

Impact of Organizational Setting on Leading by Influence in a Higher Education Organization.

Dr. Baiju Antony¹, Dr. Licy K G²

^{1,2}De Paul College, Mysore

¹baijuacm@gmail.com, ²licyliz44@gmail.com

Abstract

Leading by influence shapes the organizational behavior of a higher education institution and develops its quality culture. Collective efficacy (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) of the members of these educational organizations impacts positively in developing their academic culture and outcomes. While collective efficacy effects such an ideal organizational setting, process, and results, the leadership that promotes them is also crucially important (Versland & Erickson, 2017).

Leading by influence within a higher education ecosystem takes into consideration multiple factors that define its actual organizational setting. The present study analyzes the impact of organizational factors like knowledge, experience, skills, and the attitude of those within the academic ecosystem in shaping the leadership patterns and its influence on the academic culture. This qualitative study includes interviews with top and middle level leaders of 20 higher education institutions. The analysis shows that the years of leadership experience and educational background of the leaders and the number of years of teaching, the educational background and the attitude towards organization of teachers impact positively the leading by influence within a higher education ecosystem.

Keywords: Organizational Setting, Leadership by Influence, Collective Efficacy, Academic Culture, Leadership Experience, Faculty Attitude

1. Introduction

Higher education is experiencing a profound transformation, driven by rapid technological advancements, evolving pedagogical practices, and shifting societal expectations. In this dynamic environment, traditional hierarchical leadership models—rooted in authority and control—are increasingly inadequate. Instead, a paradigm shift is underway, emphasizing influence-based leadership that fosters trust, collaboration, and shared vision.

Leading by influence in higher education organizations represents a critical dimension of academic leadership that is profoundly shaped by the unique organizational characteristics and contextual factors inherent in these institutions. Educational leadership is built on the premise of constructing and applying knowledge in ways that make a positive difference (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Through collaboration and communication, professionals in educational leadership work with diverse communities and build partnerships to promote positive outcomes by setting and meeting transformative goals. The organizational setting of higher education institutions creates distinct challenges and opportunities for influence-based leadership that differ significantly from traditional corporate environments.

Leaders in higher education institutions directly or indirectly influence the academic world by using their unique experiences, teaching, and research skills (Northouse, 2021), yet this influence operates within complex organizational structures that require nuanced understanding and adaptive approaches.

The effectiveness of influence-based leadership in higher education is contingent upon multiple organizational factors that shape how leaders can motivate, inspire, and guide their academic communities toward shared goals. It is also important to acknowledge that people within the academic community influence one another, leading to collective efficacy (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) in an organization.

Higher education organizations possess distinctive structural characteristics that fundamentally impact how influence operates within these settings. This heroic model of leadership is now being challenged by the idea of distributed leadership, which recognizes a division of labour for leadership like the more general division of labour in schools (Spillane et al., 2004). Rather than a single heroic leader, the distributed approach sees leadership as a set of activities in which the initiators and recipients of influence are constantly changing based on expertise, context, and situational demands. The evolution of leadership theories shows a quantum leap from the “Great Man Theory” to more behavioral theories demonstrating that leadership traits can be learned and applied across various circumstances (Gronn, 2002).

Shared leadership involves distributing leadership responsibilities across various members of the educational community (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This collaborative approach is particularly relevant in higher education where faculty autonomy and academic freedom are foundational principles. The organizational setting of universities and colleges typically features flat hierarchies and collegial governance structures that require leaders to rely more heavily on influence rather than formal authority to achieve institutional objectives.

This chapter delves into the evolving nature of leadership within higher education institutions, particularly in the Indian context. Drawing upon qualitative interviews with 20 senior academic leaders, including principals, faculty members, and administrators, the study explores how personal attributes of leaders and members of these institutions—such as knowledge, experience, skills, and attitudes—interact within the organizational setting and shape leadership practices. The aim is to understand how these leaders navigate their roles beyond formal authority, leveraging influence to cultivate high-performing, collaborative academic cultures.

2. Literature Review

Academic Culture and Professional Autonomy

The organizational culture of higher education institutions significantly shapes how influence-based leadership operates. Whether one works at the higher levels of leadership or at the department levels, the influence as an educational leader is pivotal (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). With the right leadership approach, one can create a learning environment that promotes academic excellence, adaptability, and creativity. However, this influence must navigate the complex dynamics of academic culture, where faculty members value intellectual independence and scholarly inquiry.

