Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(31s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

The Impact of School Leadership Style on Lecturers' Performance at Public Universities in Vietnam

Nguyen Van Phong[1]
[1] Hanoi Metropolitan University, Hanoi, Vietnam

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 Dec 2024
Revised: 10 Feb 2025
Accepted: 28 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

This study assesses the impact of shared leadership behaviors of university leaders on faculty performance, particularly in the context of growing interest in collaborative leadership models to improve organizational outcomes in higher education institutions. Using a quantitative research method, the study used a cross-sectional survey to collect data on leadership behaviors and lecturer performance. The research sample included 800 lecturers from four public universities in Vietnam: National Economics University, Academy of Finance, Banking University of Ho Chi Minh City, and Ho Chi Minh City University of Education. Participants were selected through a convenience sampling method. The author used a scale for shared leadership and lecturer performance , with Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients of 0.81 and 0.83, respectively, ensuring internal consistency. Pilot tests confirmed the validity and reliability of the measurement instrument. This study contributes to the literature on shared leadership by providing empirical evidence of its impact on faculty performance in higher education. At the same time, the study also provides practical policy implications for university administrators in applying collaborative leadership techniques to improve organizational effectiveness and faculty productivity.
Keywords: Leadership; Head, Lecturer; Work performance.

INTRODUCTION

Leaders are seen as agents of change, as there is a strong link between educational development and leadership (Khan & Mahmoud, 2020). Dominguez (2019) defines a successful leader-follower relationship as one where both parties share a vision, are guided by ethics, and have the ability to collaborate to drive change. Therefore, leaders in higher education need to be truly committed to their mission by establishing clear leadership standards to guide, implement, and achieve shared goals (Oyegoke, 2012).

In the increasingly complex context of higher education institutions, a single individual cannot address all challenges independently. The president can no longer act as an independent individual but must share responsibility and power with subordinates, especially the teaching staff who are considered as the main machines in the system of a higher education institution. This requires leaders to adjust their behavior and interactions to suit each specific situation and need. According to Dominguez (2019), the view of a single leader with absolute power is gradually being replaced by a shared leadership model, in which the leadership role is shared among many individuals in the organization.

Shared leadership occurs when group members take turns taking on leadership roles rather than relying on a single individual (Carson et al., 2007). Ensley et al. (2006) describe shared leadership as a group dynamic in which decisions are made collaboratively rather than by a single person. Randeree & Ninan (2011) also emphasize that leadership plays an important role in achieving common goals.

A prominent feature of shared leadership is the involvement of multiple individuals in the decision-making process. Hulpia & Devos (2009) argue that shared leadership behaviors promote collaboration among groups, enhance leadership support and effective supervision, and facilitate the development of long-term leadership skills among individuals. For faculty, shared leadership not only helps them hone their competencies but also prepares them for future leadership positions.

Research on shared leadership has had a significant impact on areas such as organizational performance, educational outcomes, organizational transformation, democracy in higher education settings, and participation in decision making. Therefore, studying the relationship between shared leadership and subordinate performance can help bridge the gap between theory and practice. At the same time, research also makes an important contribution to encouraging principals and educational administrators to adopt the shared leadership model.

The objective of this study is to examine leadership behaviors of public higher education institutions in Vietnam from

the perspective of subordinates and lecturers. The study will assess lecturers' performance under the influence of school leadership style . At the same time, the study also examines differences in perceptions of school leadership behaviors of leaders based on demographic characteristics, as well as how these characteristics affect lecturers' performance evaluations . To achieve the above objectives, the study uses quantitative methods, with a causal research design. Data were collected through cross-sectional surveys to ensure objectivity and comprehensiveness.

RESEARCH OVERVIEW

a. Leaders of higher education institutions

An influential leader in a higher education setting not only directs the efforts of faculty members toward a common goal but also motivates them with a clear vision. Spillane (2016) defines effective educational leadership as the process of encouraging individuals in an organization to collaborate based on their existing motivation, expertise, and experience. Similarly, Norris et al. (2017) emphasize that the role of a leader is not only that of a decision maker but also a central factor in improving collective performance, guiding faculty members toward more effective ways of working. According to him, this approach can be inherited or developed through training.

