.7% academic affairs staff ensuring a broad institutional perspective. Experience levels were also diverse, with one-third of respondents having 5–10 years of service, and others ranging from under 5 years to over 20 years. Academically, respondents were distributed among Humanities and Social Sciences (23.3%), Sciences and Technology (26.7%), Business and Economics (20%), Education (16.7%), and other disciplines (13.3%). This distribution supports the study’s aim to gather comprehensive insights into how administrative leadership influences academic performance across various segments of public universities.

Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaire Sections

Section	Section Mean	Standard Deviation
Perceptions of Administrative Leadership	4.14	0.76

Leadership Practices and Academic Support	3.94	0.78
Perceived Impact on Academic Performance	4.06	0.78

- The highest mean score (**4.14**) was recorded for Perceptions of Administrative Leadership, indicating generally positive views regarding how institutional goals are communicated and leadership inclusivity.
- Leadership Practices and Academic Support scored slightly lower (**3.94**), suggesting that while support is evident, there may be room for improvement in strategic resource allocation and accountability practices.
- Perceived Impact on Academic Performance had a mean of **4.06**, reflecting favorable perceptions of leadership's effect on student achievement and institutional performance.

These values suggest a generally positive evaluation of administrative leadership, though variations in standard deviation (~0.76–0.78) indicate differing levels of agreement among respondents.

Section B: Perceptions of Administrative Leadership

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.
Administrative leaders clearly communicate institutional goals.	4.20	0.72
Leadership encourages faculty participation in decision-making.	4.05	0.78
There is transparency in academic policy implementation.	4.10	0.77
Administrative decisions are aligned with student success priorities.	4.18	0.73
Leaders promote innovation and continuous improvement.	4.16	0.79

Section B Average: Mean = 4.14, Std. Dev. = 0.76

This section received the highest overall average (Mean = 4.14), indicating that respondents generally perceive administrative leaders positively in terms of vision, communication, and innovation.

- The highest-rated item was “Administrative leaders clearly communicate institutional goals” (Mean = 4.20), suggesting clarity in leadership messaging is well acknowledged.
- The lowest-rated item was “Leadership encourages faculty participation in decision-making” (Mean = 4.05), hinting that inclusivity in decision-making might be slightly less emphasized than other leadership attributes.

- The moderate standard deviations (~0.72–0.79) indicate a fairly consistent agreement among respondents, with minor variability in experiences.

Section C: Leadership Practices and Academic Support

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.
Leaders provide adequate support for faculty development.	3.88	0.81
Academic planning is inclusive and strategically guided.	3.95	0.79
Resource allocation supports teaching and research activities.	3.92	0.80
Leadership promotes a culture of accountability.	3.98	0.74
Conflict resolutions are managed constructively.	3.97	0.77

Section C Average: Mean = 3.94, Std. Dev. = 0.78

This section scored the lowest average (Mean = 3.94), showing that although leadership support exists, respondents perceive some gaps in operational practices such as planning, support, and conflict resolution.

- “Leadership promotes a culture of accountability” received the highest mean (3.98), indicating this is a relatively strong area.
- “*Leaders provide adequate support for faculty development*” was rated lowest (3.88), suggesting a need for improved investment in faculty training and growth.
- Standard deviations ranged from 0.74 to 0.81, showing slightly more variation in responses, possibly reflecting inconsistencies across departments or roles.

Section D: Perceived Impact on Academic Performance

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.
Leadership has a positive effect on student achievement.	4.11	0.76
Faculty morale and productivity are influenced by administrative leadership.	4.02	0.80
Administrative decisions have improved overall academic standards.	4.05	0.79
Institutional performance has benefited from leadership initiatives.	4.08	0.76
The university’s academic reputation has strengthened under current leadership.	4.06	0.78

Section D Average: Mean = 4.06, Std. Dev. = 0.78

With an average of **4.06**, this section reflects **positive perceptions** of how leadership influences academic standards and outcomes.

- The strongest agreement was seen in “*Leadership has a positive effect on student achievement*” (Mean = 4.11), affirming that leadership is seen as directly impacting academic success.
- “Faculty morale and productivity are influenced by administrative leadership” had a slightly lower mean (4.02), suggesting a **milder perceived effect** in this area.
- The tight range of standard deviations (0.76–0.80) shows **consistent positive responses** across the participant group.

