

**CONCEPTUALIZING AND DEVELOPING A NOMOLOGICAL
FRAMEWORK OF ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP –
A STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA**

DARSHNA K. VAGHELA



**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY - DELHI
OCTOBER 2019**

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2019

**Conceptualizing and Developing a Nomological Framework of
Academic Leadership –
A Study of Higher Education Institutions in India**

by

DARSHNA K. VAGHELA

Department of Management Studies

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



**Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
October 2019**

This thesis is dedicated to
my husband Mr. Kalpesh Banker
and
my daughter Baby. Amyra Banker

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**Conceptualizing and Developing a Nomological Framework of Academic Leadership – A Study of Higher Education Institutions in India**” being submitted by **Mrs. Darshna K. Vaghela** for the award of **Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)** in Department of Management Studies is a record of bonafide work carried out by her.

She has worked under my supervision and has fulfilled the requirements for the submission of this thesis, which has attained the standards required for Ph.D. degree of the Institute. The results presented in this thesis have not been submitted elsewhere, either in part or in full, for the award of any other degree or diploma.

Date:

Research Supervisor,

Dr. Kanika T. Bhal

Professor

Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi (India) - 110016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor **Prof. Kanika T. Bhal**, whose valuable guidance and enormous support has always boosted my confidence and equipped me to carry out this research work very diligently. I truly found a friend, philosopher and a guide in her who not only guided me for my thesis but also encouraged and supported me during my entire personal journey throughout these Ph.D. years. Her higher standards have provided me with the sense of direction with which I also have been able to raise my professional standards high. I feel very fortunate to have worked with her and have witnessed her persona.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee members; **Prof. Purnima Singh**, **Prof. Sushil** and **Dr. Shuchi Sinha**, for their insightful comments and encouragement during my pre-PhD presentation. In addition, I am grateful to **Dr. P. Vigneswara Ilavarasana** for his guidance during my qualitative research analysis.

I am indebted to **all the participants** who helped me with the interviews and surveys for their wholehearted engagement by agreeing to all the demands placed on them. Without them this work would not have been possible.

My husband, **Mr. Kalpesh Banker** deserves a special mention for his invaluable emotional and moral support and the amount of patience that he showed during trying times of my PhD years. My daughter **Amyra**'s cooperation and adjustments during her important foundational years is unmatched and highly admirable. I am grateful to my dedicated parents **Mr. Kantilal** and **Mrs. Bhavna** for showering their blessings and my in-laws **Mr. Babulal** and **Mrs. Geeta** for showing immense confidence in me as their daughter-in-law. My siblings **Dimple** and **Nilesh** were the constant encouragement and source of motivation.

The most loving and compassionate approach shown by Amyra's care taker 'didi' **Miss Manju**, and most dedicated and sincere attitude shown by my domestic help **Mrs. Lilam** towards my day to day house chores, have rendered me with the additional empowerment that helped me work with the desired concentration and attention.

I would like to thank my seniors **Dr. Megha Gupta** and **Dr. Priyanka Jaiswal** and a fellow friend **Dr. Monica Verma** who were continuous source of material and moral support during my research work that helped me better refine my work at every stage. Apart from that, I thank all my peers (**Chitra, Swati, Smita, Veenu and Sauvik**) for their boost and encouragement. I also thank the administrative staff that includes **Mr. Amit Jha, Mr. Jagdish, Mr. Parikshit Gautam, Mr. Amit Tiwari** and all the other supporting staff for their facilitation.

