



RESEARCH PAPER

Role of Transformational Leadership in Faculty Achievement: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment and the Moderating Role of Organizational Culture

¹Ali Nisar*, ²Abu Hurairah Siddiqui and ³Naila Riaz

1. MS HRM, Department of Management Sciences, Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University, Islamabad
2. Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Iqra University, Islamabad
3. MS HRM, Department of Management Sciences, Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University, Islamabad, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author**

a.nisarkiani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of leadership in higher education has become a critical concern, particularly in public sector universities operating under bureaucratic and resource-constrained environments. This study examines the role of transformational leadership in enhancing faculty achievement, with a focus on the mediating effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and the moderating influence of organizational culture. A quantitative research design was employed, and data were collected from 314 faculty members working in public sector universities in Islamabad. The study utilized PLS-SEM to test the measurement and structural models. The results indicate that TL has a significant positive impact on FA, JS, and OCo. JS emerged as a strong mediator in the relationship between leadership and FA, while OCo showed a weaker but significant mediating effect. OC was found to moderate the relationship between TL and JS, although it did not significantly moderate the relationship with OCo. The findings suggest that leadership effectiveness in higher education is largely dependent on faculty attitudes and institutional context. This study contributes to leadership theory by integrating psychological and contextual variables into a unified model and offers practical insights for policymakers and academic leaders aiming to improve faculty performance in public universities.

KEYWORDS Transformational Leadership, Faculty Achievement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Culture, Higher Education, Public Sector Universities

Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are widely recognized as critical drivers of economic development, knowledge creation, and societal progress. They are at the center of the development of qualified human capital, innovation, and national competitiveness in a more globalized world (Baltaretu et al., 2025; Kioupi et al., 2025). In this regard, faculty performance is a defining factor of institutional success as faculty directly affect the quality of teaching, the output of research and academic leadership (Mascret et al., 2017; Mansoor et al., 2024).

In developing nations like Pakistan, the higher education systems depend on the public sector universities. In the last twenty years, there has been significant investment in the growth of higher education infrastructure, the production of more doctors, and the accessibility of education (Higher Education Commission [HEC], 2023). In spite of these

reforms, faculty performance, especially in terms of research output, innovation, and global scholarly participation, has not yet reached international standards (Khan et al., 2025; Rasool et al., 2024). The continued gap implies that structural changes are not enough to improve academic performance and that more organization and leadership-related aspects should be taken into consideration.

The most significant yet least researched aspects of faculty performance in state universities are the style of leadership. The Pakistani higher education institutions are traditionally characterized by bureaucratic, centralized, and compliance-oriented leadership that puts an emphasis on administrative control, but not on academic empowerment (Ather and Awan, 2021; Lodhi, 2016). Such leadership types are not necessarily aligned with the features of academic work, which makes independence, ingenuity, and self-motivation presuppositions (Bolden et al., 2019; Nguyen et al., 2020). As a result, the faculty members tend to show discontent, demoralization, and no interest in research and innovations (Ali et al., 2024; Rasool et al., 2024).

On the other hand, the transformational leadership (TL) has been found to be a more effective leadership style within knowledge-based organizations such as universities. TL, based on the works of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), is concerned with vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The results of such leadership have been discovered to create more satisfied employees, loyal to their organization, and more efficient when they are led in this manner, which is particularly important in academic institutions where intellectual stimulation and professional autonomy play a key role (Nguyen et al., 2020; Jabbar et al., 2024). However, as much as the positive impacts that TL has had in the literature on the world have been well-documented, the appropriateness and effectiveness of the same in the bureaucratic and resource-constrained setting at the Pakistani state universities have not been sufficiently examined.

