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Abstract
This study explored the administrative roles of higher educational leaders in the public and private universities at Lahore. The objective was to determine the administrative roles being played and assigned to the educational leaders in different capacities in different universities. The population consisted of all the permanent teaching faculty members working in the four faculties in these universities. These faculties included the Natural Sciences, Management Sciences, Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences. The population was divided in two groups. The group one was comprised of Deans, Directors, HODs, Professors, Associate Professors whereas the second group was stretched over Assistant Professors and Lecturers. Stratified sampling was done for the first tier and for the second tier all faculty members were approached and those who gave their inclination were added in the sample. The sample consisted of 349
respondents out of which 247 were from public and 102 were from private universities. The data was collected through a rating scale. Findings of the research revealed that there was a significant difference between the administrative roles among the faculty of public and private universities. The study concluded that higher educational leaders must identify and practice their roles to enhance the quality of the universities.
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**Introduction**

Learning is the core business in today’s knowledge economy (Lodge & Bonsanquet, 2014). Quality is the driving force and central point for all the leaders engaged in the system of higher education. Globally the higher education systems are pressed to bring the proficiency by maintaining the quality of learning environment (Zepeda, Parylo, & Klar, 2017). Today higher education is going through a great transformation thus quality of learning is considered as a central policy area. For this governments are giving quality a central place in an educational policies (Mbabazi Banwesiga, Fejes, & Dahlgren, 2013). The human resource of universities must equip themselves with knowledge, skills and technology so that they can work to their full potential. So, the ingredients of quality are still a debated issue. The landscape of higher education theorizes that due to the mass enrollments in universities worldwide the pressure on an educational system is to find out purposeful way to improve the teaching and learning environment. The higher education has involved masses throughout the world so it must provide opportunities to whole society (Kazmi, 2005). A research in Ireland highlighted that the governments are keen to take new initiatives for the improvement of the overall quality in higher education (Lane & Johnstone, 2013) and so that they can tackle diversity and rapidly changing dynamics in higher education institutions (Hazelkorn, 2014).

It is important to mention that quality learning environment is the key to handle the complex and rapidly changing and technologically infused unpredictable world of higher learning (Honey, 1999). Abualrub, Karseth, & Stensaker (2013) and Abualrub (2014) found that limited literature exists about learning environments. It has also been found in the study that the learning environments are the instruments for managing the challenges of quality. And that in the available literature three different lenses are used to research these environments i.e., learning environment as pedagogical setting, as a networking activity and as an organizational responsibility. It was concluded that leaders and administrators are less aware about learning environment researches. Fields, Kenny, & Mueller (2019) through their case study approach explored those educational leaders are the builder of trust, possessed interpersonal skills and encourage positive discourses. The researcher through their coaching and mentoring empowered others as another researcher supported this view through his findings that university level basketball players were influenced more by the training and instructional behavior from their coaches that include positive feedback and social support (Atta, Butt, Kamil, & Mushtaq, 2019). They are the risk takers, collaborators and create networking between all stakeholders. Brennan & Shah (2000) researched that learning environments are all programs, policies, procedures tone of educational institutions supporting and enhancing
the process of learning. A study advocated that in this world of knowledge economy flexibility and innovation are the essential elements of learning environment. These environments are encouraging, motivating, risk taking and giving incentives for those involved in these enterprise (Schellekens, Paas, Verbraeck, & Van Merriënboer, 2010). According to Broek & Hake (2012) and Davis & Maldonado (2015) learning environments are not viewed without context. Context determine the needs and requirements that are according to the society, educational institutions, learner’s characteristics, teaching experiences and learning process (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2011).

**Literature Review**

**Administrative Roles of Leaders for Quality Learning Environment**

Quality is a dynamic process that deals with teaching learning process, curriculum development, student progress and achievement, assessment, research and so on. Quality is gaining the vision, mission, goals and objectives by the students, teachers as well as educational institutions (Lucander & Christersson, 2020; Venkatraman, 2007). Along with other factors quality is also affected by the workloads, salary benefits and research that generate knowledge (Quraishi, Hussain, Syed, & Rahman, 2010). It is also about inculcating values in the learning environments (Blackmore*, 2004). Now different countries have shifted their policies to achieve higher levels of quality because transformation is required within rapidly changing scenarios. It is not sufficient to write or develop policy statements to deal with this great challenge and requires more steps to count. It is also worth to mention that the quality system is generally created due to the external demands, policies, and regulations which are not research proven. There is no doubt that the universities have a major leading role in the design and development of these policies (El Alfy & Abukari, 2020; Stensaker, 2003). It is emphasized that educational leaders must know and understand their roles and the purpose of the organization in which they are working. Governments are developing educational leadership as a ‘soft’ policy lever to raise the educational quality (Pont & Hopkins, 2008). A study found that a dean’s administrative role like courage boost up the quality of academic programs. Further it showed a clear mission, strategic plan and strong leadership. They also impact on the other faculty members. So they can be called as change agents and advocates of quality of learning environment (Potter, Socha, & O’Connell, 2012).