The principal plays a vital role in ensuring that faculty members collaborate and work effectively to achieve the common goals of the university (Courtney, 2018). The network of relationships among members of the organization reflects not only the leadership position but also the interdependence between individuals (Moolenaar et al., 2015). The success of a higher education institution cannot be based on a single leader but must be the result of coordination and mutual support between faculty and administrators.

Traditionally, leadership has been understood as a top-down process where a leader uses his or her power and influence to direct subordinates. However, modern research suggests that leadership is not simply about directing a team but also involves building a collaborative and empowering environment (D'Innocenzo et al., 2014). Recent studies have shifted the focus from an individual-centered leadership model to a more flexible model that relies on the participation of multiple stakeholders in the organization (Wang et al., 2014). This has led to an increased interest in collective leadership models in higher education.

The concept of shared leadership emphasizes that there is not only a single individual in command but that many members of the organization may play leadership roles at different times. In recent years, many studies have shown similarities in different approaches to shared leadership (Carson et al., 2017; Pearce & Conger, 2013). According to D'Innocenzo et al. (2014), shared leadership is defined by "shared achievement, shared responsibility, and collaborative values," thereby promoting close coordination between administrators and faculty in improving teaching and research performance.

According to Boies et al. (2010), shared leadership is a characteristic that emerges in a group, formed by the process of spreading leadership responsibility among members. Pearce and Conger (2013) also emphasized that leadership should not be focused on the control of an individual but should be widely distributed in a group. The phrase "shared leadership" refers to the way in which many individuals participate in the process of running an organization, creating a highly collaborative and connected working environment (Pearce & Conger, 2013). People with a shared leadership style have both a supervisory role and a collaborative role, contributing to the effective operation of the organization (Muethel & Hoegl, 2012).

Shared leadership is described as a model in which decision-making power is not concentrated in an individual but is shared among team members, which helps improve organizational performance (Wang et al., 2019). In the context of public universities, institutional leadership plays an important role in coordinating activities and promoting the development of faculty. The leader's responsibilities are not limited to supervision but also include supporting, guiding, and facilitating faculty to maximize their potential. Therefore, the way administrators interact with faculty has a significant impact on the performance of the school (Werther, 2016).

In addition, organizational structure and shared leadership models are interrelated. Shared leadership can only be effective if the organization ensures conditions such as appropriate delegation of authority, transparent monitoring mechanisms, and clear accountability (Angell, 2010). In a highly supportive work environment where leadership is appropriately distributed, faculty tend to be more proactive and creative in their work (Erkutlu, 2012). Creating an environment that encourages shared responsibility not only helps to maximize the potential of each individual but also increases recognition for their contributions. Although the core principle of shared leadership is that “we are stronger

together than we are alone," to maximize this potential, appropriate leadership strategies are needed (Chu et al., 2015). An effective leader must not only manage but also motivate, guide and empower the teaching staff, thereby improving the quality of teaching and research in public universities.

b. Sharing power

Every member of the community has leadership potential and is expected to contribute to the development of the school. Leadership in an organization is based on both adaptive behavior and specific assessment criteria. While management requires coordination of all parts, assessment criteria ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity to participate in the leadership process at a given time (Goksoy, 2016). An organization can only develop sustainably when its members coordinate to carry out their responsibilities. When power is distributed among many individuals rather than concentrated in a single person, it promotes a culture of trust, helping members collaborate more openly and effectively .

There are three important principles in the shared leadership model: first, management is seen as a connecting factor, allowing people to interact and coordinate with each other; second, leadership boundaries are flexible, allowing members to seek advice from many trusted sources; third, diversity in leadership is recognized by many or all members of the group. When an individual is given leadership responsibility at a certain time, all other members also have the obligation to ensure that their leadership role is carried out effectively. In fact, it is impossible to ensure absolute equality if all authority is concentrated in only one individual or a small group of powerful people (Gronn, 2019).

