
Educational Leadership as a Humanistic Practice in Pakistan: Psychological Well-Being, Ethics, Culture, and Policy

Ain Fatima

Independent Researcher

Ain.libran@gmail.com

Ms. Fauzia Amin (Corresponding Author)

Lecturer, English Department, Government College Women University,
Faisalabad.Pakistan.

fauziaamin@gcwuf.edu.pk

Abstract

Educational leadership is commonly examined through the language of institutional effectiveness, governance, performance, quality assurance, and strategic development. Such approaches, however, can overlook the human, ethical, cultural, and psychological dimensions of leadership. This conceptual study examines the psychological well-being of educational leaders in Pakistan by interpreting educational leadership as a humanistic practice concerned with human agency, dignity, ethical responsibility, meaningful work, relationships, and institutional culture. The study integrates Burns's (1978) and Bass's (1985) transformational leadership perspectives with Ryff's (1989) multidimensional model of psychological well-being. An interpretive qualitative approach is employed through thematic analysis of policy documents and scholarly literature concerning educational leadership, institutional governance, organizational conditions, and mental health in Pakistan. Four analytical themes are developed: transformational expectations, structural and cultural constraints, the humanistic dimensions of leadership well-being, and policy integration. The analysis indicates that Pakistani higher education policies increasingly emphasize governance, quality, leadership development, and institutional performance, while psychological well-being remains insufficiently integrated into leadership and governance frameworks. Excessive administrative demands, restricted institutional autonomy, inadequate resources, bureaucratic structures, organizational culture, and sociocultural attitudes toward mental health can constrain leaders' capacity to exercise transformational and human-centered leadership. Drawing on Ryff's framework, the study argues that autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships, purpose in life, and self-acceptance should be regarded not merely as individual psychological attributes but also as conditions shaped by institutional structures and cultural environments. The

study concludes that sustainable educational leadership requires a shift from a predominantly managerial understanding of leadership toward a humanistic model that recognizes the dignity, agency, ethical responsibility, and well-being of educational leaders. Integrating leadership, institutional culture, and mental health policy can contribute to more humane and sustainable higher education in Pakistan.

Keywords: Educational Leadership; Humanistic Leadership; Psychological Well-Being; Leadership Ethics; Human Agency; Institutional Culture; Human Flourishing; Pakistan

1. Introduction

Educational leadership is generally discussed in terms of institutional performance, governance, strategic planning, quality assurance, and organizational development. Yet educational institutions are fundamentally human communities in which leadership is exercised through relationships, values, communication, responsibility, meaning, and ethical judgment. Educational leaders are therefore not merely administrators responsible for achieving institutional targets; they are human actors who must negotiate competing expectations, institutional constraints, professional relationships, and social responsibilities. Understanding educational leadership consequently requires attention to the psychological and humanistic conditions within which leadership is practiced.

The psychological well-being of educational leaders has received comparatively limited attention in the Pakistani context. University leaders are expected to promote institutional development, support faculty, enhance educational quality, respond to governance requirements, and facilitate organizational change. At the same time, they frequently operate within complex bureaucratic and resource-constrained environments that can restrict autonomy and increase administrative pressure. This creates a significant tension between the expectation that leaders should transform institutions and the organizational conditions available to support such transformation.

Transformational leadership provides an important theoretical perspective for understanding this tension. Burns (1978) conceptualized transformational leadership as a process through which leaders and followers raise one another toward higher levels of motivation, morality, and purpose. Bass (1985) subsequently developed the theory by emphasizing idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Within educational settings, transformational leadership has been associated with shared vision, professional commitment, collaboration, organizational development, and institutional improvement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

However, transformational leadership cannot be understood independently of context. Leadership practices are shaped by institutional culture, governance structures, available resources, professional relationships, and wider social conditions (Brauckmann et al., 2020;

Miller, 2018; Morrison, 2013). Where leaders have limited autonomy, excessive administrative responsibilities, insufficient resources, or weak organizational support, their capacity to enact transformational values may be constrained. The issue is therefore not simply whether educational leaders possess appropriate competencies, but whether institutional structures permit those competencies to be exercised meaningfully.