Worldwide researches summarized that the mechanism of quality assurance exists but the educational leadership roles for quality learning environment are not very clear. It is also proved that well defined roles of educational leadership regarding quality of learning environment will provide properly trained and well-educated human resource. This workforce will be able to compete the demands of the country and can provide vast educational opportunities to accommodate the diversified people having different interests to contribute to the National and international knowledge generation (Williams, de Rassenfosse, Jensen, & Marginson, 2013). Flinn & Mowles, (2014) described to explore the actual working of the educational leaders instead of their thinking for doing something. It is also necessary for the educational leaders to clearly understand their role in the wider context of the university. This.
will enable them to figure out the complex nature of the learning environment (Badillo-Vega & Buendía-Espinosa, 2020; Ladyshewsky & Flavell, 2011).

According to Middlehurst & Elton (1992) and Mullen, Boyles, Witcher, & Klimaitis (2020) administrative roles are linked with the healthy learning environment and interactive process between or within staff, faculty, students and administrators etc. Practices of these leaders are related to physical aspects like finances, wide range of activities and resources. Motivation and communication are effectively done by them to create an appropriate working climate. Further the researcher proved through his inquiry that increasing socialization among players impacted the process of their quality learning in sports and lack of leadership roles as a supporter and developer may hinders the performance of the student athletes (Channa & Hussain, 2018; Zia-ul-Islam, Jabeen, & Iqbal, 2020). In other professions like coaches exhibiting social support behaviors such as supporting players in the development of effective teams, removing conflicts and act as a problem solver contribute to increase the quality of social learning environments (Farah, Khan, & Adeel, 2021; Samson & Bakinde, 2021). They put efforts to balance and integrate institution into a coherent whole. They understand and make inferences about the external environment, involve external representation and seek to influence for fundraising and linking industry to educational process. Administrative leaders are involved in governance, forming rules and regulations and setting administrative norms. Some researchers relate transformational leadership with administrative roles because ethical considerations are very much emphasized in this type of leadership model (Van Wart, 2013a). They are good communicators. Montez (2003) consider roles essential for administrative perspectives of leadership which are incorporated, relational, reliable, efficient, and provide direction or guidance. Some researches highlighted that these leaders set vision and goals, communicate and motivate these vision effectively, raise resources for universities and implement policies and procedures (Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Shahmandi, Silong, Ismail, Samah, & Othman, 2011). Further a researcher demonstrated that these leadership roles involve coaching and teaching staff and students. This lead toward the lifelong learning process (Schellekens et al., 2010). Winter (2009) also supported the it is the heart of the demand from leadership to develop such vision which is acceptable by whole institution with the involvement of all the staff in shaping the values that are hidden in the environment and give institution a unique identity. It is also necessary that all concerned stakeholders must involve in creating vision and further it must be communicated to them. In this way they get more understanding of each other values and institutional norms and it is easy for them to fulfill universities goals and mission.

Research Methodology

It was a quantitative study, conducted at Lahore based public and private universities chartered by government of Punjab and Pakistan. There were five Public and 11 Private Universities. The universities included in population are those which are offering common faculties (Natural Sciences, Management Sciences, Arts and Humanities and the Social Sciences) dealing with general education only. In the first stage as, stratified sampling was used. Then commonalities were searched out in these universities. Out of these universities which are offering Natural Sciences, Management Sciences, Arts and Humanities and the Social Sciences had been taken
up for the study purpose on the basis of commonality and leaving others aside. Such universities are stretched over 4 faculties at the minimum. The population consisted of two tiers; first tiers Deans/Professors/Directors/Head of the departments (HODs) or chairman and Associate professors. Second tier is composed of the faculty members including assistant professors and lecturers as junior faculty of the one Public and two Private Universities at Lahore; embracing four faculties. At the first-tier census sampling was done for senior faculty members. Permissions were sought from the junior faculty. A schedule of visits to the institutions was prepared and intimated to the junior faculty of universities selected for the conduct of research. Not all but about 40% of the staff showed this inclination to be the participants of research. Three visits for each of the university were planned. Those who turned up till the last visit were included in the sample that came out to be the 30% of the total junior faculty.