When leaders empower their subordinates, they not only foster interdependence but also help members take more initiative in their work rather than just passively complying. It can be argued that when power is more widely distributed, roles in the organization become more flexible and less rigid. When the success of an organization is shared, more members have the opportunity to benefit from those achievements. Shared leadership is achieved by encouraging a spirit of cooperation and motivating all members to contribute to the common development. This is also an indispensable element in teaching and educational management today (Grönn, 2019).

The leader is responsible for building an effective team to accelerate innovation through human efforts. To understand the motivation and effectiveness of the team, it is necessary to identify common goals and assign appropriate tasks to each individual. A team operates effectively when there is a smooth coordination between members. The development of the team depends mainly on the cohesion in implementing the common goal and the level of commitment of each member. Organizing and mobilizing resources play an important role, and the productivity of the organization also depends on the skills and cooperation of the members (Leithwood et al., 2019)..

c. University lecturers' work performance

A successful organization cannot be separated from the results of work performance as well as the performance of employees in that organization. Performance is defined as the quantity and quality of work of individuals or groups in the company in performing the main tasks and functions guided by the standards, as well as the operating standards, criteria and measures that have been established or applied in the company (Torang, 2013). Employee performance is also the result of work both in quality and quantity that employees achieve when performing their tasks according to the assigned responsibilities (Mangkuprawira & Hubeis, 2007).

Thus, performance is the result of the quantity or quality achieved by an individual or a group of employees in performing their work tasks according to the standards or procedures established by the company. Employee performance has several important indicators, namely quantity, quality, performance of tasks and responsibilities. Here, performance is not only related to individual performance but also reflects the contribution of employees to the overall goals of the organization (Guo, Wong-On-Wing, & Lui, 2014).

In theoretical research, work performance is considered a multidimensional concept, reflecting both the process of performing work and the results achieved. Some performance approaches focus on work behavior, emphasizing the specific actions that workers perform to complete assigned tasks. According to this approach, work performance is not simply the output but also includes the effort, responsibility and working methods of individuals in the process of performing tasks. In contrast, the results-based approach focuses on the specific achievements that individuals or organizations achieve, such as the number of published research, creative products or the level of completion of work targets (Campbell et al., 1993; Roe, 1999).

In the context of higher education, the research performance of lecturers is not only measured by the number of

scientific works or articles published but also reflected in the level of contribution to the development of knowledge and the quality of teaching. High-performing lecturers often demonstrate a proactive spirit in research, updating and innovating teaching methods, as well as actively participating in academic activities to improve the quality of education. A favorable working environment along with a transparent performance evaluation mechanism can promote the motivation of lecturers, thereby contributing to improving the quality of training and scientific research at educational institutions (Duze, 2012; Gibbs, 2002).

In fact, the performance of university lecturers plays an important role in maintaining and improving the quality of education (Retnowati et al., 2021). Regular evaluation helps identify strengths and weaknesses in the teaching and research process, thereby proposing support policies to improve lecturers' productivity. This not only helps improve the quality of student output but also contributes to the sustainable development of the higher education system.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

a. Research sample and questionnaire

This study was conducted on 800 lecturers working at public universities . The research sample was selected as a random sample with a purposeful distribution based on the selection criteria of universities by region, including the National Economics University and the Academy of Finance in the North ; the Banking University of Ho Chi Minh City and the University of Education in Ho Chi Minh City in the South . At the same time, a convenient sampling strategy was also used to ensure the representativeness of the research sample. Specifically, 40% of the total number of lecturers on the list were selected to participate in the survey, based on the recommendation of Gay et al. (2008), when the total size is about 800 people, the minimum sample size needed to be collected is 40%. This data was collected from the official information pages of the universities.