This question has particular relevance in Pakistan, where higher education has undergone substantial changes in governance, quality assurance, institutional regulation, and leadership expectations. Recent public debate concerning university autonomy has further highlighted tensions between institutional leadership and external governmental or regulatory control (Ur Rehman, 2025). Such conditions raise a broader humanistic question: What happens to the well-being, agency, dignity, and sense of purpose of educational leaders when they are held responsible for institutional transformation without having sufficient autonomy and organizational support?

Psychological well-being offers an appropriate conceptual lens through which to examine this question. Ryff (1989) conceptualizes well-being not simply as happiness or the absence of psychological illness but as positive psychological functioning involving autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. These dimensions have considerable relevance to educational leadership because leadership itself involves decision-making, responsibility, interpersonal relationships, professional development, meaning, and the ability to respond constructively to complex institutional environments.

The present study therefore approaches educational leadership from a humanistic perspective. Rather than treating psychological well-being as an individual issue separate from institutional performance, it conceptualizes well-being as interconnected with organizational structures, institutional culture, ethical responsibility, and leadership practice. The central research question is:

How do institutional, cultural, and policy conditions shape the relationship between transformational leadership and the psychological well-being of educational leaders in Pakistan?

The study contributes to the literature by bringing together transformational leadership theory and Ryff's model of psychological well-being within an interpretive framework that emphasizes human agency, dignity, ethical responsibility, institutional culture, and human flourishing. It further contributes to the Arts and Humanities orientation by understanding leadership not merely as a managerial mechanism but as a human and ethical practice embedded within cultural and institutional meanings.

2. Literature Review

Transformational Leadership and Educational Practice

Transformational leadership was introduced by Burns (1978) as a form of leadership concerned with transforming the motivations, values, and aspirations of leaders and followers. Bass (1985) expanded this perspective by identifying four major dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The theory emphasizes the capacity of leaders to create shared purpose, stimulate intellectual engagement, encourage development, and establish meaningful relationships.

In educational settings, transformational leadership has been adapted to address shared vision, participatory decision-making, professional development, individualized support, and organizational improvement. Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) demonstrated that transformational leadership can influence organizational conditions and student engagement. Subsequent research has associated transformational leadership with teachers' motivation, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, collaboration, and institutional development (Balyer, 2017; González-Cruz et al., 2019; Kouni et al., 2018).

The significance of transformational leadership, however, extends beyond organizational outcomes. The theory contains an implicit humanistic dimension because it recognizes followers as individuals with values, aspirations, intellectual capacities, and developmental needs. Individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation all involve forms of human engagement that cannot be reduced entirely to administrative procedures or performance indicators.

This humanistic dimension becomes particularly important when educational leadership is understood as a relational practice. Leaders influence institutional culture through the meanings they communicate, the relationships they establish, and the opportunities they create for participation and professional development. Leadership consequently involves not only the achievement of organizational objectives but also the creation of conditions in which individuals can experience agency, recognition, purpose, and belonging.

Context, Culture, and Institutional Constraints

Transformational leadership does not operate in a social or institutional vacuum. Miller (2018) emphasizes the significance of culture and context in shaping educational leadership, while Brauckmann et al. (2020) highlight the relationship between leadership and organizational context. Morrison (2013) similarly identifies structural challenges that can restrict educational leaders' ability to implement change. Bush (2018) draws attention to inadequate funding, insufficient leadership investment, and governance challenges affecting educational leadership.

These perspectives are particularly relevant to Pakistan. Educational leaders may be expected to improve quality, introduce innovation, manage staff, meet regulatory requirements, and respond to institutional pressures while working within bureaucratic structures and resource limitations. Under such circumstances, leadership effectiveness becomes partly dependent on

the extent to which leaders possess meaningful institutional autonomy and organizational support.

The issue is therefore not simply a matter of leadership competency. A leader may possess the motivation, professional knowledge, and interpersonal capacity required for transformational leadership while simultaneously lacking the institutional authority necessary to implement meaningful change. The resulting tension can affect not only institutional performance but also the leader's psychological experience of work.