Darshna K. Vaghela

ABSTRACT

The term ‘academic leadership’ is variedly conceptualized by different researchers for example, educational leadership (Bolman & Gallos, 2010); teaching leadership (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006); instructional leadership (Hallinger, 2003); principal leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003); collegial leadership (Singh, Manser & Mestry, 2007); intellectual leadership (Macfarlane, 2013) etc. We abide by their concepts as and when we related with them, however, throughout all the studies; while referring to the academic leadership as a construct, we have kept the meaning of it to be the ‘highest authority’ (Pilbeam, & Jamieson, 2010) in a higher educational institution. In the later parts of this document, we have discussed academic leadership in relation to different styles as mentioned above. Availability of very scant literature into the field creates an urge to discuss the Indian higher education system in detail. Reason being; while most of the Indian higher educational institutions face financial crunch, top ranked institutes like Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), despite having the financial support from the government, appear to be at a critical juncture (Gulhati, 2007). Apart from the issues like governance and regulations, autonomy of an institutional leadership, political interference in institutional matters, faculty salary etc. prevalent in the Indian higher education system, only a few institutions are able to secure ranks in the global rankings despite a huge potential. Since success or a failure of an institute depends on the academic leadership (Simkins, 2005), we wanted to explore different roles academic leaders play in the globally acclaimed universities/institutes so that suggestive measures for rest of the segment of higher education can be taken. So, we searched for the way through which an academic leadership can be measured and evaluated. However, we did not find any measurement scale on academic leadership except the one developed for the Chinese context by Xu, (2011). The way Indian higher education operates

is unique because of the unique context and challenges it faces. Hence, we wanted to use the scale that is best suited for the Indian academic leadership. Thus, we started our research with the interview based qualitative study where we aim to develop the academic leadership scale for India.

As methodology, we adopted the mixed method research approach where the exploration based qualitative, and validation based quantitative both the types of studies are conducted to draw a conclusion. Mixed method design renders the benefit of multi-method (Friedrich, Byrne & Mumford, 2009) and multi-source. Using single source for the data using single method increases the chances of common method bias (Eichhorn, 2014); however, mixed method comprises qualitative and quantitative research studies which are totally different in terms of their sample requirements and the conduct, it provides us with the benefits of the multiple data sources and frees us from the common method bias.

Our entire work is divided into multiple studies that widely covered different scale development stages like item generation, scale construction and scale validation, as per the methodology suggested by De Vellis (1991) and Hinkin (1998). We started our work with the qualitative study based on in-depth interviews of eminent Indian academic leaders. We drew meanings from their texts and developed the 14-items (comprising 4 dimensions) tool that can help measuring academic leadership. These four dimensions are; setting up teaching learning environment (STLE), managing intellectual capital (MIC), stewardship and reputation management (SRM) and personal and relational competence (PRC). We used SPSS 20 to conduct the exploratory factor analysis to attain these four dimensions and 14 items. Total 48% variance was explained with $VEF1 = 38.17$, $VEF2 = 4.88$, $VEF3 = 3.40$ and $VEF4 = 3.14$. the cumulative VE for $F1 = 38.17$, $CVEF2 = 43.05$, $CVEF3 = 46.44$ and $CVEF4 = 49.57$.

Once the scale was developed, we moved further to validate the psychometric properties of the scale. With the help of confirmatory factor analysis, we proved the academic leadership as a multidimensional construct. The scale presented sound psychometric measures like reliability measures Cronbach alpha α (STLE 0.81, MIC 0.87, ISRM 0.72 and PRC 0.72) and composite reliability CR (STLE 0.86, MIC 0.88, ISRM 0.74 and PRC 0.76), convergent validity measure average variance extracted AVE (> 0.5) (STLE 0.67, MIC 0.61, ISRM 0.50 and PRC 0.52). As a measure of the discriminant validity all the $\sqrt{\text{AVEs}}$ were more than their inter-correlations.

For the empirical scale validation phase, we designed survey-based questionnaires for three important stakeholders like faculties, non-academic staff members and the students; where we incorporated different psychological, task related and institutional outcomes along with the scale items. This way we can establish the predictive validity for each of the dimension with respect to different stakeholder related outcome measures. We conducted the predictive validity analysis for the scale for which we used the outcome measures which were common to all the three stakeholders. These measures were psychological ownership PO, institutional commitment IC, institutional engagement IE and the reputation R. We used AMOS 20 for conducting the structural equation modeling for the faculty and students. For the non-academic staff members, due to the limited sample size we conducted its analysis on the smart PLS v2.