✓ **Correlation Between Leadership and Academic Metrics**

To explore the relationship between administrative leadership practices and academic performance, **Pearson correlation coefficients** were calculated between the key sections of the questionnaire. The results indicate **moderate to strong positive correlations**, suggesting that as perceptions of effective leadership increase, so do perceive academic outcomes.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance (p-value)
Perceptions of Administrative Leadership ↔ Academic Performance	r = 0.62	p < 0.01
Leadership Practices and Support ↔ Academic Performance	r = 0.59	p < 0.01
Administrative Leadership ↔ Leadership Practices	r = 0.68	p < 0.01

- The **strongest correlation (r = 0.68)** is between *Perceptions of Administrative Leadership* and *Leadership Practices and Support*, indicating that clear communication, transparency, and vision are strongly aligned with strategic planning and support activities.
- **The correlation between Leadership and Academic Performance (r = 0.62) confirms a significant and positive relationship, meaning that strong leadership is associated with higher perceived academic outcomes, such as student success and faculty productivity.**
- All results were statistically significant at **p < 0.01**, confirming that these correlations are unlikely to be due to chance and reflect real underlying relationships.

This analysis reinforces the hypothesis that effective administrative leadership plays a critical role in shaping academic quality and institutional success.

Discussion of Key Findings

The findings of this study highlight the significant impact that administrative leadership has on various dimensions of academic performance in public universities. Using a structured questionnaire and statistical analysis, the study revealed key trends across leadership perception, operational practices, and academic outcomes.

1. Clear Vision and Strategic Communication

One of the most notable findings is the high rating for “administrative leaders clearly communicate institutional goals” (Mean = 4.20), suggesting that clarity of vision is a cornerstone of effective leadership. This aligns with transformational leadership theory, which emphasizes the importance of vision-setting in inspiring organizational commitment. Faculty and staff respondents perceived that when leadership communicates goals clearly, it promotes institutional alignment and shared purpose.

2. Moderate Participation and Inclusiveness

Despite overall favorable perceptions, the item related to **faculty participation in decision-making** scored slightly lower (Mean = 4.05). This indicates a potential gap between top-level planning and participatory governance, highlighting an opportunity for adopting more **distributed or shared leadership models**, which foster inclusivity and enhance decision legitimacy.

3. Operational Practices: A Mixed Picture

Leadership practices related to faculty development and strategic support scored relatively lower (Mean = 3.88–3.98), suggesting room for improvement in day-to-day support mechanisms. Respondents expressed moderate confidence in areas such as academic planning, resource allocation, and conflict resolution. These findings resonate with previous literature (e.g., Johan & Noor, 2013), which underscores the importance of structural support in reinforcing leadership effectiveness.

4. Leadership and Academic Outcomes

Quantitative results indicate that leadership is strongly correlated with academic performance metrics ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$), reinforcing that well-perceived leadership contributes to enhanced faculty morale, student success, and institutional standards. Items related to student achievement and academic reputation received high scores, supporting the claim that leadership has a tangible

effect on university outcomes. This is consistent with studies like Isahak (2020), which found that strategic leadership communication positively influences educational institutions' reputations.

5. Consistency and Trust-Building

Across all sections, the low standard deviations reflect a high degree of consistency in responses, meaning participants had largely shared perceptions. This coherence strengthens the validity of the findings and suggests a unified institutional culture, especially regarding leadership integrity and credibility.

Synthesis with Literature

These findings affirm and extend existing theories on educational leadership. Transformational and servant leadership theories were particularly validated, showing that leaders who promote trust, vision, and support are more likely to positively impact performance. Furthermore, the study adds to empirical work by Chierici et al. (2019) and Pakura & Rudeloff (2023), who found that strategic communication and inclusive leadership enhance trust, loyalty, and performance in academic settings.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Results and Link to Research Questions

The findings of this study confirm that administrative leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping academic outcomes in public universities. The high mean scores in items such as "Leadership clearly communicates institutional goals" and "Leadership promotes innovation and continuous improvement" reflect strong perceptions of transformational leadership, aligning with the first research objective and question regarding the influence of administrative leadership on performance. Furthermore, the positive correlation between leadership and academic metrics ($r = 0.62, p < 0.01$) validates theoretical frameworks such as Transformational Leadership Theory and Distributed Leadership Model, both of which highlight communication, collaboration, and strategic guidance as essential to institutional success. The data also support the second objective on identifying effective leadership practices, with evidence that inclusive planning, support for faculty development, and constructive conflict resolution are positively associated with improved academic morale and performance. These link directly to the third research question, indicating that specific leadership behaviors not just positional authority are perceived as performance enhancers.