The first component of the questionnaire included general questions aimed at collecting information on the gender, age, educational background and work unit of the lecturers. The second part assessed the independent variable of the study, namely the leader's leadership behavior. This part used a 21-item Likert scale, with the rating ranging from "Strongly disagree" (coded as 1) to "Strongly agree" (coded as 5). The general leadership behavior measurement instrument (SLS) was divided into four groups of indicators. The final section of the questionnaire was used to assess the dependent variable of the study, namely, the performance of lecturers. The lecturer performance scale was developed by Amin et al. (2013), consisting of 22 Likert scale items with similar rating levels, ranging from “Strongly disagree” (coded as 1) to “Strongly agree” (coded as 5). The lecturer performance measurement tool (TPS) was also divided into four groups of indicators.

b. Preliminary survey

According to Frankel et al. (2012), “validity” refers to the quality, relevance, accuracy, and practicality of the research results. To assess the relevance of the research instrument, a pilot study was conducted to test the participants’ understanding and response. Lecturers from the Academy of Finance discussed the research instrument to ensure its usefulness. Accuracy and consistency of data have important implications for the evaluation of each research component.

In the context of measurement, “reliability” reflects the consistency of results obtained across different testing attempts. This study was completed in April 2024, with 75 original participants not included in the final sample.

According to Mallery (2013), the accepted reliability coefficient in social science research is usually at least 0.70. To assess the reliability of the data, the study used the coefficient Cronbach alpha .

Table 1. Cronbach Alpha Reliability

Observation variable	Encryption	Quantity	Number of observations	Cronbach's alpha
Sharing of leaders	SLS	75	21	.81
Lecturer's sharing	TPS	75	22	.83
Shared		**75**	**43**	**.84**

The reliability coefficient used to identify via doing female reliability Analysis. The most reliable scale was the SLS (α = .81), followed by the TPS (α = .83). Overall, the instrument's consistency was .84, indicating high-quality reliability.

c. Official survey

The researcher used a closed-ended questionnaire to collect data from lecturers. The data collection process was carried out directly at the universities. The researcher also committed to protecting the personal information of the participants, ensuring that the data would not be leaked or shared. The average time to read, distribute, and process the survey took about 5 to 10 minutes. The analysis and validation of the research instrument took about 15 to 20 minutes.

RESULT STUDY

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. These were reported as means, percentages, one-way ANOVA, standard deviations, frequencies, linear regression, and independent samples t-test.

The dataset has been updated with survey findings. Data has been analyzed using SPSS. 2 6.0 The dataset has been updated with survey findings. We have tested our statistical hypothesis and generated some basic data for descriptive purposes. Regression analysis has been used to determine the positive association between variables.

Table 2. Sample descriptive statistics on gender

Gender	Quantity	Rate (%)
Male	350	43.75
Female	450	56.25
Total	**800**	**100**

Table 2 shows the gender-based description of the sample. The table shows the number and percentage of respondents classified by gender. The gender of the 800 lecturers who participated in the survey . According to the table, there are 350 male respondents (43.75%) and 450 female respondents (56.25%).

Table 3. Sample descriptive statistics on age

Year old	Quantity	Rate (%)
16-25	23	2 , 875
26-35	363	45 , 375
36-45	369	46,125
46-50	30	3.75
Over 51	15	1 , 875
Total	**800**	**100**

Table 3 shows the sample description by age. The table shows the number and percentage of respondents based on their age. In this table, 23 (2.875%) of the respondents were between the ages of 16-25. 363 (45.375%) of the respondents were between the ages of 26-35. A total of 369 (46.125%) of the respondents were below the ages of 36-45. 30 (3.75%) of the respondents were below the ages of 46-50. 15 (1.875%) of the respondents were below the ages of 51 and above. Table 2 shows the sample description by gender. The table shows the number and percentage of respondents classified by gender. Gender of 800 lecturers participated in the survey has been revealed. According to this table, there are 350 men responded. (43.75%) and 450 respondents were female (56.25%).

Table 3. Sample descriptive statistics on professional qualifications

Professional qualifications	Quantity	Rate (%)
University	240	30
Master	360	45
PhD	200	25

Total	**800**	**100**

Table 4 shows a description of the sample based on level. The table shows number And proportion belong to participant according to professional level There used to 240 faculty members (30%) have undergraduate degrees . There are 360 (45%) faculty members who are qualified for master's degrees and 200 (25%) faculty members who are qualified for PhD degrees or are pursuing PhD degrees.