Total 35 hypotheses were developed out of which 7 were rejected. We have provided details of each hypothesis along with the logical arguments for all the rejected hypothesis in the discussion chapter 7. It also provides insightful practical and theoretical implications along with some important suggestions that can be used by future researchers to improve the work and research design in this area. Despite limitations, our work is expected to encourage researchers and benefit academics in great way.

सार

‘अकादमिक नेतृत्व’ शब्द के लिए विभिन्न शोधकर्ताओं द्वारा अलग-अलग अवधारणा है, जैसे की, शैक्षिक नेतृत्व (बोलमैन & गैलोस, 2010; शिक्षण नेतृत्व (हे & हॉजकिन्सन, 2006); निर्देशात्मक नेतृत्व (हॉलिंगर, 2003); प्रमुख नेतृत्व (मार्क्स & प्रिंस्टी, 2003); कोलेजिअल नेतृत्व (सिंह, मैनसर & मेस्ट्री, 2007); बौद्धिक नेतृत्व (मैक्फार्लेन, 2013) आदि। हम उनकी अवधारणाओं का पालन करते हैं जब हम उनके साथ संबंधित होते हैं, हालांकि, सभी अध्ययनों के दौरान; एक निर्माण के रूप में अकादमिक नेतृत्व का उल्लेख करते हुए, हमने उच्च शैक्षणिक संस्थान में इसका अर्थ सर्वोच्च अधिकारी (पिलबीम & जैमिसन, 2010) रखा है। इस दस्तावेज़ में, हमने ऊपर वर्णित विभिन्न शैलियों के संबंध में अकादमिक नेतृत्व पर चर्चा की है। इस क्षेत्र में बहुत कम साहित्य की उपलब्धता भारतीय उच्च शिक्षा प्रणाली पर विस्तार से चर्चा करने का आग्रह करती है। कारण है कि; जबकि अधिकांश भारतीय उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों को वित्तीय संकट का सामना करना पड़ता है, भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान (IIT) और भारतीय प्रबंधन संस्थान (IIM) जैसे शीर्ष क्रम के संस्थान, सरकार से वित्तीय सहायता प्राप्त करने के बावजूद, एक महत्वपूर्ण मोड़ पर हैं (गुलाटी, 2007)। शासन और नियमों जैसे मुद्दों के अलावा, एक संस्थागत नेतृत्व की स्वायत्तता, संस्थागत मामलों में राजनीतिक हस्तक्षेप, संकाय वेतन आदि मुद्दे भारतीय उच्च शिक्षा प्रणाली में प्रचलित हैं, केवल कुछ एक संस्थान विशाल क्षमता के बावजूद वैश्विक रैंकिंग में रैंक सुरक्षित करने में सक्षम हैं।। चूंकि किसी संस्थान की सफलता या असफलता अकादमिक नेतृत्व (सिम्किन्स, 2005) पर निर्भर करती है, हम विश्व स्तर पर प्रशंसित विश्वविद्यालयों / संस्थानों में अलग-अलग भूमिका निभाने वाले अकादमिक नेताओं की खोज करना चाहते थे ताकि उच्च शिक्षा के क्षेत्र के बाकी हिस्सों के लिए विचारोत्तेजक उपाय किए जा सकें।। इसलिए, हमने उस रास्ते की तलाश की जिसके माध्यम से एक शैक्षणिक नेतृत्व को मापा और मूल्यांकन किया जा सकता है। हालांकि, हमें जू (2011) द्वारा चीनी संदर्भ के लिए विकसित एक को छोड़कर अकादमिक नेतृत्व पर कोई माप का पैमाना नहीं मिला। जिस तरह

से भारतीय उच्च शिक्षा अद्वितीय संदर्भ और चुनौतियों का सामना करती है वह अद्वितीय है। इसलिए, हम उस पैमाने का उपयोग करना चाहते थे जो भारतीय शैक्षणिक नेतृत्व के लिए सबसे उपयुक्त है। इस प्रकार, हमने अपने शोध को साक्षात्कार आधारित गुणात्मक अध्ययन के साथ शुरू किया जहां हमारा उद्देश्य भारत के लिए शैक्षणिक नेतृत्व के पैमाने को विकसित करना है।