An employee who trusts their leader is expected to have positive job satisfaction. Karadağ (2020) mentions that because there is a stronger acceptance and respect for authority in collective cultures, leaders create more influence in these collective cultures than in individualistic cultures. This cultural dimension

becomes particularly important in higher education settings where institutional culture may vary significantly between departments, schools, and national contexts. These specific characteristics of higher education play a crucial role in defining leading-by-influence culture and approaches.

Contextual Adaptation and Flexibility

The organizational setting of higher education institutions requires leaders to demonstrate exceptional contextual awareness and adaptability in their influence strategies. Evidence shows that good leaders behave differently depending on many factors (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987). These include the size of the school, grade levels served, student demographics, the community context, and state and local policies and resources. That suggests there is no single best model for leadership. This principle applies equally to higher education, where institutional type, size, mission, and culture all influence how leaders can effectively exercise influence.

Higher education leaders face many challenges specific to the context of the institution, and good leadership depends on proper understanding and effective responses to the context (Bush, 2018). Inspiring leaders may have high standards, a strong vision, and a clear understanding of their organizational environment. The effectiveness of influence-based leadership is contingent upon leaders' ability to read and respond to these contextual factors while maintaining authentic relationships with diverse stakeholders.

Stakeholder Complexity and Influence Networks

Higher education organizations are characterized by complex stakeholder networks that significantly impact how influence operates within these settings. It encompasses a wide range of roles and responsibilities, from setting strategic directions and goals to fostering a positive school culture and implementing policies that enhance teaching and learning (Northouse, 2021). The evolution of educational leadership has seen a shift from traditional, top-down management approaches to more collaborative and inclusive models.

The organizational setting requires leaders to navigate influence relationships with faculty, students, staff, governing boards, alumni, community partners, and regulatory bodies. Each stakeholder group has distinct expectations, communication preferences, and responsiveness to different influence strategies. Studies have found that the approach higher educational leaders take in making various decisions can have a powerful ripple effect throughout their faculty members, students, and even the broader community (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Transformational Leadership in Academic Settings

The organizational setting of higher education institutions appears particularly conducive to transformational leadership approaches that emphasize influence through inspiration and vision. Nguyen et al. (2021) found a high correlation between leadership and job satisfaction and stated that the leader's style is important (Karadağ, 2020). Shaari et al. (2022) found a relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and job satisfaction in their research on academic staff. Their ability to imagine and creatively plan, for example, can directly correlate to student success (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The organizational culture of higher education, with its emphasis on innovation, critical thinking, and

intellectual growth, provides fertile ground for transformational leaders who can influence through compelling visions of educational excellence and scholarly achievement.

Servant Leadership and Academic Values

The organizational setting of higher education institutions also creates favorable conditions for servant leadership approaches. Servant leaders seek to empower others, promote collaboration, and create a nurturing environment where everyone feels valued and respected (Northouse, 2021). This leadership style is particularly effective in fostering a positive school culture and has been effective at addressing disparities among students from underserved schools and neighborhoods.

The values embedded in higher education organizations—service to students, commitment to knowledge creation, and dedication to societal betterment—align naturally with servant leadership principles. This alignment enhances the effectiveness of influence-based leadership that prioritizes empowerment and development of others within the academic community.

Institutional Mission and Strategic Direction

The organizational setting's mission and strategic priorities significantly influence how leaders can effectively exercise influence. Whether it's improving access to education, enhancing student support services, or fostering innovation in teaching and learning, higher education leadership acknowledges the importance of the mission and orients others toward the urgency of implementation. Leaders operating within research-intensive universities face different influence challenges compared to those in community colleges or liberal arts institutions. The organizational setting's emphasis on research, teaching, or service creates distinct contexts that require tailored influence strategies and stakeholder engagement approaches.

Institutional Culture and Influence Receptivity

The organizational culture within higher education institutions significantly affects receptivity to different forms of influence. In line with research findings, it can be said that leadership is important in ensuring the job satisfaction of academic staff in collectivist cultures (Karadağ, 2020). The fact that institutions are seen as a family in collectivist cultures contributes to employees developing a sense of loyalty to the institution and management. As a result, the relationship between perceived leadership in higher education and job satisfaction is higher in collectivist cultures than in individualistic ones. These cultural dimensions within the organizational setting create varying conditions for influence-based leadership. Institutions with strong collaborative cultures may be more responsive to participatory influence strategies, while those with more hierarchical traditions might require different approaches to building influence and trust.