Table 5. Statistics on lecturers' connections with international individuals and organizations

Higher education institution	Quantity	Rate (%)
Academy of Finance	80	10 , 0
National Economics University	290	36.25
Banking University of Ho Chi Minh City	300	37.5
Ho Chi Minh City University of Education	130	16.25
Total	**800**	**100**

Table 5 describes the sample by university. The table shows the number of respondents and their percentage by university. The table shows that the respondents from the Academy of Finance were 80 (10.0%), the National Economics University were 290 (36.25%), the Banking University of Ho Chi Minh City was 300 (37.5%), and the University of Education of Ho Chi Minh City was 130 (16.25%).

Table 6. Shared leadership style for lecturers

Observation variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Team leadership skills (TL)	800	15.36	1.75
Supervisory leadership ability (SL1)	800	11.07	1.61
Supportive leadership (SL2)	800	14.18	1.78
Leadership capabilities for faculty to participate in important decisions (PDML)	800	18.83	1.89
Shared leadership (SLS)	800	74.80	4.58

Table 6 describes the Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) based on specific responses. It also explains the sub-factors of the SLS, including Team Leadership, Supervisory Leadership, Supportive Leadership, Participative Decision Making leaders and their total SLS. Average value and standard deviation belong to The Shared Leadership Scale (SLS) scores were 74.80 and 4.58, respectively. The mean and SD for Team Leader (TL) was (M = 15.36, SD = 1.75), which was slightly higher. The mean for Supervisory Leader (SL) was (M = 11.07, SD = 1.61), which was the lowest. The mean and SD for Participative Decisional Leader (M = 14.18, SD = 1.78) was higher. The mean and SD for Participative Decisional Leader (M = 18.83, SD = 1.89) was higher, indicating that The lecturer has the highest average score on this scale.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics on lecturer performance

Observation variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Skill Teaching (TS)	800	18.89	2.33
Skill Management (MS)	800	11.93	1.55
Legal skills (RD)	800	23.46	2 , 19

Interpersonal relationships (IR)	800	15.47	1.92
Lecturer performance (TPS)	800	54.28	3 , 27

Table 7 shows a description of the Teacher Performance Rating Scale (TPS) based on specific responses. The table also explains the sub-elements of the TPS, including teaching skills, management skill, regularity And discipline, interpersonal relationships relationship, And total TPS. The mean and standard deviation of the lecturers . TPS (mean = 54.28, standard deviation = 3.27). The mean and standard deviation for Teaching Skills (TS) is (M = 18.89, SD = 2.33), which is slightly higher. While the mean score for Management Skills (M = 11.93, SD = 1.55) is the lowest. The results for Discipline (M = 23.46, SD = 2.19) show that the lecturers have the highest mean score on female ratio. The mean and SD point because interpersonal relationships relationship is (M=15.47, Standard deviation = 1.92).

Table 8 . Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	St. Error	F	P
1	.699	.474	.455	.40877	16.23	.00

Table 8 shows the regression analysis using SL score as a predictor of TP score. The findings suggest how significant changes in TP (dependent variable) can be explained. via SL (independent variable). The R^2 value was 0.47 4 indicating that SL explained 47% of the variation in TP (dependent variable). The results were statistically significant (R^2 =.474, adjusted R^2 =.455, F=16.23, p=.00). TP showed statistical significance (β=.681, p<.05).

Table 9. Gender comparisons regarding perceptions of leadership behavior

Observation variable	Sex	Mean	Standard deviation	D_f	t	P
Team leadership skills (TL)	Male	15.35	1.74	798	- .18	.85
	Female	15.37	1.75			
and supervision skills (SL1)	Male	11.09	1.66	798	- 2.68	.05
	Female	12.04	1.56			
Supportive leadership (SL2)	Male	14.12	1.81	798	- 1.12	.26
	Female	14.26	1.74			
Participative leadership (PDML)	Male	18.78	1.96	798	- 2.68	.001
	Female	19.87	1.80			
Leadership share (SLS)	Male	74.76	4.61	798	.395	.004
	Female	75.93	4.55			

To compare the mean values of general leadership behavior ratings between men and women participants, one independence sample t-test used to be used. Table 09 programme that woman lecturer shared leadership assessment behavior significantly higher (M=75.93, SD=4.55) than male faculty (M=74.76, SD=4.61). The p-value (>0.04) indicates that male and female professors have significantly different views. Female faculty perceive participative leadership (M=19.87, SD=1.80) more highly than male faculty (M=18.78, SD=1.90). The mean PDML scores of male and female faculty are significantly different. In addition, there is a significant difference in the impression of supervisory leadership (SL1). Female faculty are more respected in this area (M=12.09, SD=1.56) than male respondents (M=11.09, SD=1.66).