कार्यप्रणाली के रूप में, हमने मिश्रित विधि अनुसंधान दृष्टिकोण को अपनाया जहां निष्कर्ष आधारित गुणात्मक, और सत्यापन आधारित मात्रात्मक दोनों अध्ययन निष्कर्ष निकालने के लिए आयोजित किए जाते हैं। मिश्रित विधि डिजाइन बहु-विधि (फ्रेडरिक, बायरन & ममफोर्ड, 2009) और बहु-स्रोत के लाभ का प्रतिपादन करती है। एकल विधि का उपयोग करते हुए डेटा के लिए एकल स्रोत का उपयोग करने से सामान्य विधि पूर्वाग्रह (ईचहोर्न, 2014) की संभावना बढ़ जाती है; हालाँकि, मिश्रित विधि में गुणात्मक और मात्रात्मक अनुसंधान अध्ययन शामिल हैं जो उनकी नमूना आवश्यकताओं और आचरण के संदर्भ में पूरी तरह से अलग हैं, यह हमें कई डेटा स्रोतों के लाभ प्रदान करता है और हमें सामान्य विधि पूर्वाग्रह से मुक्त करता है।

हमारे पूरे काम को कई अध्ययनों में विभाजित किया गया है जो कि डि वेलीस (1991) और हिनकिन (1998) द्वारा सुझाई गई पद्धति के अनुसार आइटम जनरेशन, स्केल निर्माण और स्केल वेलिडेशन जैसे विभिन्न पैमाने के विकास चरणों को व्यापक रूप से कवर करते हैं। हमने प्रख्यात भारतीय अकादमिक नेताओं के गहन साक्षात्कार के आधार पर गुणात्मक अध्ययन के साथ अपना काम शुरू किया। हमने उनके साक्षात्कार से अर्थ निकाला और 14-आइटम (4 आयामों वाला) उपकरण विकसित किया जो अकादमिक नेतृत्व को मापने में मदद कर सकता है। ये चार आयाम हैं; शिक्षण अधिगम वातावरण (STLE), बौद्धिक पूंजी (MIC), प्रबंधन और प्रतिष्ठा प्रबंधन (SRM) और व्यक्तिगत और संबंधपरक क्षमता (PRC) की स्थापना करना। हमने इन चार आयामों और 14 वस्तुओं को प्राप्त करने के लिए खोज कारक विश्लेषण का संचालन करने के लिए SPSS 20

का उपयोग किया। कुल 48% विचरण, $VEF1 = 38.17$, $VEF2 = 4.88$, $VEF3 = 3.40$ और $VEF4 = 3.14$ के साथ समझाया गया था। $CVF1 = 38.17$, $CVF2 = 43.05$, $CVF3 = 46.44$ और $CVF4 = 5.57$ था।

स्केल विकसित होने के बाद, हम स्केल के साइकोमेट्रिक गुणों को मान्य करने के लिए आगे बढ़े। पुष्टि कारक विश्लेषण की मदद से, हमने अकादमिक नेतृत्व को बहुआयामी निर्माण के रूप में साबित किया। स्केल ने साइकोमेट्रिक माप जैसे की क्रोनबेक अल्फा α (STLE 0.81, MIC 0.87, ISRM 0.72 और PRC 0.72) और समग्र विश्वसनीयता CR (STLE 0.86, MIC 0.88, ISRM 0.74 & PRC 0.76) को प्रस्तुत किया, अभिसरण वैधता माप औसत विचरण का औसत AVE निकाला। (> 0.5) (STLE 0.67, MIC 0.61, ISRM 0.50 & PRC 0.52)। विवेकपूर्ण वैधता के एक उपाय के रूप में सभी AVE उनकी अंतर-सहसंबंधों से अधिक थे।