Navigating Academic Freedom and Institutional Goals

One of the most significant challenges in leading by influence within higher education organizations involves balancing respect for academic freedom with institutional goal achievement. Grounding your educational leadership strengths in ethics ensures that decisions are guided by a commitment to the well-being and holistic development of students (Northouse, 2021). It also fosters trust and credibility, which are essential for building strong, supportive relationships with key stakeholders, including professors, parents, university board members, and more. The organizational setting requires leaders to influence faculty and staff while maintaining respect for intellectual autonomy and academic traditions. This delicate

balance requires sophisticated influence strategies that align institutional needs with individual professional interests and scholarly pursuits.

Building Sustainable Change Capacity

The organizational setting of higher education institutions requires leaders to build sustainable capacity for change and innovation through influence-based approaches. An educational leader is responsible for fostering a culture of lifelong learning within the institution (Fullan, 2001). One's education symbolizes a dedication to ongoing growth and adaptability, ensuring the institution remains innovative and excellent. This involves creating organizational conditions that support continuous improvement, innovation, and adaptation. Leaders must influence not only current decisions and actions but also build institutional capacity for future leadership and change management.

Factors within the Organizational Setting

Leading by influence in higher education institutions is significantly shaped by critical personal and organizational factors like the education level of leaders and organizational members, their experience in higher education work, and their attitudes toward the organization. These interconnected elements create a complex dynamic that determines how effectively leaders can exercise influence within academic settings. Leaders in HEIs directly or indirectly influence the academic world by using their unique experiences, teaching, and research skills (Hoy & Miskel, 2008), yet the effectiveness of this influence is contingent upon the educational qualifications, experiential background, and organizational commitment of both leaders and followers within the institution.

The unique characteristics of higher education organizations require a nuanced understanding of how these factors interact to create conditions conducive to influence-based leadership. Academic leadership plays a critical role in fulfilling higher education institutions' missions, fostering a competent workforce, and becoming a key driver in unlocking the potential to achieve sustainability goals (Manfredi & Vickers, 2021). Understanding how education, experience, and organizational attitude shape this leadership is essential for developing effective leadership strategies in academic settings.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is anchored in the concepts of collective efficacy and influence-based leadership. Collective efficacy, as defined by Bandura, refers to a group's shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute actions required to achieve desired goals (Bandura, 1997). In educational settings, Hoy and Miskel (2008) emphasize that collective efficacy among faculty members is pivotal for fostering an environment conducive to innovation and transformation (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Leaders who nurture collective efficacy empower faculty and staff to collaborate effectively, aligning efforts towards common objectives and enhancing institutional performance. Research indicates that collective efficacy contributes to higher levels of organizational performance, reflected in improved faculty engagement, higher student achievement, and stronger institutional alignment (Bandura, 1997; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). By fostering a sense of shared purpose and mutual trust, leaders can create a culture where innovation thrives and challenges are met with collective resilience.

Influence-based leadership encompasses various models, including transformational, servant, and adaptive leadership. Versland and Erickson (2017) argue that influence arises not solely from positional

authority but from interpersonal trust, emotional intelligence, and participative decision-making. This approach is particularly relevant in academic settings, where expertise is decentralized and collaboration is essential. Transformational leadership, as conceptualized by Bass and Avolio (1994), involves inspiring followers through vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Such leaders motivate others by aligning organizational goals with individual aspirations, fostering an environment of continuous growth and innovation. Servant leadership, introduced by Greenleaf, emphasizes the leader's role as a servant first, prioritizing the growth and well-being of individuals and communities (Greenleaf, 1977). This model aligns with the values of higher education institutions that emphasize collaboration, autonomy, and shared governance. In practice, influence-based leadership in higher education manifests through mentorship, shared vision, and the empowerment of faculty and staff. Leaders who adopt this approach facilitate inclusive decision-making processes, encourage professional development, and foster a culture of mutual respect and trust (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Greenleaf, 1977; Versland & Erickson, 2017).

In the context of Indian higher education, where institutions are navigating reforms, technological integration, and increased accountability, understanding the dynamics of influence-based leadership becomes crucial. This chapter offers insights into how organizational contexts can either enable or constrain such leadership approaches. By examining the lived experiences of academic leaders, the study contributes to the discourse on quality culture in higher education and provides practical recommendations for fostering inclusive and developmental leadership ecosystems. Ultimately, this exploration underscores the imperative for higher education leaders to transition from traditional authority-based models to influence-driven practices that align with the collaborative and adaptive demands of contemporary academia.

