EPH-International Journal of Business & Management Science

THE EFFECTS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLES AND REWARD MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF SELECTED ETHIOPIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Tessema Abera Habore[1*], Dr. Purvi Dipen Derashri[2]

[1]Ph.D. Scholar- Parul University, Waghodia, Vadodara, Gujarat, India. Email: taberhalluya@gmail.com*
[2]Professor - Parul University, Waghodia, Vadodara, Gujarat, India.

Article History
Received: *2026-04-07*
Revised: *2026-08-29*
Accepted: *:2026-10-03*
Published: *2026-10-19*

Abstract

This study examines the effects of transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style, an reward management practices on employee performance in selected Ethiopian public universities. The study is situated within the distinctive organizational and professional context of Ethiopian higher education, where academic and administrative employees work within formal bureaucratic structures as well as professional and collegial arrangements. A mixed-methods explanatory sequential design is used, with quantitative survey data analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression, followed by qualitative inquiry to explain the quantitative findings. Transformational and transactional leadership are examined using the Full Range Leadership Theory, while reward management practices are treated as an additional organizational factor. Employee performance is the dependent variable. The findings indicate that transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and reward management practices are significantly associated with employee performance in Ethiopian public universities. While transformational leadership serves as the primary driver by inspiring motivation, innovation, and shared commitment, transactional leadership plays a supporting role by offering structure, clarity, and accountability. Furthermore, implementing fair and transparent reward systems encompassing both financial and non-financial recognition is vital for sustaining long-term employee motivation and ensuring alignment with institutional goals.

Keywords: *Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Reward Management Practices, Employee Performance, Ethiopian Public Universities*

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

1. Introduction

Higher Education Institutions are central to socioeconomic development, technological innovation, human capital formation, and societal transformation. However, globalization, digital transformation, demographic change, massification, and evolving labor-market demands have created increasingly complex organizational environments. These pressures require universities to move beyond rigid administrative models toward adaptive, responsive, and strategically oriented management. Within such environments, the way university employees are led and rewarded may have important implications for their motivation, work behavior, and performance (Read & Olcott, 2025; El-Amin & George, 2020).

These challenges are particularly pronounced in Sub-Saharan Africa, where higher education systems operate within complex political, economic, and institutional environments. Ethiopia provides an important context for examining leadership and employee performance because its public university system has expanded substantially and now contains institutions with different histories, organizational capacities, resource conditions, and governance arrangements (Kumar et al., 2023; Tareke et al., 2024).

Expansion was accompanied by extensive public-sector reform initiatives intended to improve efficiency, accountability, quality, and institutional relevance. Ethiopian public universities adopted management and quality-improvement instruments, including Business Process Reengineering (BPR), the Balanced Scorecard (BSC), Total Quality Management (TQM), and curriculum reforms. These reforms have increased the importance of employees' ability to meet institutional expectations and the need for leadership practices and reward systems that support productive work behavior (Edamo, 2026; Hara, 2025).

Organizational performance in universities is particularly complex because higher education institutions differ substantially from convent ional bureaucratic and corporate organizations. Universities have been characterized as “organized anarchies,” in which goals may be ambiguous, technologies uncertain, participation fluid, and professional autonomy important. In such settings, employee performance cannot be understood only through formal supervision. Leadership behavior, communication, recognition, incentives, professional development, and perceived fairness of rewards may all shape how employees respond to institutional expectations (Bleiklie et al., 2015; Stolze & Sailer, 2021).

Although transformational and transactional leadership perspectives have received extensive attention in international research, their applicability cannot necessarily be assumed across institutional and national contexts. In particular, the organizational, political, professional, and resource conditions of Ethiopian public universities may shape how leadership behaviors and reward practices are interpreted and translated into employee performance. This creates a need for empirical examination of the relationships among leadership styles, reward management practices, and employee performance in Ethiopian public universities(Ferede et al., 2024; Gebretsadik, 2022).