Research in Pakistan supports the contextual nature of educational leadership. Ahmed and Kiran (2024) found positive relationships between transformational leadership and organizational culture, motivation, job satisfaction, and commitment within educational settings. Kanwal et al. (2025) similarly reported positive associations between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, collaboration, and professional performance among educational workers. However, these studies also indicate the importance of contextual conditions, professional development, cultural factors, and institutional support.

Zulfqar et al. (2016), examining leadership and decision-making in public and private universities in Pakistan, found evidence of transformational behaviors such as vision articulation, consensus building, and the maintenance of high standards. At the same time, the scope of participatory decision-making remained institutionally constrained. This finding is important because participation, autonomy, and shared decision-making are not merely managerial mechanisms; they are also expressions of human agency within institutional life.

Psychological Well-Being as Human Flourishing

Ryff's (1989) model provides a multidimensional understanding of psychological well-being. Unlike purely hedonic approaches that emphasize happiness, pleasure, or satisfaction, Ryff conceptualizes well-being in terms of positive functioning and human development. The six dimensions—autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance—provide a particularly useful framework for interpreting the human experience of leadership.

Autonomy refers to the capacity to act with independence and self-direction. For educational leaders, autonomy is connected with meaningful participation in institutional decision-making and the ability to exercise professional judgment. Environmental mastery concerns the capacity to manage and shape one's surrounding environment. In educational leadership, this involves navigating institutional complexity while maintaining a sense of competence and control.

Personal growth relates to continuous development and openness to new experiences. Educational leadership requires continual learning because institutions operate within changing social, technological, intellectual, and policy environments. Positive relations emphasize meaningful interpersonal connections, while purpose in life concerns the

perception that one's activities possess direction and meaning. Self-acceptance involves a balanced understanding and acceptance of oneself.

These dimensions demonstrate that psychological well-being is not simply a private psychological state. It is also connected with social relationships, institutional environments, professional identity, cultural expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation. For this reason, the well-being of educational leaders should not be treated exclusively as an individual responsibility.

The Pakistani Policy Context

Pakistan's higher education policy environment increasingly emphasizes governance, quality assurance, institutional effectiveness, leadership, and regulatory standards (Higher Education Commission [HEC], 2024, 2026). These priorities are important for institutional development, but a predominantly performance-oriented approach can leave insufficient space for considering the human conditions through which institutional objectives are pursued.

Mental health policy, meanwhile, has historically been associated primarily with the health sector. Earlier discussions identified significant gaps in mental health services, resources, professional capacity, and institutional support in Pakistan (Humayun, 2018). The Planning Commission (2021) also documented mental health and psychosocial support initiatives within the broader national policy environment.

More recent international guidance has encouraged education systems to move beyond treating mental health as an isolated health-sector concern. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2025) advocates coordinated and cross-sectoral approaches that integrate mental health promotion, prevention, and support within educational environments. This perspective is significant for higher education because institutional governance, leadership, workplace culture, staff support, and psychological well-being are interconnected dimensions of educational life.

The literature therefore reveals a conceptual and policy gap. Educational leadership is generally discussed in terms of institutional effectiveness and governance, while psychological well-being is often addressed through mental health and health-sector frameworks. The relationship between the two remains insufficiently theorized, particularly in the Pakistani higher education context.

3. Conceptual Framework and Methodology

Research Design

This study employs an interpretive qualitative approach based on policy and document analysis and thematic synthesis of scholarly literature. The purpose is not to statistically test relationships between variables but to interpret how educational leadership, psychological

well-being, institutional culture, and policy are represented and connected within the Pakistani context.

The study draws upon three interconnected bodies of evidence: policy and institutional documents concerning higher education and mental health; empirical studies addressing educational leadership and organizational conditions in Pakistan; and theoretical literature concerning transformational leadership and psychological well-being.

The interpretive approach is particularly appropriate because the study is concerned with meanings, values, institutional relationships, human agency, and policy discourse. Such an approach enables educational leadership to be examined as a human and cultural practice rather than solely as a measurable organizational variable.