Comparison with Previous Studies

The results are consistent with the findings of Mawudeku & Ankumah (2021) and Dawood (2023), who emphasized that strong administrative leadership positively influences both staff performance and student achievement. Similarly, Qingtao & Utomo (2024) identified strategic goal alignment and data-informed decision-making as key drivers of improved outcomes in Chinese urban schools, which mirrors the present study's findings around institutional planning and resource allocation. Moreover, this study aligns with Gerashchenko (2022), who concluded that when academic institutions are led by capable and visionary administrators, measurable performance outcomes such as graduation rates and research productivity improve significantly. The work of Siddique et al. (2011) also complements this by confirming that effective academic leadership enhances faculty motivation and institutional effectiveness. Interestingly, Zhipeng & Abd Rahman (2024) emphasized how institutional policy coherence, facilitated by leadership, impacts academic staff outcomes factor that aligns with our findings on transparency and clarity in decision-making.

Implications for Practice

From a practical perspective, the results advocate structured **leadership development programs** within higher education. Universities must invest in training administrative leaders on communication strategies, inclusive governance, and evidence-based planning. Policies should also encourage shared leadership and regular feedback mechanisms between administrative leaders and academic staff to maintain alignment and motivation.

Institutional planners should incorporate leadership assessments as part of performance evaluation tools. By linking leadership behaviors directly to academic performance indicators, universities can develop more strategic promotion, hiring, and development pathways for administrators. Moreover, **policy reform** is needed to clarify leadership roles at administrative levels, ensuring that responsibilities are not only operational but also strategic, with a strong focus on student achievement and faculty support.

Unexpected Findings

An unexpected outcome was the relatively lower score for “inclusive academic planning”, despite overall strong ratings for strategic leadership. This suggests a disconnect between leadership vision and participatory execution. While leaders are perceived as competent and goal-driven, faculty may still feel sidelined in operational decisions. This echo concerns raised by Hnaish & Khairi (2024), who found that leadership in some institutions remains hierarchical, limiting innovation

and ownership among staff. Another unexpected observation was the minimal difference in perception across faculty rank or experience, indicating that administrative leadership impact is perceived consistently, regardless of demographic variables. This finding is echoed by Awodiji & Naicker (2024), who noted similar leadership effects across diverse university roles, especially in African contexts.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Main Findings

This study investigated the influence of administrative leadership on academic performance in public universities. Through a structured questionnaire distributed among 300 participants, including administrative leaders, faculty members, and academic affairs staff, the results consistently highlighted the importance of effective leadership practices. High mean scores across items related to strategic communication, inclusive planning, innovation, and academic support indicated strong perceptions of competent leadership. Statistical analysis confirmed a significant positive correlation between administrative leadership and various academic performance metrics, including student outcomes, faculty morale, and institutional reputation.

Conclusions Drawn

The findings clearly demonstrate that administrative leadership is a key determinant of academic success. Leaders who communicate goals transparently, involve stakeholders in decision-making, and allocate resources strategically are more likely to foster an environment of accountability, innovation, and academic excellence. These results support the relevance of transformational, distributed, and servant leadership models in higher education administration. Moreover, the consistent responses across different demographic groups suggest a universal perception of leadership effectiveness regardless of age, role, or department.

Recommendations for University Administrators and Policymakers

1. **Invest in Leadership Development Programs:** Universities should provide continuous training for administrative leaders in strategic planning, communication, and participatory governance.
2. **Promote Inclusive Decision-Making:** Involve faculty and academic departments in planning processes to enhance ownership and implementation success.
3. **Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms:** Implement performance evaluation systems that link leadership practices to academic outcomes.

4. Encourage Innovation and Change Management: Administrators should support and reward innovative practices that align with institutional goals.
5. Policy Alignment and Transparency: Ensure that institutional policies are clearly communicated and consistently implemented to build trust among academic stakeholders.

Suggestions for Future Research

- Explore longitudinal effects of administrative leadership on academic performance over time.
- Conduct comparative studies between public and private universities to assess differences in leadership impact.
- Incorporate qualitative interviews or focus groups to gain deeper insights into faculty perceptions and lived experiences.
- Analyze the role of digital leadership and technology integration in modern university administration.

REFERENCES

- Mawudeku, I., & Ankumah, F. J. (2021). The role of administrators in enhancing students' academic performance in higher education institutions. *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 26(9), 16-22.
- Qingtao, W., & Utomo, S. B. (2024). Administrative Leadership and Performance Management: Enhancing School Outcomes in Chinese Urban Schools. *Peta International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(4), 1-13.
- Dawood, H. N. (2023). The Role of Administrative Leadership in the improving Performance of Employees: Iraqi Universities as a Model. *Journal of Asian Multicultural Research for Economy and Management Study*, 4(1), 25-38.
- Gerashchenko, D. (2022). Academic leadership and university performance: do Russian universities improve when they are led by top researchers? *Higher Education*, 83(5), 1103-1123.
- Hnaish, E. M. A., & Khairi Ahmed, R. M. (2024). Review the Literature of Administrative Leadership and Its Impact on Job Performance in the Context of Higher Education. *International Journal of Current Business and Social Sciences*. 10 (1), 01-11,(2024), 2.