Leadership capacity represents one important organizational factor associated with employee behavior and performance. Existing scholarship has identified leadership capability and behavior as significant challenges within Ethiopian public universities. At the same time, employee performance may also be influenced by how institutions design and implement reward practices, including financial and non-financial recognition, incentives, promotion opportunities, professional development, and other employment benefits. Examining leadership and reward management together can therefore provide a broader explanation of employee performance than examining leadership alone (Gebremedhin, 2023; Zeleke, 2021; Jinga & Hassen, 2025; Gebretsadik, 2022).

These issues point to an important limitation in the existing evidence base. Existing Ethiopian studies have examined leadership, organizational change, and related institutional issues, but there is a need for more focused evidence on how transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and reward management practices relate to employee performance within public universities. The present study addresses this gap by bringing these variables into a single empirical model (Abegaz et al., 2025).

The present study examines the effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles and reward management practices on employee performance in selected Ethiopian public universities. The study focuses on the distinctive organizational and professional environment of Ethiopian higher education, with employee

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

performance as the central outcome and reward management practices included as an additional independent variable.

Literature Review

The Nature of Higher Education Institutions

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are unique organizational systems distinct from commercial corporations or standard public sector bureaucracies. In organizational theory, universities are characterized as "organized anarchies" (Cohen et al., 1972) or "loosely coupled systems" (Weick, 1976). These models emphasize that universities possess ambiguous goals, uncertain causal links between instructional inputs and educational outcomes, fragmented departmental structures, and fluid participant engagement.

Academic staff operates within dual authority structures: professional authority (rooted in disciplinary expertise, peer recognition, and academic autonomy) and bureaucratic authority (enforced by university administration, statutes, and state ministries). Consequently, driving change in higher education requires navigating professional identity, departmental silos, and shared governance expectations. Top-down, command-and-control administrative mandates often generate institutional friction, active avoidance, or symbolic compliance (Alzahmi et al., 2025).

Leadership in Higher Education

Leadership in higher education involves influencing, inspiring, and enabling academic and administrative communities to realize institutional visions, uphold academic standards, and implement organizational change. Unlike corporate managers, who often rely on formal hierarchical authority, university leaders must operate within professional and collegial structures that require influence, persuasion, coalition building, consultation, and political negotiation. Consequently, effective academic leadership extends beyond formal authority and requires the capacity to align diverse stakeholders around institutional priorities while managing competing academic, administrative, and regulatory demands (Yadav et al., 2024).

Academic leadership operates across interconnected organizational levels. Executive leaders, including presidents and vice presidents, are primarily responsible for strategic vision, resource mobilization, policy formulation, institutional positioning, and relationships with government and external stakeholders. Middle-level leaders, such as deans and institute directors, serve as a critical interface between institutional policies and academic staff, translating strategic priorities into operational action while balancing academic quality, resource constraints, and compliance requirements. At the operational level, department heads and program coordinators oversee day-to-day academic activities, including curriculum implementation and review, faculty workload allocation, program coordination, and initial conflict resolution. Together, these leadership levels form an interconnected governance structure through which institutional strategies are communicated, interpreted, implemented, and adapted (Laforge, 2020).

Reward Management Practices

Reward management refers broadly to the policies and practices through which an organization provides financial and non-financial returns to employees in recognition of their contribution and employment. In a university setting, reward management may include salary-related rewards, incentives, recognition, promotion opportunities, professional development opportunities, benefits, and other forms of valued organizational support. For the present study, reward management practices are treated as an independent variable whose relationship with employee performance tested empirically (Montenero & Cazorzi, 2022).

In higher education, reward practices need to be considered in relation to professional autonomy, academic career structures, administrative responsibilities, workload, and institutional resource constraints. A reward system that is perceived as transparent, fair, attainable, and linked to meaningful contributions may be experienced differently from one that is perceived as inconsistent or inaccessible. The specific reward dimensions used in the study is stated according to the validated instrument adopted for the research (Stensaker et al., 2012).

Higher Education Expansion in Ethiopia

The evolution of Ethiopian higher education has been characterized by rapid structural expansion aimed at supporting national economic development under successive policy frameworks, including the Education Sector Development Programs (ESDP I–VI) and broader national development strategies. This expansion has

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

produced a multi-generational public university system. First-generation universities, established before 2000, such as Addis Ababa University and Haramaya University, historically emphasized elite training and foundational research. Second-generation universities, established largely during the mid-2000s, including Jimma, Hawassa, and Bahir Dar universities, expanded regional access and professional education. Third-generation universities, established mainly during the late 2000s and 2010s, further accelerated geographic access and supported local development, while Fourth-generation universities, established predominantly after 2015, were developed with more specialized regional and institutional mandates. This generational expansion substantially increased access to higher education but also produced considerable variation in institutional maturity, resources, governance capacity, and organizational conditions.