अनुभवजन्य पैमाने सत्यापन चरण के लिए, हमने तीन महत्वपूर्ण हितधारकों जैसे संकायों, गैर-शैक्षणिक कर्मचारियों के सदस्यों और छात्रों के लिए सर्वेक्षण-आधारित प्रश्नावली तैयार की; जहां हमने विभिन्न वस्तुओं के साथ-साथ विभिन्न मनोवैज्ञानिक, कार्य संबंधी और संस्थागत परिणामों को शामिल किया। इस तरह हम विभिन्न हितधारक संबंधित परिणाम उपायों के संबंध में प्रत्येक आयाम के लिए अपेक्षित वैधता स्थापित कर सकते हैं। हमने उस पैमाने के लिए अपेक्षित वैधता विश्लेषण किया जिसके लिए हमने परिणाम उपायों का उपयोग किया जो सभी तीन हितधारकों के लिए सामान्य थे। ये उपाय मनोवैज्ञानिक स्वामित्व PO, संस्थागत प्रतिबद्धता IC, संस्थागत भागीदारी IE और प्रतिष्ठा R थे। हमने संकाय और छात्रों के लिए संरचनात्मक समीकरण मॉडलिंग के संचालन के लिए AMOS 20 का उपयोग किया। गैर-शैक्षणिक कर्मचारियों के सदस्यों के लिए, सीमित नमूना संख्या के कारण हमने SmartPLS v2 पर अपना विश्लेषण किया।

कुल 35 परिकल्पनाएँ विकसित की गईं जिनमें से 7 अस्वीकार हो गईं। हमने चर्चा अध्याय 7 में सभी अस्वीकृत परिकल्पनाओं के लिए तर्कों के साथ प्रत्येक परिकल्पना का विवरण प्रदान किया है। यह कुछ महत्वपूर्ण सुझावों के साथ व्यावहारिक और सैद्धांतिक निहितार्थ भी प्रदान करता है जिसका उपयोग भविष्य के

शोधकर्ताओं द्वारा कार्य और अनुसंधान डिजाइन में सुधार के लिए किया जा सकता है। सीमाओं के बावजूद, हमारा काम शोधकर्ताओं को प्रोत्साहित करना और शिक्षाविदों को शानदार तरीके से लाभान्वित करना है।

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM CONCEPTUALIZATION	1
1.1	Chapter Overview	1
1.2	Higher Education as a Core	1
1.3	Evolution of Indian Higher Education.....	2
1.4	Current Indian Higher Education Scenario.....	2
1.4.1	Broad Institutional Issues	5
1.5	Academic Leadership.....	10
1.5.1	Higher Education Contexts and Leadership Functions	11
1.6	Academic Leadership and Academic Excellence	17
1.7	Research Gaps.....	20
1.8	Guiding Research Questions.....	21
1.9	Organization of Thesis	21
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	25
2.1	Chapter Overview	25
2.2	Introduction to Leadership.....	25
2.2.1	Process view of leadership	26
2.2.2	Person view of leadership.....	27
2.2.3	Contextual/Contingency Leadership	29
2.3	Academic Leadership.....	32

2.3.1	Modern Academic Leadership Approaches	37
2.4	Outcomes of Academic Leadership in Higher Education.....	39
2.4.1	Outcomes Common for Students, Faculty and the Staff	46
2.4.2	Faculty Outcomes.....	55
2.4.3	Students Outcomes	59
2.4.4	Staff Outcomes	63
3	RESEARCH FRAMEWORK	67
3.1	Chapter Overview	67
3.2	Research Objectives.....	67
3.3	Research Design.....	67
3.3.1	Rationale for using Mixed Method Design:	69
3.4	Overarching Methodology	71
3.4.1	Operationalizing ‘academic leadership’ construct	71
3.4.2	Scale Development (Study 1, 2, 3 and 4)	72
3.4.3	Nomological Framework Development (Study 5, 6 and 7)	73
3.4.4	Participants Overview	74
3.5	Item Generation (N=12).....	76
3.5.1	Analysis and Result	77
3.6	Expert validation (N=12)	77
3.6.1	Analysis and Result	78