3. Research Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a qualitative approach, using open-ended questions designed to explore multiple facets of leadership in higher education. Responses were collected from 20 academic leaders across various institutions. The questions focused on their involvement in organizational development, role of self-assessment, institutional support, experiential learning, educational qualifications, skill application, and the impact of personal attitudes. The responses were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns and insights, with emphasis on capturing direct quotations to ensure authenticity and preserve the voice of the participants.

Participants

Twenty leaders—comprising principals, vice-principals, deans, heads of departments, and senior administrators—were selected from ten higher education institutions, both public and private. The institutions varied in size, location, and mission to ensure a diverse sample.

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted using a set of guiding questions designed to explore how leaders perceive their role, the nature of their influence, and how institutional structures support or constrain their leadership. The key questions included:

1. Can you describe the way you involve in the organizational development of your institution?
2. How do you assess your role within this higher education institution?
3. How does your organization involve you in its growth?
4. How important is your experience in higher education for your specific role in this college?
5. How does your level of education impact the way you influence the organizational culture?
6. How has being skillful influenced your organizational role?
7. What specific role does your attitude toward the college and leadership play in your contribution to organizational development?

Data Analysis

The Responses of the 20 participants were transcribed and analyzed thematically using open coding. Recurrent patterns were grouped under themes corresponding to the variables identified in the theoretical framework. Triangulation and member checking were used to ensure credibility and accuracy.

Findings & Suggestions

The study revealed that leadership in higher education institutions is deeply shaped by personal engagement, accumulated experience, and the overall organizational environment. Respondents consistently emphasized their active role in institutional development, particularly in areas like curriculum enhancement, staff development, quality assurance, and fostering research culture.

Role of Education as Credibility Foundations

The education level of leaders in higher education institutions serves as a fundamental prerequisite for establishing credibility and influence within academic communities. While many educational leadership professionals have advanced degrees and can work in academic settings, they are practitioners who work in applied positions (Gagliardi et al., 2019). This educational foundation is particularly crucial in higher education where intellectual achievement and scholarly credentials are highly valued assets of leaders and members of the organization. To quote a respondent, “a doctoral degree adds credibility and allows me to push academic reforms confidently.” Similarly, many leaders and those exercising administrative roles in institutions view that higher education and greater academic credentials help them to model scholarly values and to uphold academic rigor within their institutions. It is very much considered that the education level of leaders directly impacts their ability to influence faculty members who themselves possess advanced degrees and expect their leaders to demonstrate comparable or superior academic achievements. This educational parity or superiority creates the initial conditions necessary for respect and receptivity to influence attempts.

Education Level and Analytical Capabilities

Higher education levels enhance leaders' analytical and problem-solving capabilities, which are essential for effective influence in complex academic environments. Some of the most important educational leadership skills, which correlate with some of the most-wanted skills among recruiters, schools, and companies, are analytical thinking, collaboration, and leadership (Gagliardi et al., 2019). The World Economic Forum named analytical thinking and innovation as the number one skill for 2025 in The Future of Jobs Report 2020 (WEF, 2020). These enhanced analytical capabilities enable leaders to make more

informed decisions, present compelling arguments, and demonstrate the intellectual rigor that resonates with academic audiences, thereby increasing their influence potential.

Educational Background and Shared Understanding

The education level of organizational members also significantly impacts how influence operates within higher education institutions. When leaders and followers share similar educational backgrounds and academic orientations, it creates a foundation of shared understanding and common language that facilitates influence processes. The study of higher education leadership delves into the intricate workings of academic institutions (Kezar, 2013). Leaders and others in the organization think that higher academic qualifications help in enhancing credibility and enabling greater contributions to institutional development. One leader opined, “having a PhD gives me the academic authority to bring in reforms,” and another said, “my qualifications allow me to mentor and guide others effectively.” This shared educational foundation enables leaders to communicate more effectively with their constituents, understand their perspectives, and frame influence attempts in ways that resonate with academic values and priorities.

Contextual Knowledge and Adaptive Leadership

Experience in higher education work provides leaders with crucial contextual knowledge that significantly enhances their ability to exercise influence effectively. Impressive evidence shows that good leaders behave differently depending on many factors (Spillane, et al., 2004). These include the size of the school, grade levels served, student demographics, the community context, and state and local policies and resources. That suggests there is no single best model of leadership. Understanding of the institutional context, legacy, and culture—which is facilitated greatly through institutional experience—makes leaders and other members of the organization actively involve in its growth and development. Their contributions ranged from curriculum development and academic strategy to student engagement and infrastructure planning. One principal remarked, “I play an integral role in forming academic strategies and ensuring they are implemented with quality and integrity.” Another shared, “Development isn’t about buildings alone; it’s about building people.” Higher education leaders share the belief that leadership is a collaborative process of cultivating institutional potential and aligning stakeholders towards shared goals, largely supported by deeper understanding of the organizational legacy and culture.