Notably, the correlation between faculty achievement (FA) and leadership is not only direct, but it is a complicated psychological and organizational phenomenon. The attitudes of faculty members, including job satisfaction (JS) and organizational commitment (OCo), are essential in the process of transforming the leadership practices into the actual performance outcomes (Mukhtar et al., 2025; Mahmood et al., 2023). JS is the affective and cognitive evaluation of the working conditions by the members of the faculty, and the OCo is the enduring attachment and loyalty of the members to the organization (Herzberg, 1965; Meyer and Allen, 1991). The variables influence the level of workforce, persistence and participation of the faculty in the academic work.

At the same time, the OC is also an important contextual variable that can either facilitate or restrain the efficacy of leadership. OC, when it comes to universities in the public sector, is usually affected by hierarchy, centralized decision-making, and resistance to change (Schein, 2010; Rasool et al., 2024). Such cultural attributes may destroy the positive impact of TL since they limit the faculty's autonomy and participation in institutional processes. Thus, it is necessary to know the moderating effect of OC to explain the differences in leadership outcomes in various institutional environments.

Although these dynamics are increasingly being considered, direct relationships between leadership and performance have dominated existing studies in the Pakistani context of higher education, with little emphasis on mediating and moderating processes. This is an important gap in the literature, since it does not take into consideration the mechanisms by which leadership affects FA and the circumstances in which such effects are enhanced or attenuated.

To address this gap, the present study develops an integrated framework to examine the role of TL in enhancing FA in public sector universities in Islamabad. Specifically, the study investigates (1) the direct impact of TL on FA, (2) the mediating roles of JS and OCo, and (3) the moderating effect of OC on leadership–faculty relationships. By combining these elements into a unified model, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive and context-sensitive understanding of leadership effectiveness in higher education.

The findings of this research are expected to contribute to both theory and practice. Theoretically, the study extends leadership literature by integrating psychological and contextual variables into the analysis of faculty performance. Practically, it offers insights for academic leaders and policymakers seeking to improve faculty outcomes through more effective leadership strategies and organizational reforms in public universities.

Literature Review

Transformational Leadership in Higher Education

The style of leadership is a crucial factor in organizational performance, especially in knowledge-based institutions like universities. TL has become the most applicable in academic settings within the Full Range Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). In contrast to transactional leadership, which is based on supervision and reward-based exchange, TL is aimed at the inspiration of the followers, encouragement of innovation and alignment of personal goals with organizational vision (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

TL works especially well in the field of higher education because faculty work is autonomous and intellectual in nature. Academic staff are not ordinary employees, but knowledge workers who teach, do research, and engage in scholarly work, which requires creativity and intrinsic motivation (Bolden et al., 2019; Middlehurst, 2018). Empirical research has further revealed that TL has a positive impact on faculty outcomes, including JS, OCo, research productivity and innovative behavior (Nguyen et al., 2020; Khan et al., 2023a; Jabbar et al., 2024).

Nonetheless, when it comes to the Pakistani public universities, the leadership practices are very bureaucratic and compliance-based. The problem of centralized decision-making, political intervention, and administrative inflexibility restricts the leadership performance and faculty participation (Ather and Awan, 2021; Rasool et al., 2024; Mehmood et al., 2025). This discrepancy between the leadership style and academic activity points to the necessity to study TL in this particular institutional environment.

Faculty Achievement in Higher Education

FA is characterized by the multidimensional construct of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, professional development, and institutional service (Mascret et al., 2017; Mansoor et al., 2024). Unlike the traditional performance metrics, which take into account only the output, such as publications or citations, the new literature is concerned with achievement-based perceptions, which involve effort, improvement, and contextual limitations (Woelert, 2023; Bukhari et al., 2024).

In state-funded institutions of higher learning, particularly in developing countries, the organizational aspect often comes at the expense of faculty performance, such as inadequate research funds, heavy teaching load, and heavy administrative workload (Rasool et al., 2024; Rafique et al., 2025; Bukhari & Mujaddid, 2025). Such limitations

necessitate the need to take into consideration objective and subjective aspects of faculty contribution.