3.7	Content Validation (EFA, N = 101).....	79
3.7.1	Analysis and Result	79
3.8	Scale Validation	80
3.9	Construct Validation	81
3.9.1	Analysis and Results	82
3.10	Empirical Validation – Student Outcomes	83
3.10.1	Procedure	83
3.10.2	Analysis and Result	84
3.11	Empirical Validation – Faculty Outcomes.....	84
3.11.1	Procedure.....	84
3.11.2	Analysis and Result	85
3.12	Empirical Validation – Staff Outcomes.....	85
3.12.1	Procedure.....	86
3.12.2	Analysis and Result	87
4	ITEM GENERATION: STUDY 1	89
4.1	Chapter Overview	89
4.2	Rationale for developing a new scale	89
4.3	Scale Development Process	90
4.4	Participants’ Profile	91
4.5	Data Collection	97

4.6	Item generation through thematic analysis	98
4.7	Result of thematic analysis	100
4.8	Dimensions of Academic Leadership	100
4.8.1	Dimension 1- Scrutinizing Academic Environment and Responding.....	101
4.8.2	Dimension 2 – Establishing and implementing Teaching-Learning and Research Parameters	102
4.8.3	Dimension 3 - Driving in times of Institutional Expansion and Growth	103
4.8.4	Dimension 4 - Managing Academic Excellence	103
4.8.5	Dimension 5 - Managing Physical Resources	104
4.8.6	Dimension 6 - Acquiring Talent.....	104
4.8.7	Dimension 7 - Managing Intellectual Capital	105
4.8.8	Dimension 8 - Engaging with External Stakeholders	106
4.8.9	Dimension 9 - Influencing Ability (personal aspect)	106
4.8.10	Dimension 10 - Academic Competence	107
4.8.11	Dimension 11 - Academic Stewardship	108
4.8.12	Dimension 12 - Community Service	108
5	SCALE CONSTRUCTION (Study 2 and 3)	111
5.1	Chapter Overview	111
5.2	Broad Objectives.....	111
5.3	Expert Validation ($N_{\text{Experts}} = 12$)	111

5.3.1	Objective and Rationale	112
5.3.2	Participants and Procedure	112
5.3.3	Analysis and Result	113
5.4	Content Validation (EFA, $N_{EFA} = 101$).....	115
5.4.1	Objective and Rationale	115
5.4.2	Participants and Procedures.....	116
5.4.3	Measures Used	117
5.4.4	Analysis and Results	121
5.4.5	Predictive Validity of the AL dimensions	127
5.5	Summary	133
5.6	Key Trends.....	133
6	SCALE VALIDATION (Study 4, 5, 6 and 7)	135
6.1	Chapter Overview	135
6.2	Objectives	136
6.3	Background and Rationale for the Scale (Construct and Empirical) Validation	136
6.4	Participants.....	137
6.4.1	Institutional level sampling	137
6.4.2	Individual level Sampling	138
6.5	Type of Measures Used	140
6.5.1	Independent Variables (IVs)	140

6.5.2	Dependent Variables (DVs)	140
6.6	Construct Validation ($N_{CFA} = 548$)	141
6.6.1	Measures Used	141
6.7	Data Analysis - Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	148
6.7.1	Construct Stability	148
6.7.2	Psychometric Properties of Four Dimensions of Academic Leadership.....	152
6.7.3	Psychometric Properties of Dependent Variables	154
6.7.4	Common Method Bias Test.....	156
6.7.5	Predictive Validity of AL Dimensions.....	158
6.8	Objectives	161
6.8.1	Student Profile	161
6.8.2	Students' Measures.....	161
6.8.3	Analysis and Results	167
6.9	Objectives	173
6.9.1	Faculty Profile	173
6.9.2	Faculty specific measures.....	173
6.9.3	Analysis and Results	178
6.10	Overview	184
6.11	Objectives	184
6.11.1	Staff Profile	184