Table 10. Gender comparisons in relation to perceptions of faculty performance

Observation variable	Gender calculate	Value medium	Standard deviation	D_f	t	P
Skill teaching (TS)	Male	15.36	1.89	798	2.58	.004
	Female	16.60	1.95			

Skill belong to manage (MS)	Male Female	15.41 15.32	1.68 1.80	798	.591	.555
Discipline (RD)	Male Female	15.90 15.88	1.43 1.58	798	.197	.846
Interpersonal Relations (IR)	Male Female	15.22 15.32	1.33 1.43	798	.173	.32
Lecturer performance (TPS)	Male Female	46.68 47.82	2.92 3.04	798	.456	.005

The t-test was used to compare the mean performance scales of the teachers, teaching ability, management skill, consistency and discipline, and interpersonal relationships relationship scores of male and female lecturers from different groups. The results of the T-test are presented. Table 10 shows that female lecturers (M=47.8, SD=3.04) expressed their opinions on the TPS scale significantly more than male lecturers. There may be a statistical difference significant difference in mean TPS scores between males and females. It also explains the sub-factors of the TPS scale. It was found that female faculty reported slightly higher views on TS (M = 16.60, SD = 1.95) than did males (M = 15.36, SD = 1.89). Male faculty scores And female lecturer do Are not distinctive between skills

Table 11. Mean and SD of TLS

Observation variable	Year old	Quantity	Value medium (Mean)	Standard deviation (SD)
Skill teaching (TS)	16-25	23	14.87	1.77
	26-35	363	15.46	1.91
	36-45	369	15.46	1.93
	46-50	30	16.34	1.94
	> 50	15	15.44	1.09
Skill manage (MS)	16-25	23	15.27	1.39
	26-35	363	15.42	1.87
	36-45	369	15.36	1.66
	46-50	30	15.07	1.58
	> 50	15	15.70	1.37
Discipline (RD)	16-25	23	16.41	1.55
	26-35	363	15.86	1.55
	36-45	369	15.96	1.48
	46-50	30	15.41	1.20
	> 50	15	15.83	1.73
Interpersonal relationships (IR)	16-25	23	15.65	1.22
	26-35	363	15.54	1.56
	36-45	369	15.35	1.68
	46-50	30	15.12	1.67
	> 50	15	15.33	1.36
Performance teacher performance (TPS)	16-25	23	55.54	3.36
	26-35	363	54.73	3.31
	36-45	369	53.93	3.26
	46-50	30	53.24	2.91
	> 50	15	53.83	2.66

Table 11 shows the age group of the respondents as indicated in the study. Out of 800 respondents, 23 were between the ages of 16 and 25. Majority of the respondents were faculty members (N = 369) between the ages of 36 and 45. 363

of the respondents were below the age of 35 (N = 363), 30 were between the ages of 46 and 50 and 15 were 51 and above. It also highlights the sub-factors in the TPS scale. It is seen that the number of items with high mean scores (M = 16.41, SD = 1.55). Low scores (M = 14.83; SD = 1.74).

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

This study investigated how the general leadership behavior of principals affects the performance of faculty and subordinates at the university level. There is a need to investigate the attitudes of faculty toward the general leadership behavior of principals.