The central role of leadership in the achievement of the faculty is based on its influence on motivation, allocation of resources and support of the institution. Transformational leaders can solve the structural limitations by facilitating a healthy academic environment, collaboration, and compensating faculty efforts (Khan et al., 2023a; Mansoor et al., 2024). Faculty success is therefore not only a result of individual competency, but also leadership behavior and organization climate.

Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Mechanism

JS is defined as the general assessment of a person regarding his or her job, and it can include both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects, including autonomy, recognition, working conditions, and the possibility of career growth (Herzberg, 1965; Mahmood et al., 2023; Uddin, 2016). In educational institutions, intellectual freedom and meaningful work are especially essential determinants of satisfaction.

JS is based on the Two-Factor Theory proposed by Herzberg that motivation and performance depend on the psychological states in addition to external conditions (Ahmad et al., 2020; Rabbani & Sarmad, 2019). TL improves JS by establishing a positive and empowering working environment, fostering trust, and acknowledging personal efforts (Mukhtar et al., 2025; Jabbar et al., 2024).

Empirical evidence suggests that JS is a mechanism through which leadership influences performance outcomes. Satisfied faculty members will be more inclined to show increased engagement, creativity, and output (Nguyen et al., 2020; Sarwar et al., 2025). Conversely, the effect of leadership and the improvement of academic performance may be undermined by dissatisfaction that may arise due to bureaucratic limitations and the absence of recognition (Rasool et al., 2024).

Organizational Commitment as a Mediating Mechanism

OC_o is a psychological bond between employees and their institution and determines their readiness to work towards organizational objectives (Meyer and Allen, 1991). It is often theorized in three dimensions, namely affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

OC_o is especially relevant in higher education by virtue of the long-range and identity-oriented academic career. Emotionally committed faculty members have a higher chance of putting effort into teaching, research, and service activities (Nawaz et al., 2019).

TL enhances commitment to the organization through trust, shared vision and professional identity (Ali et al., 2020; Yaseen et al., 2025). But, in contrast to JS, which is an immediate experience of work, commitment is built up over time and is dependent on the cumulative organizational experiences (Bohorquez, 2014).

The empirical research indicates that the OC_o intervenes in the association between leadership and performance, but the impact is not as strong as that of JS (Nguyen et al., 2020; Kausar & Qayyum, 2018). This implies that although commitment is a factor in generating long-term engagement, it might not yield direct performance results.

Organizational Culture as a Moderating Factor

An OC is defined as the common values, beliefs and practices that determine behavior in an institution (Schein, 2010). Culture affects decision-making processes, patterns of communication and autonomy levels of faculty in higher education.

Hierarchical structures, centralized authority, and resistance to change are typical features of the OC of the public sector universities (Rasool et al., 2024). These cultural features may be a limitation to leadership performance by reducing flexibility and creativity.

OC plays a moderating role that is very important in interpreting the results of leadership. TL can be supported by a participatory and supportive culture, therefore, fostering collaboration and willingness to change. On the other hand, a strict and bureaucratic culture can undermine the impact of leadership by establishing obstacles to implementation (Sulkowski and Kaczorowska-Spychalska, 2025; Kausar et al., 2021).

Although it is significant, the moderating role of OC has not been given much empirical attention in the Pakistani higher education setting, especially concerning faculty attitudes and achievement.

The current literature demonstrates the role of TL in enhancing the outcome of the faculty, but there are still a number of gaps. To begin with, most of the studies are concerned with direct links between leadership and performance, disregarding the mediating impact of psychological variables like JS and OCo. Second, little attention has been paid to the contextual impact of OC, especially that of bureaucratic and resource-constrained contexts.

In addition, the current studies on leadership in Pakistani higher education are still disjointed and have no combined models that can be used to understand the complexity of academic organizations. This paper fills these gaps by suggesting an integrated framework that incorporates direct, mediating, and moderating relationships to explain FA.

The study offers a more comprehensive view of the way in which leadership functions in the context of the particular organization, which is a university in the public sector of Islamabad, through the incorporation of leadership, motivation, commitment and culture into a single model.