6.11.2	Staff Specific Measures	185
6.11.3	Analysis and Results	188
6.12	Summary	192
6.13	Key Trends.....	192
7	DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	195
7.1	Chapter Overview	195
7.2	Overall Summary	195
7.2.1	Construct Clarity	195
7.2.2	Redundancy	196
7.2.3	Convergent and Divergent Validity	198
7.3	Discussion of Key Findings	199
7.3.1	Impact of academic leadership dimensions on common outcome variables (Comparison between the key trends from study 3 and study 4).....	199
7.3.2	Impact of academic leadership dimensions on student outcome variables (Key trends from the study 5)	201
7.3.3	Impact of academic leadership dimensions on the faculty outcome variables (Key trends from the study 6)	202
7.3.4	Impact of academic leadership dimensions on the staff outcome variables (Key trends from the study 7)	203
7.4	Theoretical Contribution	205
7.4.1	Indian Academic Leadership – A Contingent Approach	206

7.5	Practical Implications.....	209
7.6	Limitations and Directions for Future Research	212
7.7	Conclusion	214
REFERENCES		217
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		285
ANNEXURES		291
Annexure A. Interview Schedule – Study 1		291
Annexure B. Expert Validation – Study 2.....		293
Annexure C. Retained Dimensions and Items.....		307
Annexure D. Content Validation – Study 3		311
Annexure E. Academic Leadership Scale (ALS)		315
Annexure F. Details of Scales Used		317

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Flow of the Literature Review.....	26
Figure 2.2 Research Model	65
Figure 3.1 Research Process	74
Figure 6.1 Four Factors Correlated	151
Figure 6.2 Path Diagram for Common Variables	159
Figure 6.3 Path Diagram – Student Variables	171
Figure 6.4 Path Diagram – Faculty Variables.....	182
Figure 6.5 Path Diagram in PLS for Staff Variables	191

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Stakeholder-wise classification of outcomes.....	45
Table 4.1 Summary of the sample	93
Table 5.1 Sample Summary for the Study 2 expert validation	114
Table 5.2 Sample Summary for the Study 3 Content Validation	118
Table 5.3 Pattern Matrix for the factor loading of items	123
Table 5.4 Simple Statistics for AL Dimensions.....	124
Table 5.5 Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Dependent Variables	128
Table 5.6 Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Each of the DV.....	129
Table 5.7 Predictive Validity of AL dimensions using Correlation Co-efficient	130
Table 5.8 Predictive Validity of AL dimensions using Regression Analysis.....	132
Table 6.1 Details of the Sample.....	139

Table 6.2 Pattern Matrix (Construct Stability through EFA/ Study 4)	150
Table 6.3 Construct Stability through CFA (Comparison of Alternate Models/Study 4)	151
Table 6.4 Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the AL Dimensions	153
Table 6.5 Divergent Validity of Dimensions	154
Table 6.6 CFA of Dependent Variables	155
Table 6.7 Factor Loading, CR, AVE, and Cronbach Alpha of DVs	157
Table 6.8 CMBT through the model-fit	158
Table 6.9 Comparison among Proposed, Alternate and Null model	159
Table 6.10 Tests of hypotheses – Study 4	160
Table 6.11 Summary of the Student Sample	162
Table 6.12 Model Fit Indices for student specific DVs	168
Table 6.13 Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Student specific DVs	169
Table 6.14 CMBT through the model-fit	170
Table 6.15 Comparison among Proposed, Alternate and Null model for Student Variables	172
Table 6.16 Test of hypotheses – Student Variables	172
Table 6.17 Faculty Profile Summary	174
Table 6.18 CFA of faculty specific DVs	179
Table 6.19 Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the faculty specific DVs	181
Table 6.20 CMBT – Faculty variables	182
Table 6.21 Comparison among Proposed, Alternate and Null model for Faculty Variables	183

Table 6.22 Test of hypotheses – Faculty Variables	183
Table 6.23 Sample Summary for the Staff.....	185
Table 6.24 Cronbach Alpha, Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	189
Table 6.25 Hypotheses Testing for Staff variables.....	191
Table 7.1 Stakeholder-wise classification of variables as per their nature	208