Understanding Organizational Dynamics and Stakeholder Networks

Experienced higher education professionals develop sophisticated understanding of the complex stakeholder networks and organizational dynamics that characterize academic institutions. Studies have found that the approach higher educational leaders take in making various decisions can have a powerful ripple effect throughout their faculty members, students and even the broader community (Gagliardi et al., 2019). [Respondents considered skills like effective communication, emotional intelligence and adaptability as very important to understand stakeholder perspectives and to make effective networking for productive organizational settings. A faculty administrator said, “you must know how to listen, respond and adapt to changing needs,” an organizational dynamic which is also closely linked with interpersonal dynamics so crucial for academic leadership at the higher education level.

These experiential dynamics enable leaders at different levels of the organization to identify key influence targets, understand power structures, navigate political dynamics, and anticipate potential resistance or support for their initiatives. It is so useful to organize training programs, to plan for academic units, to recruit academic staff, and to evaluate and coordinate the institution (Bush, 2004). The complexity arising out of the numerous networks within the institution necessitates such leadership capabilities, thereby highlighting the importance of experience in leading by influence.

Relationship Building and Trust Development

Experience in higher education work facilitates the development of relationships and trust networks that are essential for influence-based leadership. Leaders in HEIs play a fundamental role in ensuring effective communication and thus building trust and transparency (Bush, 2008). Long tenure and experience within higher education settings enable leaders to build these crucial relationships over time. One senior faculty member said, “Earlier I used to react quickly; now I respond thoughtfully.” Another shared, “Years of academic life teach you when to speak, when to listen, and when to act.” Such insights show that experience cultivates a deeper understanding of organizational dynamics, enhancing a leader’s influence to build relationships and trust.

Professional Network Development and Influence Amplification

Experience in higher education work enables leaders to develop extensive professional networks that amplify their influence capabilities. Building a strong professional network can prove invaluable throughout one’s career (Gagliardi, et al., 2019). These networks provide channels for influence that extend beyond formal organizational boundaries, enabling leaders to leverage external relationships to support their internal influence efforts. Higher education experience was widely recognized by leaders as transformative assets for themselves and leadership tools to bring organizational effectiveness. A senior academic leader reflected, “Experience teaches you how to stay calm, communicate better, and see the bigger picture.”

Institutional support to learn, collaborate, and lead was also seen as a major factor in enabling impactful leadership. Some respondents appreciated the freedom they were given to take initiatives, and one stated, “our management encourages experimentation and values our inputs.” Others highlighted the need for more participatory governance, suggesting, “there are times when top-down decisions limit our scope for innovation.” Many leaders viewed their role as nurturing future leaders and encouraging shared ownership of institutional goals.

Organizational Commitment and Influence Receptivity

The attitude of organizational members toward their institution significantly affects their receptivity to leadership influence. It is observed that positive relationships existing between leadership in HEIs and academic staff are stronger in societies with collectivist cultures compared to individualist ones (Bush, 2008). This suggests that positive organizational attitudes enhance the effectiveness of leadership influence. Leadership influence was often described as transcending formal titles. One respondent shared,

“Even before I became Head of the Department, I was consulted because people valued my ideas.” Another said, “People listen to you when they know you care, not because of your position.” It is also found that influence rooted in authenticity, respect, and relational capital rather than administrative hierarchy facilitates influence receptivity within the organization.

Cultural Values and Influence Dynamics

The attitude of organizational members toward institutional values and culture significantly impacts how influence operates within higher education settings. In a country, a high level of education affects development with a positive trend in terms of economic and social results, as it will create a qualified workforce (Bush, 2008). When organizational members share and embrace institutional values, it creates alignment that facilitates influence-based leadership. Respondents who displayed empathy, humility, and integrity were more effective in influencing others. One leader shared, “My attitude has always been: I serve, I do not rule.” Another reflected, “If you stay committed to values, people begin to trust your leadership—even without a title.” It is found that the respondents saw the relationship and impact of the value system and faithful adherence to it impacting the leading by influence in an educational organization.