Analytical Framework

Burns's (1978) and Bass's (1985) transformational leadership theories provide the leadership dimension of the framework. The analysis focuses on idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Ryff's (1989) model provides the well-being dimension through six analytical concepts:

1. Autonomy
2. Environmental mastery
3. Personal growth
4. Positive relations with others
5. Purpose in life
6. Self-acceptance

These concepts are interpreted in relation to the institutional and cultural environment in which educational leadership occurs.

The resulting conceptual relationship can be represented as follows:

Transformational Leadership

↓

Human Agency, Ethical Responsibility, Meaningful Relationships & Shared Purpose

↓

Psychological Well-Being and Human Flourishing

Institutional Culture + Governance Structures + Resource Conditions + Sociocultural Context + Policy Environment

The contextual conditions surrounding the framework function as **moderating conditions**. They can strengthen or constrain the extent to which transformational leadership is translated into meaningful human and institutional outcomes.

Data Sources and Analytical Procedure

The documentary material included policy-related publications concerning higher education governance, quality assurance, leadership development, institutional effectiveness, and mental health in Pakistan. International policy guidance was also considered where it provided a comparative framework for understanding the integration of education and mental health.

Published research on educational leadership and organizational conditions was examined for evidence concerning leadership practice, institutional autonomy, workload, organizational culture, professional development, decision-making, support structures, and employee well-being.

The analysis proceeded through thematic interpretation. Four themes were developed:

Theme 1: Transformational Expectations. This theme examines expectations placed upon educational leaders concerning institutional development, quality improvement, innovation, shared vision, and organizational change.

Theme 2: Structural and Cultural Constraints. This theme examines bureaucracy, restricted autonomy, workload pressures, limited resources, institutional culture, governance structures, and sociocultural attitudes that may constrain leadership practice.

Theme 3: Humanistic Dimensions of Leadership Well-Being. This theme interprets leadership through autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, relationships, purpose, self-acceptance, dignity, agency, and meaningful work.

Theme 4: Policy Integration and Human Flourishing. This theme examines possibilities for connecting educational leadership, mental health, organizational culture, and institutional policy.

Because the study is based on secondary evidence, it does not claim to establish direct causal relationships between transformational leadership and psychological well-being. Instead, it offers a conceptual interpretation of how the two domains may be interconnected within institutional and policy contexts.

4. Analysis and Discussion

Educational Leadership beyond Managerial Effectiveness

The analysis indicates that educational leadership in Pakistan is frequently framed through institutional effectiveness, governance, strategic planning, quality assurance, and

performance. These dimensions are important, but a purely managerial understanding of leadership can overlook the human experience through which institutional change is pursued.

Transformational leadership requires leaders to communicate purpose, inspire others, encourage intellectual development, support individuals, and build relationships. These activities require emotional, psychological, relational, and ethical resources. Leadership consequently depends not only on what leaders are expected to achieve but also on the conditions under which they are expected to act.

From a humanistic perspective, the leader is not simply an institutional instrument. The leader is a person whose autonomy, dignity, professional identity, relationships, aspirations, and sense of meaning are relevant to institutional life. When leadership is reduced to performance targets, these dimensions can become invisible.

Autonomy and Institutional Agency

Autonomy is one of the central dimensions of Ryff's (1989) model and is also fundamental to meaningful leadership. Educational leaders require sufficient authority to make decisions, implement institutional priorities, and respond to the needs of their organizations.

Research on Pakistani universities indicates that institutional decision-making can be constrained by governance arrangements and organizational structures (Zulfqar et al., 2016). Public debate concerning university autonomy similarly illustrates the tension between institutional leadership and external authority (Ur Rehman, 2025).

From a humanistic perspective, restricted autonomy has implications beyond administrative efficiency. It can affect leaders' sense of agency and responsibility. If individuals are held accountable for outcomes while having limited authority over the decisions necessary to produce those outcomes, leadership becomes structurally conflicted.

This suggests that leadership development cannot be limited to training leaders in communication, management, strategic planning, or governance. Institutional structures must also provide meaningful opportunities for professional judgment and participation.