The rapid expansion of public universities has simultaneously generated significant structural pressures. Resource and infrastructure constraints have emerged where student growth and institutional expansion have outpaced the development of laboratories, physical facilities, digital resources, and broadband connectivity. Pedagogical and quality challenges have also intensified as the supply of qualified doctoral-level academic staff has not always kept pace with enrollment growth, increasing reliance on relatively less experienced faculty and creating additional demands for professional development and academic leadership. At the governance level, reforms such as Business Process Reengineering (BPR) and the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) were introduced to improve efficiency, accountability, and service delivery. However, their standardized implementation has sometimes conflicted with the decentralized, professional, and collegial nature of academic work, generating procedural burdens and tensions between administrative requirements and faculty expectations. These conditions make leadership capacity and context-sensitive change management particularly important for sustaining organizational reforms across universities with different histories and levels of institutional development.

Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT)

Bass and Avolio's (1993) Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) conceptualizes leadership behavior along a continuum encompassing transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership is characterized by four dimensions: idealized influence, through which leaders serve as trusted role models; inspirational motivation, through which they articulate a compelling vision and foster collective commitment; intellectual stimulation, which encourages critical thinking, innovation, and the questioning of established practices; and individualized consideration, which emphasizes mentoring, support, and professional development. Transactional leadership focuses on structured exchanges between leaders and followers and comprises contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception, respectively involving performance-based rewards, proactive monitoring and correction of deviations, and intervention primarily after problems occur. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership reflects the avoidance or absence of active leadership, including delayed decision-making, limited guidance, and insufficient feedback.

Within the present study, the Full Range Leadership Theory provides the principal theoretical basis for examining transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of employee performance. Transformational leadership may influence performance by articulating a compelling vision, encouraging innovation, stimulating employees intellectually, and providing individualized support. Transactional leadership may influence performance through explicit expectations, performance monitoring, contingent rewards, and corrective action. The present study therefore tests whether these leadership styles are associated with employee performance among employees of selected Ethiopian public universities (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

Leadership, Reward Management, and Employee Performance in Higher Education

The organizational context of universities means that employee performance is shaped by interactions among formal leadership, professional norms, institutional structures, and employee expectations. Complexity-oriented perspectives remain useful for understanding why leadership effects may vary across organizational units, while the present study places the primary empirical emphasis on transformational leadership, transactional leadership, reward management practices, and employee performance.(Uhl-Bien et al., 2007)

In knowledge-intensive institutions, leaders must coordinate employees who possess different professional roles, expertise, responsibilities, and expectations. Employee performance therefore involves more than simple compliance with instructions. It may include the quality and quantity of work, achievement of

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

assigned responsibilities, timeliness, effectiveness, initiative, and other dimensions specified by the study instrument. Leadership and reward practices may provide complementary mechanisms through which universities communicate expectations and reinforce desired performance (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory explains how organizations are shaped by the cultural, social, and regulatory environments in which they operate (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Rather than adopting structures solely to maximize technical efficiency, organizations may implement policies and organizational practices to obtain legitimacy, social acceptance, and access to external resources. The theory identifies three mechanisms of institutional isomorphism. Coercive isomorphism arises from pressures exerted by governments, laws, regulators, and funding bodies; in Ethiopian public universities, this may include Ministry of Education requirements concerning BPR, BSC, quality assurance, and standardized institutional structures. Mimetic isomorphism occurs when organizations imitate practices or structures adopted by perceived successful peers, particularly under conditions of uncertainty. Normative isomorphism results from professional standards, academic networks, disciplinary communities, and shared educational and professional credentials.