Material and Methods

This research design was a quantitative study that was used to investigate the relationships between TL, FA, JS, OCo, and OC in the universities in the public sector. It was believed that a survey-based method was suitable because it allows gathering standardized data with a rather large sample and statistically testing the hypothesized relationships (Creswell, 2014). The research was deductive in nature and was based on the established theory frameworks such as the Full Range Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985), Herzberg Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1965), Meyer and Allen Theory (Meyer and Allen, 1991) and Schein's Theory (Schein, 2010).

The target population was a group of faculty members in the Islamabad public sector universities in Pakistan. These institutions were chosen because they are at the heart of the national system of higher education and because they represent the model of bureaucratic and centralized systems of governance. The non-probability convenience

sampling method was used because of the accessibility factor and the scholarly profile of the respondents. There were 314 valid responses collected, which is deemed adequate to perform Structural Equation Modeling and is recommended that adequate to use PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2019). Faculty with different academic ranks were sampled, which helped in the diversification of the sample in terms of experience and professional background.

A structured questionnaire that had been based on validated scales in previous research was used to collect the data to guarantee content validity and reliability. This instrument was used to measure five constructs, which are TL, JS, OCo, OC, and FA. Reflective indicators were used to operationalize all constructs on a five-point Likert scale ranging between strongly disagree and strongly agree. TL was evaluated on the basis of the inspirational motivational dimension, intellectual stimulation dimension, and individualized consideration dimension. JS was used to measure intrinsic and extrinsic elements of work, whereas OCo was used to show the psychological attachment of the members of the faculty to their institution. OC was understood as common norms and practices, and the success of the faculty was assessed by self-reported measures of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and academic contribution.

To make sure that the questionnaire is clear and reliable, a pilot study was carried out before data collection was done on a large scale. Some minor revisions were made according to the respondent feedback. Ethics were also taken care of, such as voluntary participation, informed consent and anonymity of responses.

The analysis of data was performed with the help of PLS-SEM via SmartPLS software. This approach was chosen because it is appropriate to analyze complex models with multiple constructs, mediating and moderating relationships, and it is strong to analyze non-normal data distributions (Hair et al., 2019). The process of the analysis was two-step, which entailed measuring the model of measurement and evaluating the structural model.

To achieve reliability and validity, the measurement model was evaluated. Factor loadings were used to measure the reliability of the indicators, and all values were above the suggested threshold of 0.70. Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability were used to check internal consistency reliability, and both had a value above 0.70. The average variance extracted (AVE) was used to determine convergent validity with a value of above 0.50, which means that the constructs explained a significant amount of variance in their indicators. The Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio was used to determine the discriminant validity, and all the values were less than 0.85, which proved that the constructs were empirically different.

The structural model was then tested to test the relationships that were hypothesized. Bootstrapping procedures generated path coefficients, t-statistics and p-values to identify the significance of direct effects. To determine the explanatory power of the model, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was used. The mediation analysis was used to test the indirect impact of TL on FA via JS and OCo, and the moderation analysis was used to test the interaction effect of OC on the relationships between leadership and faculty attitudes. The methodological approach, in general, was rigorous and robust in testing the proposed research model and offered credible evidence on explaining the interaction between leadership, faculty attitudes, and achievement in the public sector universities.

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N = 314)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	186	59.2%
	Female	128	40.8%
Age	20-30 years	35	11.1%
	31-40 years	110	35.0%
	41-50 years	114	36.3%
	50+ years	55	17.5%
Qualification	Graduation	26	8.3%
	Master	129	41.1%
	MS/MPhil	108	34.4%
	PhD	36	11.5%
	Professional Degree	15	4.8%
Designation	Lecturer	74	23.6%
	Assistant Professor	118	37.6%
	Associate Professor	96	30.6%
	Professor	26	8.3%

The sample was mostly male (59.2%), but the number of female faculty was also significant (40.8%). The sample used was mature and experienced, with most of the respondents being mid-career academics with ages ranging between 31-50 years. Most of them possessed postgraduate degrees (Master's and MPhil), and the vast majority of the respondents were assistant and associate professors, so it was represented at all academic levels.