Environmental Mastery and Organizational Conditions

Environmental mastery refers to an individual's capacity to manage and shape surrounding circumstances (Ryff, 1989). In educational leadership, this dimension is closely connected with the ability to navigate institutional complexity.

However, environmental mastery should not be interpreted as an individual's obligation to overcome every organizational obstacle. A humanistic interpretation recognizes that institutional environments themselves can either enable or restrict human functioning.

Excessive administrative responsibilities, inadequate resources, bureaucratic procedures, and limited decision-making authority can weaken leaders' ability to exercise effective

leadership. Morrison (2013) and Bush (2018) emphasize the significance of structural conditions in educational leadership, while Miller (2018) demonstrates the importance of context and culture.

The implication is important: organizational problems should not automatically be interpreted as individual leadership deficiencies. A leader who experiences difficulty under structurally restrictive conditions may not lack competence; rather, the institutional environment may limit the meaningful exercise of that competence.

Personal Growth and Meaningful Professional Life

Educational leadership is inherently developmental. Leaders are required to learn, adapt, respond to emerging challenges, and facilitate the development of others. Ryff's (1989) dimension of personal growth therefore provides a valuable humanistic basis for understanding leadership.

Transformational leadership similarly emphasizes intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). The connection between these perspectives suggests that institutions should create opportunities for leaders to continue developing professionally and intellectually.

Professional development should consequently be understood not merely as a mechanism for improving organizational performance but as an aspect of human development. Leadership training, mentoring, reflection, scholarly engagement, and collegial interaction can contribute to a leader's sense of purpose and professional identity.

Positive Relationships and Institutional Culture

Educational institutions are relational environments. Leaders work with faculty, administrators, students, policymakers, governing bodies, and other stakeholders. Positive relationships are therefore central to both transformational leadership and psychological well-being.

Transformational leadership emphasizes individualized consideration and shared purpose, while Ryff (1989) identifies positive relations as a core dimension of well-being. Together, these perspectives indicate that institutional relationships are not secondary to leadership effectiveness; they are part of its human foundation.

Organizational cultures characterized by trust, collegiality, respect, participation, and communication can support both leadership and well-being. Conversely, cultures dominated by fear, excessive hierarchy, mistrust, or exclusion may undermine relational capacity.

This is particularly important in culturally diverse institutional environments where leadership practices are interpreted through social expectations and established organizational traditions. Leadership must therefore be understood within its cultural context rather than treated as a universally transferable set of techniques (Miller, 2018).

Purpose, Ethics, and Human Flourishing

Purpose in life is another central dimension of Ryff's (1989) model. Educational leadership is fundamentally connected with purpose because educational institutions are concerned with knowledge, intellectual development, social responsibility, and human formation.

Transformational leadership similarly emphasizes shared vision and collective purpose (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). From an Arts and Humanities perspective, this dimension is particularly significant because leadership can be interpreted through questions of values, responsibility, meaning, morality, and the common good.

Educational leaders are not simply responsible for institutional outputs. They also participate in shaping institutional values and the conditions under which teaching, learning, scholarship, and professional relationships occur. Leadership therefore carries an ethical responsibility toward the dignity and development of others.

A humanistic understanding of leadership consequently shifts the question from "How effective is the leader?" to a broader set of questions: What kind of institutional culture does leadership create? Whose dignity and agency are recognized? What forms of human development are enabled? And how can institutional effectiveness be pursued without sacrificing human well-being?

Policy Fragmentation and the Leadership–Well-Being Gap

One of the central findings of this conceptual analysis is the apparent separation between educational leadership policy and mental health policy. Higher education policy primarily emphasizes governance, quality, institutional effectiveness, strategic development, and leadership capacity (HEC, 2024, 2026). Mental health policy, by contrast, has traditionally been located primarily within health-sector frameworks.

Such policy fragmentation can produce a leadership–well-being gap. Educational leaders may be expected to transform institutions, support staff, improve educational quality, and manage organizational complexity without explicit policy provisions addressing their own psychological well-being.