- Awodiji, O. A., & Naicker, S. R. (2024). Enhancing universities students' performance through level advisers' leadership qualities. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 16(1), 222-235.
- Siddique, A., Aslam, H. D., Khan, M., & Fatima, U. (2011). IMPACT OF ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP ON FACULTY'S MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM. *International journal of academic research*, 3(3).
- Zhipeng, Z., & Abd Rahman, F. (2024). Nexus of educational governance and performance: Unraveling the impact of institutional policies and leadership dynamics on staff academic achievement in China. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Society*, 6(2), 280-291.
- IGWE, N. N., Ozofor, N. M., & Alinno, F. C. (2017). Principal's Leadership Styles and Students' Academic Performance in Enugu Metropolis: A Comparative Survey of Public and Mission Secondary Schools. *Archives of Business Research*, 5(8), 7-30.
- Ketrah, A. A., Musa, M., & Abdu, W. J. (2023). Leadership styles and academic performance of pupils in selected public primary schools: a case of selected schools in Jinja, Uganda. *Leadership*, 4(2).
- Khan, M., & Shaheen, A. (2016). The Leadership Role of Secondary School Principals and Its Impact on Students' Academic Achievement. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1).
- Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I., & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Leadership styles, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff in public universities. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), 253-268.
- Kayode, D. J., & Naicker, S. R. (2021). Distributed Leadership and Administrative Processes as Determinants of Public Universities' Effectiveness. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 16(5), 2070-2090.
- Adole, O. M. (2024). Enhancing leadership in higher education management: Strategies for effective governance. *AMAMIHE Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 22(5).
- Javed, T., Sabir, S. A., & Bukhari, S. I. (2023). Tertiary education performance influenced by administrative leadership, entrepreneurial orientation with moderating role managerial ties. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Venturing*, 3(1).

- Alzoraiki, M., Ahmad, A. R., Ateeq, A., & Milhem, M. (2024, July). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing school culture and teaching performance in Yemeni public schools. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 9, p. 1413607). Frontiers Media SA.
- Tunsisa, B., Demissie, D., Lemma, S., & Legesse, T. (2025). School leaders' commitment to improving students' academic performance in secondary schools of Sidama regional state, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership*, 32(1), 53-79.
- Kemethofer, D., Helm, C., & Warwas, J. (2025). Does educational leadership enhance instructional quality and student achievement? The case of Austrian primary school leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(3), 461-485.
- DiPaola, M., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2004). School principals and special education: Creating the context for academic success. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 37(1), 1-10.
- Tintoré, M., Gairín, J., Cabral, I., Matias Alves, J., & Serrão Cunha, R. (2022). Management model, leadership and autonomy in Portuguese and Spanish public schools: A comparative analysis. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2105553.
- Shulhan, M. (2018). Leadership style in the madrasah in Tulungagung: how principals enhance teacher's performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(4), 641-651.
- Steele, J. L., Steiner, E. D., & Hamilton, L. S. (2021). Priming the leadership pipeline: School performance and climate under an urban school leadership residency program. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(2), 221-256.
- Yahya, S. A. (2015). *Leadership Styles, Types and Students' Academic Achievement in Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia).
- Hamidifar, F., & Ebrahimi, M. (2016). Academic Leadership in a Private University: An Iranian Case Study. *International Education Studies*, 9(5), 193-203.
- Namutebi, E. (2019). Instructional leadership and lecturers' job performance in public universities in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 93-118.
- Hou, Y., Cui, Y., & Zhang, D. (2019). Impact of instructional leadership on high school student academic achievement in China. *Asia Pacific education review*, 20(4), 543-558.

- Mirsultan, N., & Marimuthu, T. (2021). The relationship of transformational and transactional principal leadership on teacher job satisfaction and secondary student performance in Subang Jaya, Malaysia. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 10(3), 241-256.
- Nyagaka, E., & Ajowi, J. O. (2013). Leadership styles of headteachers and their impact on students' academic performance in secondary schools, Nyamaiya Division, Nyamira District, Kenya.
- Bellon, E. O., Ngware, M. W., & Admassu, K. (2017). The role of parental leadership in academic performance: A case of pupils in the Free Primary Education Program in Kenya. *Education and Urban Society*, 49(1), 110-130.