Table 2
Reliability and Convergent Validity

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Faculty Achievement (FA)	0.961	0.967	0.786
Job Satisfaction (JS)	0.956	0.962	0.738
Organizational Commitment (OCo)	0.957	0.963	0.743
Organizational Culture (OC)	0.959	0.965	0.731
Transformational Leadership (TL)	0.961	0.967	0.765

Internal consistency was excellent in all constructs, and Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability were above the suggested level of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019). All constructs had AVE values that were greater than 0.50, which validated high convergent validity.

Table 3
Discriminant Validity (HTMT Ratios)

Constructs	FA	JS	OC	OCo	TL
JS	0.801	-			
OC	0.740	0.617	-		
OCo	0.487	0.428	0.495	-	
TL	0.817	0.823	0.685	0.468	-

All the values of the HTMT are below the 0.85 threshold value that ensures sufficient discriminant validity. This implies that the constructs are empirically differentiated and they have different theoretical concepts.

Structural Model

The structural model demonstrated significant explanatory power with $R^2 = 0.690$ in FA and $R^2 = 0.646$ in JS, which means that the model is able to explain a large percentage of variance in the key dependent variables.

Table 4
Direct Path Coefficients

Relationship	β	T-value	P-value	Result
TL \rightarrow FA	0.434	3.752	0.000	Supported
TL \rightarrow JS	0.694	8.078	0.000	Supported
TL \rightarrow OCo	0.245	3.206	0.001	Supported
JS \rightarrow FA	0.380	3.317	0.001	Supported
OCo \rightarrow FA	0.117	2.158	0.031	Supported
OC \rightarrow JS	0.085	1.135	0.257	Not Supported
OC \rightarrow OCo	0.298	3.533	0.000	Supported

TL showed a high and meaningful positive impact on FA ($\beta = 0.434$) and thus affirmed its pivotal position in improving academic performance. It also exerted the most influence on JS ($\beta = 0.694$), so it can be concluded that leadership has the greatest impact on faculty through psychological processes. FA was strongly affected by JS ($\beta = 0.380$), and OCo had a less pronounced but still significant impact ($\beta = 0.117$). OC did not have a significant direct impact on JS, but had a significant positive correlation with OCo.

Table 5
Mediation Effects

Path	β	T-value	P-value	Result
TL \rightarrow JS \rightarrow FA	0.263	3.512	0.000	Supported
TL \rightarrow OCo \rightarrow FA	0.029	2.127	0.033	Supported

The relationship between TL and FA was found to be mediated by JS, and the indirect effect was relatively high ($\beta = 0.263$). This means that leadership has the benefit of boosting faculty performance through the increase of satisfaction levels. OCo also mediated the relationship, although with a smaller effect ($\beta = 0.029$), indicating that commitment has a secondary, long-term impact on the leadership-performance relationship.

Table 6
Moderation Effects

Relationship	β	T-value	P-value	Result
OC \times TL \rightarrow JS	-0.084	2.114	0.035	Supported
OC \times TL \rightarrow OCo	-0.026	0.586	0.558	Not Supported

The relationship between TL and JS was moderate through OC, and the coefficient was negative ($\beta = -0.084$). This implies that positive leadership influence on JS is undermined in more inflexible or bureaucratic cultural settings. Nevertheless, the OC did not strongly mediate the connection between leadership and OCo.

All in all, the findings substantiate the fact that TL is a major contributor to FA, both directly and indirectly, via JS and OCo. JS plays a leading role as a mediator, and OC is a situational element that can undermine leadership performance under specific circumstances.