Yusuf (2004) supports the conclusion of the present study that shared leadership behavior of the head positively affects the performance of lecturers or subordinates. In the previous study, it was found that shared leadership has a significant impact on the performance of lecturers at Port Klang Regional University. In the present study, the productivity of lecturers in the workplace increased significantly when they were given additional leadership duties. These findings are consistent with the findings of Najib (2004) who has been discovered One positive relationship between female Leadership behavior belong to university input female Kedah land and efficiency belong to their subordinates or lecturer

Ori Eyal and Guy Roth (2011) found that principal leadership style has a significant impact collision ABOVE teacher spirit And productivity Harris (2008) stated that shared leadership can influence organizational change and that continuous education for faculty or subordinates is an important avenue for development. Previous research has addressed the relationship between shared leadership and organizational success, although the issue of shared leadership has received little attention. a lot of attention

The present study found that faculty members have positive opinions about the general leadership behavior of their heads at the university level. The general leadership scale has been shown to be based on clear responses. Explanation of the sub-factors of the SLS The scales, namely Team Leadership, Supervisory Leadership, Supportive Leadership, Participative Leadership Decision Leadership, And their total SLS. The mean And SD card The Team Leader score was the highest. The mean score of Supervisory Leadership was the lowest. The mean and SD scores of Participative Decisional Leadership showed that the lecturers had the highest mean scores on this scale. Additional research (Hi , 2014; Kormaz, 2012; Ulu And Hello, 2013; Sar-ke, 2012; Bakr, 2013; Asan, 2014; Güler, 2015; Oruç, 2014; Sarıcı, 2013; Kelkçi, 2016; Şahi, 2015) further extended the findings of this study regarding general leadership behavior and subordinates' constructive work performance.

Lecturer awareness belong to lecturer efficiency in female university level result in describe belong to female Lecturer efficiency ratio based on above specifically reply. It But also provide explanations for sub-factors such as teaching skills, management skills, regularity and discipline, And interpersonal relationships mean and SD for Teaching skills (TS) are slightly higher. The mean score for management skills is the lowest. Lecturers have the highest mean score on the measure of discipline . However, there are other studies with similar findings on the sub-dimensions of shared leadership. Some studies have been analyzed (Kurt, 2015; Tian, 2012; Sheppard, Hurley, and Dibbon, 2011) and found that shared leadership predicts the sub-dimension of lecturer performance. Some studies (Yılmaz and Kurşun, 2016; Çetin et al., 2013; Schermerhorn and et al., 1990; Mascall and et al., 2009) suggest that thing shared Leadership improves the performance of teachers or subordinates.

CONCLUSION

The study examined how general leadership behavior of the head affects the performance of lecturers in public universities in Vietnam . To achieve the research objectives, the author used reflective indicators such as percentages, frequencies, descriptive analysis, inferential analysis or independent sample t-test, analysis of variance and regression were used to answer the research questions. The current study concluded that general leadership behavior of the head has a beneficial effect on lecturers' performance. The independent sample t-test showed that women have better performance than men. One-way analysis of variance was described by demographic factors such as age, education level and university. The analysis showed that general leadership behavior was not significantly related to age or education level. Furthermore, there was no difference in general leadership behavior among universities. Another conclusion from the study indicated that lecturers' performance used to be irrelevant arrive year old And professional level It used to be identify that thing there used to be There was no difference in faculty and school-wide views of teaching performance.

RECOMMENDATION

To improve the effectiveness of shared leadership in higher education, institutions should build a collaborative culture that respects diverse opinions and promotes open communication among professors, staff, and students. This can be achieved by creating comprehensive leadership ability train programme that thing provide one wider for stakeholders with the skills needed for effective collaborative decision making. Furthermore , it is important to develop frameworks that support the interpretation of tasks while allowing team members to assume leadership responsibilities. Organizations can also promote accountability via link individual contribute with shared organization target, so that all members participate in the success of the group.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, D., Samat, S.N.A., & Samah, H.A. (2018). Teacher leadership: Going beyond classroom. *International Online Journal of Educational Leadership*, *2* (1), 1-3.

[2] Adewuya, AO, Oseni, SB, & Okeniyi, JA (2006). School performance of Nigerian adolescents with epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, *47* (2), 415-420.

[3] Baker, J.A., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher-student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *23* (1), 3.

[4] Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International journal of management reviews*, *13* (3), 251-269.

[5] Cammock, P., (2011). Leadership for emergence: Exploring organizations through a living system lens. *Leading and Managing*, *17* (1), 59-74.

