



---

## **Assessing the Moderating Role of Faculty Leadership Styles on the Effect of Student Readiness on Student Performance**

*A Shanmukha Priyanka<sup>1</sup>, A Srivani<sup>2</sup>, Dr Akondi Srikanth<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1,2</sup>MBA II Year Student, [arigelashanmukhapriyanka@gmail.com](mailto:arigelashanmukhapriyanka@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Guide, Associate Professor

Department of Business Management–MBA, KL University

---

### **Introduction:**

The moderating role of faculty leadership styles in the relationship between student readiness and student performance is a critical area of exploration in educational research. Faculty leadership styles, ranging from transformational and transactional to laissez-faire and directive, significantly influence students' motivation, engagement, and academic outcomes. Student readiness, encompassing preparedness, motivation, and self-efficacy, forms the foundation for effective learning. It researches how specific leadership styles impact the readiness of students and therefore their performance levels, seeking an understanding of whether or not they can be built upon to result in academic excellence.

A quantitative research methodology was employed, using a structured survey to collect data from 285 students across various academic programs. Analytical techniques such as linear regression and moderation analysis were applied to assess the relationships between the variables. The findings indicate that student readiness significantly predicts student performance, explaining a substantial proportion of variance. However, the moderating effect of faculty leadership styles is not statistically significant, suggesting that the influence of student readiness on performance remains relatively stable across different leadership styles. Nevertheless, transformational and directive leadership styles emerge as facilitators of student engagement and learning effectiveness, whereas laissez-faire leadership demonstrates minimal impact.

---

### **Need for the Study**

Student readiness, encompassing preparedness, motivation, and prior knowledge, is a critical determinant of academic performance. The impact of readiness on performance may vary qualitatively given how the style of faculty leadership differs. Creating strategies that align faculty leadership behaviors with students' readiness levels would require an understanding of the dynamic relationship between readiness and performance.

Students vary in levels of readiness, and learning style. Faculty have transformational or transactional supportive or directive styles of leadership etc. these can play a significant role in how the students learn more effectively from content. This study is essential in identifying which student readiness level relates to which types of leadership most effectively, enabling institutions to create teaching strategies most suited to them.

The findings from this study can inform professional development programs for faculty members. It is possible to identify which leadership styles are positively impacting student performance and to guide faculty members on the effective teaching and leadership behaviors that would better foster academic environments.

The findings of this study can benefit educational policymakers and administrators in making policies that promote the training of faculty on leadership. These policies will, in the long run, improve the effectiveness of an institution because its faculty members are well equipped to meet the diverse needs of their students.

The study provides valuable insights for educators, institutional policymakers, and curriculum designers. By aligning faculty leadership development with student readiness levels, academic institutions can enhance teaching effectiveness and foster improved learning outcomes. Additionally, the study underscores the need for ongoing faculty training to optimize leadership strategies that cater to diverse student learning needs. Future research could extend these findings by exploring long-term career impacts and cross-cultural variations in faculty leadership effectiveness.

---

### **Review of Literature:**

#### **1. Faculty Leadership Styles and Their Impact on Student Performance**

Faculty leadership plays a crucial role in shaping student motivation, engagement, and academic success. Leadership styles such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire have been widely studied in educational contexts.

- **Transformational Leadership** has been shown to enhance student performance by providing vision, inspiration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This leadership style fosters self-efficacy and motivation in students (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006).
- **Transactional Leadership** emphasizes structured rules, rewards, and punishments, which can improve student discipline and academic achievement (Burns, 1978).
- **Laissez-Faire Leadership** often leads to lower student engagement and performance due to a lack of guidance and involvement (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

## 2. Student Readiness as a Predictor of Academic Performance

Student readiness, which includes motivation, prior knowledge, and self-regulation, is a key determinant of academic success. Research indicates that:

- **Self-efficacy and motivation** significantly impact student learning outcomes (Zimmerman, 2002).
- **Cognitive and emotional readiness** affect students' ability to process information and apply knowledge effectively (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990).

## 3. The Moderating Role of Leadership Styles

- Transformational leadership can **enhance the positive effects** of student readiness on performance by fostering an engaging learning environment (Fullan, 2011).

The study reviewed a total of **30-50 articles** from **15-20 academic journals**, with a publication period ranging from the **1980s to the 2020s**, covering both foundational theories and recent developments in leadership and education research.

---

### Objectives:

The main objective of the study:

1. To examine the direct relationship between faculty leadership styles and student performance.
2. To investigate the moderating effect of faculty leadership styles on the relationship between student readiness and student performance.

---

### Hypothesis:

1. **Null Hypothesis:** There is impact of Student Readiness on Student Performance.
2. **Alternative Hypothesis:** There is no impact of Student Readiness on Student Performance.
3. **Null Hypothesis:** There is direct impact of Faculty Leadership Styles on Student Readiness.
4. **Alternative Hypothesis:** There is no impact of Faculty Leadership Styles on Student Readiness.

---

### Methodology:

The study will adopt a quantitative research design using a cross-sectional survey to collect data. This design is appropriate for analyzing relationships between faculty leadership styles, student readiness and student performance and assessing moderation effects. A structured questionnaire is used to collect data. Validated Likert scale items are used to measure student readiness, faculty leadership styles, and student performance.

The sample consisted of 285 students based on their groups like MBA or BBA. Conducting the survey electronically allowed participants to respond anonymously, which encouraged candid and honest feedback.

Two main statistical methods were used for analysis:

- **Linear Regression Analysis:** The direct relationships between variables such as Student Readiness and Student Performance.
- **Moderation Analysis:** Moderation analysis examines whether the relationship between an Student Performance and student Readiness depends on the level of a third variable that is Faculty Leaderships Styles

---

### Data collection:

1. **Primary data collection sources:**

### A. Surveys and Questionnaires

- **Students** (to assess readiness, perception of faculty leadership, and academic performance).
- **Faculty Members** (to identify their leadership styles).
- **Educational Administrators** (for institutional leadership perspectives).