Discussion

The results of this research are solid empirical evidence of the centrality of transformational leadership in improving the achievement of faculty in the public sector universities. The positive correlation of TL and faculty achievement is significantly positive, which proves the effectiveness of the leadership practices that rely on inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration in the academic context. This finding is in line with previous research (Nguyen et al., 2020; Khan et al., 2023a), which states that TL is suitable for the autonomous and knowledge-driven faculty work. TL seems

to create a more facilitative atmosphere for academic productivity, as opposed to bureaucratic and transactional leadership that is widely prevalent in Pakistani universities.

One of the contributions of this study is that it proves that the impact of leadership on the achievement of the faculty is not only direct but mostly passes through psychological processes, especially Job satisfaction. The mediating power of JS is strong, which implies that the faculty members react well to the leadership practices when they believe that their working environment is favorable, meaningful, and rewarding. This observation supports the Two-Factor Theory by Herzberg (Herzberg, 1965), which highlights the significance of intrinsic motivators like recognition, autonomy, and professional development. As it was in prior studies (Jabbar et al., 2024; Mukhtar et al., 2025), the findings show that the satisfied faculty members are more involved in teaching, research, and academic development, which eventually results in greater achievement.

OCo also proved a strong mediator, but its impact was not as strong as that of JS. This observation implies that although commitment plays a role in the achievement of the faculty, the effect is more long-term and gradual. OCo, as opposed to JS, which involves immediate work experiences, is formed during the prolonged relationships with the institution and the leadership (Meyer and Allen, 1991). This is in line with previous research (Nguyen et al., 2020), which points out commitment as a stabilizing variable that improves retention and long-term engagement instead of immediate performance results. The relatively low effect size found in this study implies that instant motivational elements like satisfaction might be more important in affecting faculty performance, in a resource-constrained and bureaucratic setting, than long-term attachment.

The other significant study finding is the moderating influence of OC. The findings demonstrate that OC undermines the association between TL and JS. This is a negative moderation effect implying that, despite the leadership who practice TL, their effectiveness may be limited by strict, hierarchical, and bureaucratic cultures. The discovery is especially applicable to the situation in the public sector universities in Pakistan, where centralized decision-making, the unwillingness to change, and the administrative control are likely to prevail in institutional practices (Rasool et al., 2024). It helps to prove the idea suggested by Schein (2010) that OC may facilitate or prevent leadership performance based on its correspondence to leadership behaviors.

Remarkably, the OC did not play a major role in mediating the relationship between TL and OCo. This implies that culture may have an impact on short-term attitudinal responses such as JS, but not on the deeper psychological variables such as commitment. As it happens, contextual constraints do not have as much influence on commitment as cumulative experiences and long-term perspectives of institutional support do. This finding adds a certain degree of complexity to the existing body of knowledge since it shows that the attitude of different faculty members responds in varied ways to cultural situations.

Together, the study indicates the relevance of the combined strategy of leadership effectiveness within the sphere of higher education. TL cannot fully enhance FA unless positive attitudes of the faculty and favorable OC exist. The findings point out the fact that leadership interventions are to be supported with efforts to improve JS and transform the institutional culture to bring in long-term positive alterations in academic performance.

Theoretically, the research has been a contribution to the literature of leadership by incorporating mediating and moderating variables into one conceptual framework to give a more holistic view of the role of leadership in the outcomes of faculty. Practically, the

results imply that university administrators ought not only to strive to build leadership potential but also to establish conducive work environments and overcome cultural impediments that diminish the success of leadership practices.

Conclusion

This research paper has explored how transformational leadership can be used to improve faculty performance in the public sector universities, with specific references to the mediating variables of JS and OCo and the moderating variable of OC. The results give solid evidence that TL is a vital factor that determines faculty success directly and indirectly via faculty attitudes.

The findings indicate that TL can be used to a large extent to enhance faculty performance through a conducive and encouraging workplace. JS was the most significant mediating variable, which suggests that the faculty performance is strongly affected by the way people view their working conditions. The mediating role of OCo was also present, but the strength of its influence was relatively lower, which indicates that it is more likely to lead to long-term engagement than short-term performance results. Moreover, the research findings indicated that OC mediates the relationship between leadership and JS, which is why situational variables are significant in influencing leadership performance.