[6] Carson, J.B., Tesluk, P.E., & Marrone, J.A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of management Journal*, *50* (5), 1217-1234.

[7] Clifford, M., Behrstock-Sherratt, E., & Fetters, J. (2012). The Ripple Effect: A Synthesis of Research on Principal Influence to Inform Performance Evaluation Design. A Quality School Leadership Issue Brief. *American Institutes for Research*.

[8] Coleman, A. (2011). Towards a blended model of leadership for school-based collaborations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* , *39* (3), 296-316.

[9] Courtney, S.J. (2018). Privatizing educational leadership through technology in the Trumpian era. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *50* (1), 23- 31.

[10] Dinham, S. (2007). How schools get moving and keep improving: Leadership for teacher learning, student success and school renewal. *Australian journal of education*, *51* (3), 263-275.

[11] Goksoy, S. (2016). Analysis of the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *16* (65), 295-312.

[12] Hoch, J. E. (2013). Shared leadership and innovation: The role of vertical leadership and employee integrity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *28* , 159-174.

[13] Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *69* (6), 1013-1034.

[14] Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2009). The influence of distributed leadership on teachers' organizational commitment: A multilevel approach. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *103* (1), 40-52.

[15] Humphreys, JH, Oyler, JD, Haden, SSP, & Novicevic, MM (2013). interventions and members' collective personalities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *32* (5), 101499.

[16] Kearney, RC, & Hays, SW (2019). Labor-Management Relations and Participative Decision Making: Toward a New Paradigm. *In Handbook of Public Quality Management* (pp. 532-544). Routledge.

[17] Khan, A., & Mahmood, M.K. (2020). Effects of Distributed Leadership on Teachers' Commitment and Job Satisfaction at Secondary Level. *Journal of Secondary Education and Research*, *2* (2), 31-42.

[18] Khasawneh, S. (2011). Shared leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in Jordanian public universities: Developing a global workforce for the 21stCentury. *Educational management administration & leadership*, *39* (5), 621- 634.

[19] Liu, S., Hu, J., Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Lin, X. (2014). Examining the cross-level relationship between shared leadership and learning in teams: Evidence from China. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25* (2), 282-295.

[20] Mofuoa, K. (2015). The exemplary ethical leadership of King Moshoeshoe of Basotho of Lesotho in the nineteenth century southern Africa. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *5* (3), 21-35.

[21] Muthoni, M.P. (2015). Shared Leadership and Students' Performance in Secondary Schools. In *Information and Knowledge Management* (Vol. 5, No. 7).

[22] Okoth, U.A. (2018). Transformational leadership curriculum in implementation (environmental education practices) in secondary schools in Siaya County, Kenya. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ* , *14* (10), 320-331.

[23] Pearce, CL, & Manz, CC (2011). Leadership centrality and corporate social responsibility (CSIR): The potential ameliorating effects of self and shared leadership on CSIR. *Journal of Business Ethic*, *102* , 563-579.

[24] Pearce, C.L., Manz, C.C., & Akanno, S. (2013). Searching for the holy grail of management development and sustainability: is shared leadership development the answer?. *Journal of Management Development*, *32* (3), 247-257.

[25] Sekhar Bhattacharyya, S., & Jha, S. (2013). Explicating strategic shared leadership process. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, *5* (1), 57-71.

[26] Sherer, D. (2021). Getting better at getting better: Improvement dispositions in education. *Teachers College Record*, *123* (4), 1-42.

[27] Song, W., Jiang, H., Zhuang, W., & Shen, X. (2005). Resource management for QoS support in cellular/WLAN interworking. *IEEE networking*, *19* (5), 12-18.

[28] Tatlah, IA, & Iqbal, MZ (2012). Leadership styles and school effectiveness: Empirical evidence from secondary level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *69*, 790-797.

[29] Terry, R.W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z., & Ma, X. (2017). Shared leadership and team effectiveness:

[30] The examination of LMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership. *Human Performance*, *30* (4), 155-168.

[31] Wang, P., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: the moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, *60* (2), 397-427.

[32] Wheelan, S.A., & Kesselring, J. (2015). *Link between faculty group: Development and elementary student performance on standardized*.