The WHO (2025) guidance provides an important international basis for challenging such separation. Its cross-sectoral approach recognizes that mental health should be incorporated into education-sector structures rather than treated exclusively as a health issue. This perspective supports the argument that higher education governance should incorporate psychological well-being, workplace culture, leadership support, and institutional relationships.

The Pakistani context therefore requires greater conceptual integration between educational leadership and mental health policy. Such integration does not imply transforming universities into mental health institutions. Rather, it means recognizing that institutional

governance and organizational culture influence the psychological conditions in which educational work takes place.

Sociocultural Context and Mental Health

Psychological well-being cannot be separated from culture. Attitudes toward mental health, help-seeking, professional identity, and emotional expression are shaped by social norms and cultural expectations. In contexts where psychological difficulties are stigmatized, educational leaders may hesitate to acknowledge distress or seek professional support.

Research concerning mental health in Pakistan has identified persistent challenges relating to stigma, service availability, and help-seeking (Humayun, 2018). More recent research similarly highlights the role of cultural narratives and social norms in shaping mental health help-seeking behavior (Daraz et al., 2025).

These conditions are important for educational leadership because leaders themselves may be influenced by the same cultural expectations. A culture that equates leadership with constant strength, control, and emotional endurance can discourage leaders from acknowledging vulnerability or seeking support.

A humanistic approach does not treat vulnerability as leadership failure. Instead, it recognizes psychological well-being as part of responsible and sustainable professional life.

Toward a Humanistic Policy Framework

The synthesis suggests that leadership development policies in Pakistan should move beyond an exclusive emphasis on competencies and institutional performance. A more comprehensive framework should connect leadership development with organizational conditions and human well-being.

Such a framework may include:

- meaningful institutional autonomy for educational leaders;
- reduction of unnecessary administrative burdens;
- leadership mentoring and reflective professional development;
- organizational cultures based on trust, dignity, participation, and respect;
- accessible psychological and well-being support;
- mechanisms for constructive dialogue between leaders and governing authorities;
- integration of mental health considerations into institutional leadership policies;
- culturally sensitive approaches to psychological support; and
- policy evaluation that considers human as well as institutional outcomes.

These measures should not be understood merely as welfare interventions. They are part of the conditions required for sustainable educational leadership.

5. Implications for Arts and Humanities

The humanistic orientation of this study provides an important contribution to the Arts and Humanities by interpreting educational leadership through concepts of human agency, ethical responsibility, dignity, meaning, relationships, culture, and flourishing.

The study challenges the assumption that educational leadership can be adequately understood through managerial indicators alone. Institutional effectiveness is ultimately produced through human relationships, values, decisions, and practices. Consequently, leadership research benefits from interpretive attention to the meanings that individuals attach to authority, responsibility, autonomy, professional identity, and institutional life.

The integration of Burns's (1978) and Bass's (1985) transformational leadership perspectives with Ryff's (1989) model also creates a bridge between leadership studies and broader humanistic questions concerning human development and flourishing. Transformational leadership addresses collective purpose, ethical influence, intellectual development, and relationships, while Ryff's framework provides a language for examining autonomy, growth, meaning, relationality, and self-acceptance.

This perspective is particularly relevant to Pakistan because leadership practices are embedded within cultural, institutional, and political contexts. Understanding those practices therefore requires more than measuring leadership behaviors. It requires interpretation of the values, institutional structures, cultural expectations, and human experiences that shape leadership.

6. Conclusion

This conceptual study argues that educational leadership in Pakistan should be understood not merely as an administrative or managerial process but as a humanistic practice involving agency, dignity, ethical responsibility, relationships, meaning, and human development.

The synthesis of transformational leadership theory and Ryff's model of psychological well-being demonstrates that effective leadership depends upon more than individual competencies. Leaders require institutional conditions that allow them to exercise autonomy, develop professionally, establish positive relationships, maintain a sense of purpose, and experience meaningful engagement with their work.