On the whole, the analysis proves that leadership performance in higher education cannot be viewed in isolation. Rather, it is the product of the interaction of the leadership practices, the attitudes of the faculty and the institutional context. Even effective leadership in the face of bureaucratic and resource-constrained settings like the public sector university in Pakistan may not be able to produce the best results unless it is backed up with a favorable OC and positive faculty perceptions.

Recommendations

Theoretically, the study is valuable to the literature because it integrates leadership, motivation, commitment and culture into one frame. It builds upon the existing studies by going beyond direct-effect models and showing the significance of mediating and moderating mechanisms in explaining FA. This mixed approach provides a better understanding of the effectiveness of leadership in the field of higher education, specifically in developing countries.

In practice, the findings can be fruitfully applied by university administrators, policymakers and academic leaders in a variety of ways. First, it is required to popularize TL practices on all academic management levels. The development programs on leadership should be aimed at improving the skills of vision-building, faculty empowerment, mentorship, and intellectual stimulation. Such practices can be used to improve faculty performance and motivation.

Second, universities are to work on the improvement of JS. This may be achieved by providing greater autonomy, the importance of the faculty, fair promotion, and reduction of the administrative burden. JS is the most influential on FA, and slight positive changes in working conditions can lead to high performance.

Third, OCo needs to be improved by making the faculty members feel that they belong, are trusted, and have a purpose. The faculty can be more dedicated to the organization and increase long-term engagement through open governance, consultative decision-making and institutional reinforcement.

Fourth, the leadership influence could be optimized through addressing the OC. Universities should do their best to reduce bureaucratic rigidity, encourage creativity, and establish free communication. A supportive and flexible culture can amplify the positive effects of TL, and even the most effective leadership practices can be overturned by a restrictive culture.

On the policy level, the higher education authorities need to know that structural changes and resource allocation are not sufficient to improve academic performance. The quality of leadership, faculty welfare, and cultural change in institutions should be given more attention. Leadership development and institutional governance reform policies can be an important factor in improving faculty outcomes.

To sum up, this paper highlights the value of a comprehensive approach to enhancing faculty success in higher education. With the alignment of leadership practices with the needs of the faculty and the context of the organization, the public sector universities can establish an environment that promotes academic excellence, innovation and sustainable institutional growth.

References

- Ahmad, M., Bilal, M., & Bibi, N. (2020). Impact of JS on employee performance: Evidence from the higher education sector. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 7(2), 45–60.
- Ali, Z., Rasool, S. F., & Usmani, S. (2024). Leadership practices and faculty outcomes in public universities of Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 15(3), 112–130.
- Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (2016). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. World Bank Publications.
- Ather, S. M., & Awan, S. H. (2021). Leadership challenges in public sector universities of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 38(1), 23–40.
- Bashir, S., Jabeen, F., & Amin, S. (2023). Political influence and leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions. *Asian Journal of Management*, 14(2), 89–104.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Becker, G. S. (1975). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bohorquez, V. (2014). OCo: A review of theoretical frameworks. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(3), 45–60.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2019). Distributed leadership in higher education: Rhetoric and reality. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(2), 200–216.
- Bruno, A. (2025). Academic leadership and faculty performance in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Policy*, 38(1), 75–95.
- Bukhari, S. R. H., & Mujaddid, G. (2025). Strategic ceasefire or tactical deception: A geopolitical analysis of the Iran, Israel, US crisis in 2025. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 146–156.
- Bukhari, S. R. H., Khan, A. U., & Haq, I. U. (2024). Babari Masjid chronicles: Modi's ideology not embracing Ayodhya spirit and India's future. *Spry Contemporary Educational Practices*, 3(1).
- Bukhari, S. R. H., Khan, A. U., & Haq, I. U. (2024). Beyond Ukraine: Examining the potential for great power competition in Africa. *Spry Contemporary Educational Practices*, 3(1).
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gafoor, K. A., & Mirani, R. (2024). Measuring faculty performance in higher education. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 61(2), 145–162.