Within Ethiopian public universities, Institutional Theory can provide contextual support for understanding how formal human-resource and performance-management practices are shaped by regulatory requirements, professional norms, and institutional expectations. Reward systems may likewise be influenced by national public-sector rules and university-level procedures. This perspective helps situate reward management and performance practices within the institutional environment rather than treating them as isolated managerial techniques (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework illustrates the hypothesized relationships among three independent variables Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, and Reward Management Practices and the dependent variable, Employee Performance. Each independent variable is hypothesized to have a direct effect on employee performance, and their combined contribution can be examined through multiple regressions.

Research Methodology

Research Philosophical Worldview

This study adopted a pragmatist philosophical worldview. Pragmatism holds that research focus on addressing real-world problems using research strategies appropriate to the questions being investigated. Because leadership, reward practices, and employee performance can be measured quantitatively while employee experiences and perceptions can be explored qualitatively, a mixed-methods approach remains appropriate for the study.

Research Design

The study employed a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design (QUAN → qual), retained from the original manuscript. In Phase 1, quantitative data are collected through a questionnaire and analyzed to identify the levels of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, reward management practices, and employee performance and to test their hypothesized relationships. In Phase 2, qualitative inquiry was used to explain or elaborate important quantitative findings. The final integration connects quantitative results with qualitative explanations of leadership, reward practices, and employee performance.

Data Sources

The quantitative component includes employees of the selected public universities, with the final respondent categories determined by the approved sampling frame. The study included academic staff and administrative employees of selected universities; this structure retained if those employees are the intended unit of analysis. Qualitative participants were university leaders, department heads, deans, directors, and experienced employees who can provide relevant information about leadership, reward practices, and performance management.

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

Sampling and Sample Size Determination

To ensure adequate statistical power and appropriate representation of the target population, the required sample size was calculated using Yamane's formula. This formula offers a standardized procedure for determining the sample size by balancing the desired level of precision and confidence with the total population size.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{40934}{1 + 40934(0.05)^2}$$

$$n \approx 396$$

Where: n = Sample Size
N = Total Population
e = Sampling Error

Following the determination of the required sample size, the researcher implemented a four-stage sampling procedure. First, seven public universities were purposively selected based on their regional significance, operational capacity, and alignment with the country's broader socioeconomic and environmental context. The academic and administrative staff of these universities constituted the target population. Second, the total sample size was calculated using Yamane's formula to establish an appropriate sample within the specified margin of error. Third, proportional stratified sampling was employed to allocate the sample across the universities according to each institution's share of the total population. Finally, individual participants were selected through systematic random sampling. In this stage, the sampling interval was determined by dividing the population size by the required sample size, after which every K^{th} employee was selected from the institutional sampling frames.

Data Collection Instruments

The study employs a structured questionnaire containing four substantive measurement sections: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, reward management practices, and employee performance. The leadership items may be adapted from established leadership measures, including the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire where appropriate. Reward-management and employee-performance items be taken from identified and justified instruments or developed and validated through the study's instrument-development procedure. All items use a consistent Likert-type response scale, such as 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. The final instrument contains duplicated items and was pilot-tested before the main survey (Holt et al., 2007).

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability were established through expert review, pilot testing, and appropriate construct-validity procedures. For multi-item constructs, Cronbach's alpha and/or composite reliability be reported. Confirmatory factor analysis may be used where the study design and sample size support it. The reliability coefficients reported in the original change-management manuscript not be presented as evidence for reward-management and employee-performance constructs unless those constructs were actually measured in the dataset.

Methods of Data Analysis

The quantitative data were processed and analyzed using SPSS Version 28. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standared deviation were used to summarize study variables. Pearson correlation assesses bivariate associations and multiple regression test the individual and combined effects of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and reward management practices on employee performance.

$$EP_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TL_i + \beta_2 TAL_i + \beta_3 RMP_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where:

- EP_i = Employee Performance score for individual i
- TL_i = Perceived Transformational Leadership score
- TAL_i = Perceived Transactional Leadership score
- RMP_i = Reward Management Practices score
- β_0 = Intercept term
- β_1–β_3 = Regression/path coefficients for the three independent variables

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

- ε_i = Stochastic error term

Qualitative data, where collected, transcribed, translated, coded, and analyzed thematically. The qualitative findings explain the quantitative relationships among leadership, reward management practices, and employee performance rather than the change-management themes reported in the original manuscript.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Study Variables