Grounding educational leadership strengths in ethics ensures that decisions are guided by a commitment to student well-being and holistic development (Reeves, 2009). It also fosters trust and credibility, which are essential for building strong, supportive relationships with stakeholders. Many respondents believed that a positive, value-driven mindset is essential to influence and lead. One leader summed it up aptly: “Attitude defines how far you can go—not just in position, but in impact.” These responses illustrate that leading by influence is rooted in personal conviction, resilience, and the ability to inspire.

4. Conclusion

The education level, experience in higher education work, and organizational attitudes of leaders and members fundamentally shape leading by influence in higher education institutions through multiple interconnected mechanisms. Education level provides the credibility foundation and analytical capabilities necessary for effective influence in academic settings. Experience in higher education work develops the contextual knowledge, relationship networks, and practical wisdom required to navigate complex institutional dynamics. Organizational attitudes create the receptivity conditions that determine whether influence attempts will be successful.

The most effective influence-based leadership in higher education emerges when these three factors align synergistically: highly educated leaders with extensive higher education experience working within organizations characterized by positive attitudes toward leadership and institutional mission. Understanding and leveraging these factors is essential for developing effective leadership capacity in higher education institutions and for creating organizational environments that support transformational change and institutional excellence.

The findings reveal that leadership in higher education is deeply embedded in personal conviction, professional experience, and institutional culture. Influence, more than authority, defines how academic

leaders contribute to organizational development. Leaders who are reflective, collaborative, and values-driven are more effective in shaping the direction and ethos of their institutions.

The organizational setting plays a dual role: it can either enable or restrict leadership potential. Members with greater knowledge, experience, and right attitude towards the organization create and promote influence-based leadership culture. Institutions that promote autonomy, support innovation, and encourage participation tend to nurture influential leaders. The future of higher education leadership lies in recognizing and fostering these nuanced forms of influence that operate beyond traditional command structures.

This chapter contributes to the growing understanding of leadership by influence in academic contexts and suggests that empowering leadership practices rooted in experience, education, skill, and attitude are vital for the holistic development of higher education institutions.

5. Summary

This chapter explores how leadership by influence manifests within the context of higher education institutions, drawing on qualitative responses from 20 senior academic leaders including principals, administrators, and faculty members. The study highlights how organizational settings shape leadership behaviors, attitudes, and effectiveness. Responses were gathered around seven guiding questions covering involvement in institutional development, self-perception of leadership roles, organizational support, and the influence of experience, education, skills, and attitude.

The analysis found that most leaders perceive their influence as deeply integrated with institutional culture, values, and participatory governance. They emphasized servant leadership, collaborative culture, and the importance of experiential and value-based practices in shaping leadership approaches. Notably, the respondents showcased a strong alignment between personal traits and institutional development, reinforcing the idea that leadership is a continuous, adaptive, and context-specific phenomenon.

6. Implications and Recommendations

The study offers several implications for institutions seeking to strengthen leadership by influence. Institutions may promote leadership training programs that focus on emotional intelligence, participatory governance, and strategic thinking. Further studies with larger sample size could help to validate or enhance the leading by influence phenomenon.

References

1. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
2. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
3. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
4. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

5. Bush, T. (2018). Contextual leadership in education: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(3), 327–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216659296>
6. Bush, T. (2008). Leadership and management development in education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207087778>
7. Gagliardi, J. S., Parnell, A., & Carpenter-Hubin, J. (2019). *The analytics imperative: A higher education leader's guide to defining and delivering value*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
8. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
9. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
10. Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
11. Karadağ, E. (2020). The effect of leadership styles on job satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 8(1), 30–48. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2020.4138>
12. Kezar, A. (2013). *Understanding leadership in higher education: Theory, research, and practice*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 39(4), 1–133.
13. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769>
14. Leithwood, K., & Louis, K. S. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
15. Manfredi, S., & Vickers, L. (2021). Leadership, gender and diversity in higher education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1690709>
16. Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Research*, 81(3), 175–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1987.10885755>
17. Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage Publications.
18. Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.
19. Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. SAGE Publications.
20. Reeves, D. B. (2009). *Leading change in your school: How to conquer myths, build commitment, and get results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
21. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027032000106726>
22. Versland, T. M., & Erickson, J. L. (2017). Leading by influence: A case study of leadership in rural schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(3), 258–274. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2016-0053>
23. Versland, T. M., & Erickson, J. L. (2017). Leading by influence: A study of how teacher leaders impact school culture. *The Educational Forum*, 81(2), 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2016.1254833>



24. World Economic Forum. (2020). The Future of Jobs Report 2020.
<https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2020/>
25. Yukl, G. A. (2012). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Pearson.