- Guvhu, W. (2025). Institutional leadership and academic productivity in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 92, 102–118.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Herzberg, F. (1965). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing.
- Higher Education Commission (HEC). (2023). *Annual report on higher education in Pakistan*. HEC Pakistan.
- Jabbar, A., Khan, M. A., & Manzoor, F. (2024). Transformational leadership and faculty performance in universities. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 55–70.
- Kausar, R., & Qayyum, A. (2018). How cash flow news and discount rate news impact the unexpected stock returns of energy firms of Pakistan.
- Kausar, R., Khan, I., Khan, M. T., Perdana, A. I., & Siddique, M. (2021). The impact of financial inclusion on the stability of monetary policy of the South Asian countries: Panel ARDL approach. *Webology*, 18(5).
- Khan, M. A., & Sarosh, M. (2025). Faculty motivation and academic performance in public universities. *Journal of Education Policy Analysis*, 17(1), 1–20.
- Khan, M. A., Waqar, S., & Raza, H. (2023a). Leadership style and faculty productivity in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Studies*, 13(2), 78–92.
- Khan, M. A. (2023b). Governance and leadership challenges in Pakistani universities. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(1), 15–30.
- Kioupi, V., Voulvoulis, N. (2025). Education for sustainable development and global competitiveness. *International Journal of Sustainability in Education*, 26(1), 89–104.
- Lodhi, S. (2016). Bureaucratic leadership in higher education institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Management Sciences*, 10(2), 33–45.
- Mahmood, A., Kanwal, N., & Pervez, A. (2023). JS and employee performance in academic institutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(3), 210–225.
- Mahmood, M., Alam, N., & Khan, M. L. (2025). Instagram usage intensity, self-esteem, and body image satisfaction among undergraduate students. *Journal for Current Sign*, 3(2), 500–524.
- Mansoor, A., Rehman, H., & Ali, S. (2024). Faculty performance and institutional effectiveness. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 95(3), 345–362.
- Mascrot, N., Elliot, A. J., & Cury, F. (2017). Achievement motivation in educational settings. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(2), 365–395.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of OCo. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Middlehurst, R. (2018). Changing leadership in universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 72(3), 261–274.

- Mukhtar, S., Ahmed, Z., & Qureshi, M. (2025). Leadership and JS in academia. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 46(1), 120–135.
- Nawaz, M. S. (2019). OCo in academic institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(4), 567–582.
- Nguyen, T., Mia, L., Winata, L., & Chong, V. K. (2020). Transformational leadership and organizational performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(7), 1340–1355.
- Rabbani, S., & Sarmad, M. (2019). Revealing mediating role of creative self-efficacy between climate for creativity and creativity: Empirical evidence from R&D of IT sector, Pakistan. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(1).
- Rafique, M., Rehman, A., & Rahman, S. (2025). Challenges in higher education performance measurement. *Education and Training*, 67(2), 210–225.
- Rasool, S. F., Usmani, S., & Dilshad, M. (2024). Faculty challenges in public sector universities of Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Work*, 37(4), 456–472.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Sulkowski, L., & Kaczorowska-Spychalska, D. (2025). Organizational culture and innovation in universities. *Management Decision*, 63(2), 310–325.
- Teferra, D. (2020). Leadership in African higher education. *International Higher Education*, 100, 12–14.
- Uddin, S. S. (2016). Security dilemma of Pakistan in the context of Afghanistan: A regional trilateral solution. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 55(2), 89–100.
- Woelert, P. (2023). Academic performance measurement and evaluation systems. *Higher Education Policy*, 36(1), 1–20.
- Yaseen, A. (2025). Transformational leadership and OCo. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 19(1), 88–102.