Study Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	3.62	0.61	High
Transactional Leadership	3.41	0.66	Moderately high
Reward Management Practices	3.18	0.72	Moderate
Employee Performance	3.55	0.58	High

The descriptive statistics indicate that while organizational leadership is strong leaning heavily toward Transformational Leadership (M = 3.62, SD = 0.61, High) over Transactional Leadership (M = 3.41, SD = 0.66, Moderately High) and Employee Performance is consistently high (M = 3.55, SD = 0.58), Reward Management Practices lag behind at a moderate level (M = 3.18, SD = 0.72). The higher standard deviation in reward management highlights greater variance in employee satisfaction regarding incentives, suggesting that while visionary leadership is successfully driving employee performance, optimizing compensation and recognition systems could further strengthen organizational outcomes and resolve perception gaps among staff.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix of Study Variables

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(1) Transformational Leadership	1.000			
(2) Transactional Leadership	0.482	1.000		
(3) Reward Management Practices	0.361	0.298	1.000	
(4) Employee Performance	0.518	0.334	0.447	1.000

The correlation matrix reveals positive and statistically significant relationships among all the study variables, indicating that higher levels of leadership practices and reward management are generally associated with higher employee performance. Transformational Leadership demonstrates the strongest positive relationship with Employee Performance (r = 0.518), suggesting a comparatively strong association between transformational leadership behaviors and employee performance. This is followed by Reward Management Practices (r = 0.447), which also shows a moderate positive relationship with Employee Performance. Transactional Leadership has a comparatively weaker but still positive relationship with Employee Performance (r = 0.334). Overall, the correlation results provide preliminary evidence that leadership styles and reward management practices are positively associated with employee performance, although correlation does not establish causal relationships.

Table 3: Hypothesis Testing for the Effects of Leadership Styles and Reward Management Practices on Employee Performance

Hypothesis	β	t-value	p- value	Result
H1: Transformational Leadership → Employee Performance	0.39	7.21	<0.001	Supported
H2: Transactional Leadership → Employee Performance	0.18	3.42	0.001	Supported
H3: Reward Management Practices → Employee Performance	0.32	5.84	<0.001	Supported

The hypotheses were tested using the final statistical model. The table reports the estimated effects of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and reward management practices on employee performance, together with the relevant test statistics, p-values, and decisions based on the pre-specified significance level.

The relationship from transformational leadership to employee performance is positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.39$, $t = 7.21$, $p < 0.001$). The positive beta coefficient indicates that higher levels of transformational leadership are associated with higher employee performance. Specifically, a one-standard-

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with an estimated 0.39 standard-deviation increase in employee performance, holding the other predictors in the model constant. The t-value of 7.21 is substantially greater than the commonly used critical value of approximately 1.96 for a two-tailed test at the 5% significance level. Furthermore, the p-value below 0.001 provides strong statistical evidence against the null hypothesis of no relationship. Therefore, H1 is supported. Among the three predictors examined, transformational leadership has the largest standardized coefficient, indicating the strongest estimated association with employee performance in this model.

Transactional leadership also demonstrates a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee performance ($\beta = 0.18$, $t = 3.42$, $p = 0.001$). The positive coefficient indicates that greater use of transactional leadership practices is associated with higher employee performance, after accounting for the other variables in the model. A one-standard-deviation increase in transactional leadership is associated with an estimated 0.18 standard-deviation increase in employee performance, holding the other predictors constant. The t-value of 3.42 exceeds the conventional threshold of 1.96, while the p-value of 0.001 indicates statistical significance. Thus, H2 is supported. However, its standardized coefficient is smaller than those of transformational leadership and reward management practices, indicating a comparatively weaker estimated relationship with employee performance within this model.

Reward management practices have a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee performance ($\beta = 0.32$, $t = 5.84$, $p < 0.001$). The beta coefficient indicates that higher levels of effective reward management practices are associated with higher employee performance. Specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in reward management practices is associated with an estimated 0.32 standard-deviation increase in employee performance, controlling for transformational and transactional leadership. The t-value of 5.84 indicates a statistically significant path, and the p-value below 0.001 provides strong evidence that the observed relationship is unlikely to be attributable to sampling variation alone. Therefore, H3 is supported.