The analysis further identifies a significant gap between educational leadership policy and psychological well-being policy. Higher education policies emphasize governance, quality assurance, institutional effectiveness, and leadership development, whereas psychological well-being is more commonly addressed through separate mental health frameworks. The resulting fragmentation can place substantial transformational expectations upon educational

leaders without adequately addressing the human conditions required to meet those expectations.

The study therefore proposes a shift toward a humanistic understanding of educational leadership in Pakistan. Such an approach recognizes that sustainable institutional development cannot be separated from the well-being of the people who lead and constitute educational institutions. Leadership policy should consequently incorporate autonomy, organizational support, professional growth, healthy institutional cultures, meaningful relationships, and culturally sensitive psychological support.

Ultimately, educational leadership should be evaluated not only by what institutions achieve but also by how institutional goals are pursued and what forms of human flourishing those practices enable. Integrating leadership, ethics, culture, institutional governance, and psychological well-being can provide a more humane and sustainable foundation for the future of higher education in Pakistan.

References

- Ahmed, S., & Kiran, S. (2024). Impact of transformational leadership on educational institutions. *Archives of Educational Studies (ARES)*, 4(1), 78–96.
- Ali, R. K. (2024). *Exploring bullying against academics in Pakistan: A corrosive workplace issue* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato].
- Balyer, A. (2017). Trust in school principals: Teachers' opinions. *EduLearn*, 6, 317–325.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Brauckmann, S., Pashiardis, P., & Ärlestig, H. (2020). Bringing context and educational leadership together: Fostering the professional development of school principals. *Professional Development in Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1747105>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (2018). Research on educational leadership and management: Broadening the base. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(3), 359–361.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218758555>
- Daraz, U., Bojnec, Š., Khan, Y., & Hussain, Z. (2025). Cultural narratives, social norms, and psychological stigma: A study of mental health help-seeking behavior in Peshawar, Pakistan. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 16, 1560460.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1560460>
- González-Cruz, T. F., Botella-Carrubi, D., & Martínez-Fuentes, C. M. (2019). Supervisor leadership style, employee regulatory focus, and leadership performance: A

-
- perspectivism approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 660–667.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.065>
- Higher Education Commission. (2024, October 10). *Governance and quality assurance key challenges of higher education sector: Chairman HEC*.
<https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/news/Pages/Governance-and-Quality-Assurance-Key-Challenges-of-Higher-Education-Sector-Chairman-HEC.aspx>
- Higher Education Commission. (2026, March 18). *HEC reaffirms statutory mandate as sole authority for national higher education standards*.
<https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/news/Pages/HEC-Reaffirms-Statutory-Mandate.aspx>
- Humayun, A. (2018, December 3). Mental health reforms. *Dawn*.
<https://www.dawn.com/news/amp/1449130>
- Kanwal, A., Fatima, Q., & Asghar, T. (2025). Exploring transformational leadership: Practice, impacts and challenges faced by educational leaders in Pakistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 564–575.
[https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025\(6-I\)49](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025(6-I)49)
- Kouni, Z., Koutsoukos, M., & Panta, D. (2018). Connection of teachers' organizational commitment and transformational leadership: A case study from Greece. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 17(8), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.17.8.6>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320064>
- Miller, P. (2018). 'Culture', 'context', school leadership and entrepreneurialism: Evidence from sixteen countries. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), Article 76.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8020076>
- Morrison, A. R. (2013). Educational leadership and change: Structural challenges in the implementation of a shifting paradigm. *School Leadership & Management*, 33(4), 412–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2013.813462>
- Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan. (2021). *Year book 2020–21*. Ministry of Planning, Development & Special Initiatives.
https://pc.gov.pk/images/YearBook_2020_21.pdf
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
-

Ur Rehman, A. (2025, February 1). The erosion of university autonomy. *The Express Tribune*. <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2525784/the-erosion-of-university-autonomy>

World Health Organization. (2025, November 24). *Guidance on policy and strategic actions for mental health and the education sector*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240114722>

Zulfqar, A., Valcke, M., Devos, G., Tuytens, M., & Shahzad, A. H. (2016). Leadership and decision-making practices in public versus private universities in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(1), 147–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9414-0>