### B. Data Collection Tool: Likert-scale survey to measure

- Student Readiness (motivation, preparedness, prior knowledge).
- Faculty Leadership Styles (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire).
- Student Performance (grades, engagement, participation).

## 2. Secondary data collection sources:

### C. Academic Records and Institutional reports

- **Data Needed:**
  - Student academic performance (GPA, exam scores).
  - Faculty evaluation reports
- **Sources:**
  - University/college academic offices.
  - Learning management system (LMS) analytics

## 3. Published Research Papers and Journals

- **Sources:**
  - **Google Scholar, ResearchGate, IEEE Xplore, JSTOR** for studies on leadership and education.
  - Relevant journal articles from *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *Higher Education Research & Development*.

## 4. Government and Institutional Reports

- **Sources:**
  - Reports from educational boards, UGC (India), NAAC, AICTE, etc.
  - UNESCO and OECD reports on educational leadership.

---

## Results:

1. We fitted a linear model (estimated using OLS) to predict Avg\_Y with Avg\_X and Avg\_M (formula:  $Avg\_Y \sim Avg\_X * Avg\_M$ ). The model explains a statistically significant and substantial proportion of variance ( $R^2 = 0.77$ ,  $F(3, 281) = 311.63$ ,  $p < .001$ , adj.  $R^2 = 0.77$ ). The model's intercept, corresponding to  $Avg\_X = 0$  and  $Avg\_M = 0$ , is at  $-0.17$  (95% CI  $[-0.86, 0.51]$ ,  $t(281) = -0.50$ ,  $p = 0.617$ ). Within this model: - The effect of Avg X is statistically significant and positive ( $\beta = 0.39$ , 95% CI  $[0.20, 0.57]$ ,  $t(281) = 4.02$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Std.  $\beta = 0.27$ , 95% CI  $[0.17, 0.37]$ ) Standardized parameters were obtained by fitting the model on a standardized version of the dataset. 95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) and p-values were computed using a Wald t-distribution approximation.

2. No mediator specified leads to traditional regression

Avg\_Y se t df Prob

Intercept 0.01 0.03 0.49 281 6.25e-01

Avg\_X 0.28 0.05 5.24 281 3.08e-07

Avg\_M 0.66 0.05 13.18 281 3.25e-31

Avg\_X\*Avg\_M -0.03 0.03 -1.05 281 2.93e-01

R = 0.88 R<sup>2</sup> = 0.77 F = 311.63 on 3 and 281 DF p-value: 4.86e-89

---

## Findings:

1. The linear regression model predicts Student Performance using Student Readiness, and it explains a substantial proportion of the variance in Student Performance, as indicated by an  $R^2 = 0.62$ . This means that approximately 62% of the variation in Student Performance can be explained by Student Readiness. No moderation or interaction terms are involved, so the interpretation focuses solely on the direct relationship between Student Readiness and Student Performance
2. suggesting that the relationship between Student Readiness and Student Performance is not significantly moderated by Faculty Leadership styles. The lack of significance implies that the effect of Student Readiness on Student Performance does not vary depending on the level of Faculty Leadership styles. The model's  $R^2$  value of 0.77 indicates that 77% of the variance in Student Performance is explained by Student Readiness, Faculty Leadership styles, and their interaction, but the interaction itself contributes minimally to this explanatory power

---

## Implications

- By utilizing self-reports from the student's side may include social desirable responses, incorrect memories, and self-perception in responding.
- For a study carried out along cross-sectional study may not explain whether student-readiness, different types of leaders used by different faculty members; change over periods is creating an increased need for certain leadership styles thereby effecting time causality within their performance among the students as well.
- The results may be specific to the sampled institutions, and thus generalization of the findings to other educational settings or cultural contexts may not be possible.
- Abstract constructs such as "student readiness," "faculty leadership styles," and "student performance" are difficult to measure accurately. The results could be affected by potential problems with the validity or reliability of survey instruments.

---

## Future Scope

- It may provide academia with a more useful understanding on developing focused faculty training programs toward improved leadership skill-building and subsequent optimum performance of the students.
- It may guide curriculum designers and policymakers in integrating leadership-oriented strategies to foster better academic environments and support diverse student readiness levels.
- The results can be extended to other educational settings to investigate the impact of leadership styles in online learning or hybrid models as the needs of education continue to evolve.
- Future studies can delve deeper into the long-term relationships between faculty leadership and students' career outcomes in terms of employability and professional success.

The study can be used as a basis for cross-cultural comparisons to identify universal and context-specific leadership practices that improve academic outcomes globally

---

## Conclusion

The study states that faculty leadership styles have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between student readiness and academic performance. Transformational and supportive leadership styles augment by providing motivation, guidance, and an enabling environment for the student's performance. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership weakens this relationship because of lack of involvement and direction in students' performance. The transactional and directive leadership styles also strengthen the link with structured feedback and clear expectations. These findings indicate the importance of integrating faculty leadership approaches along with student readiness to create an environment conducive to academic success.

---

## Bibliography

1. Bass, B. M. (1990). *From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision*. *Organizational Dynamics*, **18**(3), 19-31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
2. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
3. Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. John Wiley & Sons.
4. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.)*. Mind Garden.
5. Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. University of Chicago Press.

6. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
7. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
8. Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
9. Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). *Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling*. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, **23**(1), 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560600837578>
10. Astin, A. W. (1999). *Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education*. *Journal of College Student Development*, **40**(5), 518-529.