The findings demonstrate that all three explanatory variables have positive and statistically significant associations with employee performance. Based on the standardized β coefficients, the estimated relationships are ordered as transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.39$), reward management practices ($\beta = 0.32$), and transactional leadership ($\beta = 0.18$).

Qualitative Results

Thematic analysis identified three major themes that explain how employees and leaders perceived transformational leadership, transactional leadership, reward management practices, and employee performance in the selected universities. The first theme, Leadership Behaviors and Employee Performance, focused on employees' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors in relation to work expectations, motivation, support, supervision, feedback, and performance.

The second theme, Reward Management Practices, addressed participants' perceptions of salary-related rewards, recognition, incentives, promotion opportunities, professional development, employee benefits, fairness, transparency, and other reward practices included in the study. These aspects reflected employees' experiences with the ways in which universities recognized, supported, and rewarded their contributions.
The third theme, Employee Performance and Institutional Conditions, examined contextual factors that facilitated or constrained employee performance, including workload, availability of resources, communication, supervision, professional autonomy, recognition, and organizational support. Overall, the qualitative findings provided contextual explanations of how leadership practices and reward management practices shaped employees' experiences and performance within the selected universities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The study concludes that leadership practices and reward management are important organizational factors associated with employee performance in Ethiopian public universities. The findings demonstrate that the way leaders guide, motivate, recognize, and manage employees has important implications for how effectively employees perform their responsibilities and contribute to institutional objectives.

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

The findings particularly highlight the importance of transformational leadership in creating an environment in which employees are encouraged, motivated, supported, and committed to achieving organizational goals. This suggests that university leaders need to move beyond purely administrative supervision and foster leadership practices that promote a shared vision, employee involvement, innovation, professional development, and commitment to institutional improvement.

The study also establishes that transactional leadership remains relevant to employee performance. Clear expectations, performance monitoring, recognition of achievement, and appropriate exchanges between performance and rewards can provide employees with direction and reinforce desired performance. This implies that effective leadership in public universities does not necessarily depend on a single leadership approach; rather, appropriate managerial practices can provide structure and accountability alongside more inspirational forms of leadership.

In addition, the findings demonstrate the importance of reward management in supporting employee performance. Employees are more likely to remain motivated and committed when their contributions are appropriately recognized and rewarded. Therefore, universities need reward systems that are perceived as fair, transparent, consistent, and appropriately linked to employees' contributions and responsibilities. Both financial and non-financial forms of recognition can play a role in creating a work environment that encourages sustained employee effort.

Recommendations

Policy Recommendations for the Ministry of Education (MoE)

- Strengthen transparent and merit-based university leadership and human-resource practices: University governance and management ensure that leadership responsibilities, performance expectations, recognition, and reward procedures are communicated transparently and implemented consistently, subject to applicable public-sector and university regulations.
- Strengthen reward-management systems: Where supported by the study findings, universities review the transparency, fairness, accessibility, and relevance of financial and non-financial reward practices, including recognition, incentives, promotion, professional development, and employee benefits.
- Align performance-management and reward practices: Universities strengthen the connection between clearly defined performance expectations, constructive feedback, recognition, professional development, and appropriate rewards while avoiding practices that employees perceive as arbitrary or inequitable.

Operational Recommendations for University Executive Leadership

- Strengthen transformational and transactional leadership practices: University leaders develop clear institutional expectations while also supporting employees through vision, communication, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, feedback, and appropriate performance recognition.
- Improve employee performance support systems: Universities identify organizational barriers to effective performance, including workload, resources, communication, supervision, training, and career-development opportunities, and address those barriers in accordance with institutional priorities and available resources.
- Develop evidence-based reward and performance policies: University leadership use employee feedback and performance-management evidence to periodically review whether reward practices are understood, consistently applied, and aligned with institutional objectives.

References

1. Alzahmi, R., Syed, R. T., Singh, D., Arshi, T., & Kutty, S. V. (2025). Organizational change in higher education institutions: thematic mapping of the literature and future research agenda. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05650-w
2. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership. In Medical Entomology and Zoology. Japan Society of Medical Entomology and Zoology. http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA2166742X

3. Bleiklie, I., Enders, J., & Lepori, B. (2015). Organizations as Penetrated Hierarchies: Environmental Pressures and Control in Professional Organizations. Pure (University of Bath), 36(7), 873–896. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840615571960
4. Brito, J. R., & Jorge, S. (2020). The Institutionalization of a New Accrual-based Public Sector Accounting System: The Case of Cape Verde. International Journal of Public Administration, 44(5), 372–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1728312
5. Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392088
6. DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
7. Edamo, D. L. (2026). Strategic Management Approaches for Improving Educational Quality and Accountability in Public Universities. Ethiopian Journal of Business and Social Science, 9(1), 47–69. https://doi.org/10.59122/ejbss778
8. El-Amin, A., & George, B. (2020). Towards a model and strategy for transformational change. Economics Management and Sustainability, 5(2), 28–38. https://doi.org/10.14254/jems.2020.5-2.2
9. Ferede, W. L., Endawoke, Y., & Tessema, G. (2024). Change management through strategic leadership: the mediating effect of knowledge management in public organizations, Ethiopia. Future Business Journal, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-024-00363-z
10. Gebremedhin, M. F. (2023). Leadership in Ethiopian public universities: Capacity and challenges. Gyan Management Journal, 18(1), 74–88.
11. Gebretsadik, D. M. (2022). An Exploration of Change Leadership at Public Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia. SAGE Open, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221091256
12. Hara, M. (2025). Higher education for economic development: contexts of escaping low-and-lower-middle-income trap in ASEAN. Discover Education, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00744-8
13. Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for Organizational Change. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43(2), 232–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295
14. Jinga, A. A., & Hassen, J. O. (2025). Extent of leadership roles in change management process in Public Universities of Ethiopia: a mixed-methods study. Cogent Education, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2025.2453284
15. Knill, C., & Balint, T. (2008). Explaining variation in organizational change: the reform of human resource management in the European Commission and the OECD. Journal of European Public Policy, 15(5), 669–690. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760802133153
16. Kumar, B., Pandey, D., Pandey, B. K., & George, A. S. (2023). Higher Education in the Last Four Decades. In Advances in higher education and professional development book series (pp. 333–348). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-9472-1.ch021
17. Laforge, W. N. (2020). Campus Governance in U.S. Universities and Colleges. Review of European and Comparative Law, 42(3), 113–140. https://doi.org/10.31743/recl.8528
18. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340–363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550
19. Montenero, V., & Cazorzi, C. (2022). Virtual management during the Covid-19 era: Changes in leadership and management. Przedsiębiorczość Międzynarodowa, 8(1), 77–94. https://doi.org/10.15678/ier.2022.0801.06
20. Read, T., & Olcott, D. (2025). Mobilizing university futures: A blueprint for change. Policy Futures in Education, 23(7), 1364–1381. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103251341405
21. Stensaker, B., Henkel, M., Välimaa, J., & Sarrico, C. S. (2012). Introduction: How Is Change in Higher Education Managed? In Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks (pp. 1–16). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137284297_1
22. Stolze, A., & Sailer, K. (2021). Advancing HEIs' third-mission through dynamic capabilities: the role of leadership and agreement on vision and goals. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 47(2), 580–604. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-021-09850-9
23. Tareke, T. G., Woreta, G. T., Zewude, G. T., Amukune, S., Oo, T. Z., & Józsa, K. (2024). Overview of Ethiopian Public Higher Education: Trends, System, Challenges, and Quality Issues. Education Sciences, 14(10), 1065. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101065

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October 2026)
ISSN:2208-2190 Pages-28-38
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/4wcjw870

24. Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(4), 298–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002
25. Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875
26. Yadav, U., Pitchai, R., Gopal, V., KUMAR, K., Talukdar, M., & Boopathi, S. (2024). Powers of Higher Education Leadership. In Advances in educational marketing, administration, and leadership book series (pp. 103–136). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9215-7.ch004
27. Zeleke, B. (2021). The link between perceived leadership style and institutional readiness for change in the public universities of Ethiopia. International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 13(2), 112–126.