The rating scale was developed and use for data collection. Same rating scale was used for the different levels of leadership. Each item was casted on five-point Likert Scale. To develop the validity and reliability of the rating scale expert opinion was taken and pilot test was done. Title, demographic information about the respondents was also included i.e., the name of university, public or private, gender, qualification, post held, experience in post and at university and experience of teaching and administration as well. For data analysis appropriate statistical tests were used.

**Data Analysis and Results**

Data was collected from 349 respondents among those 205 (58.7%) were male and 144 (41.3 %) were female. The rating scales to the tune of 247 (70.8%) were collected from the Public Universities and 102 (29.2%) from the Private Universities. Faculty wise respondents participated in the study from both public and private universities which is as; 176(50.6%) were from Faculty of science, 62(17.8%) were from Faculty of Arts and Humanities, 56(16.1%) were from Faculty of Economics and Management and 55(15.5%) were from Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences. Post wise distribution of the faculty was found out as 5 (1.4%) were Deans, 7 (2.0%) were Directors, 24 (6.9%) were Head of departments/ Chairmen, 26(7.4%) were Professors, 47 (13.5%) were Associate professors and 240 (68.8%) were junior faculty members. The qualification of staff is as 18(5.2%) staff were MA/MSc, 160 (45.8%) staff were MS/MPhil, 160(45.8%) were PhD and 8(2.3 %) were Post Doc working in sampled public and private sector universities. There were 193(55.6%) who had 1-5 years of experience in the current post, 100 (28.8%) had 6-10 years, 33(9.5%) had 11-15 years and 21 (6.1%) had 16-20 years of experience in their current position.
Table 1 Shows the administrative roles of leaders and that there is a significant difference between the opinion of the public and private universities thus showing a gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Administrative roles for educational leaders</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>Head wise budget and expenditures are prepared each year</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional audit is conducted regularly</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconciliation record of accounts is maintained</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Educational Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Performance audits are made after regular intervals</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow through the system is monitored</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efforts are made to maintain the enrollment level</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Calendar of the Program</strong></td>
<td>Notified each year</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include schedule of administrative activities</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes schedule of curriculum activities</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline Record</strong></td>
<td>Record is maintained</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions made are recorded, communicated and followed up</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Rules and Regulations</strong></td>
<td>Discipline rules exist</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation and examination rules exist</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations followed for confidentiality of required matter exist</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, financial and leave rules exist</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code of conduct of ethics exist</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p-value < 0.05 is considered as significant.
Table 2 Shows the administrative roles of leaders and that there is a significant difference between the opinion of the public and private universities thus showing a gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Administrative roles for educational leaders</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Professional Development of Faculty Process and Plan</td>
<td>Record of faculty recently participated or participating exist</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation reports are submitted by the concerned teachers</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate documentation of faculty academics is kept</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional experience, performance and technical competencies are published and certified</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A faculty handbook that delineates, appropriate procedure &amp; policies including published criteria for the recruitment, appointment, teaching role, promotion, grievance processes and termination of faculty based on principles of fairness and regard forth</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems are operational for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of all faculty</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of faculty contribution in the areas of student learning, scholarship, institutional development and community service exists</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate support for the professional advancement and development of its faculty including the pursuit of terminal degrees</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A published statement of academic freedom and adherence to its principles within the context of the institutional mission exists</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty training is arranged keeping in view of diverse needs of teaching</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Policy</td>
<td>Admission policy exist and followed</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional prospectus is made available</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admission is advertised, HEC criteria for minimum level of student entrance score is followed</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment practices are followed in line with HEC directions</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p-value < 0.05 is considered as significant.

Discussion

The first objective of the study was to highlight the administrative leadership roles in the universities at Lahore. These roles are about budget and expenditure, internal educational efficiency, annual calendar of the program, discipline record, institutional rules and regulations, continuous professional development of faculty process and plan and admission policy. The
other studies in the literature that inquired the administrative leadership roles are (Van Wart, 2013b; Winter, Taylor, & Sarros, 2000). Middlehurst & Elton (1992) has also identified some related leadership roles in her research that include roles for resources, finances, fund raiser, motivators, communicators, creator of working climate.

The roles related to budget and expenditure is very important because efficient use of resources is linked with it. Budget is the working plan of income and expense. Universities document each item that is required for budget. The roles we researched according to this domain are head wise budget and expenditures are prepared each year, institutional audit is conducted regularly, reconciliation record of account is maintained. These factors have a great impact on the higher educational quality because their limit decides the working and efficiency of the system. These also determine the mobilization of funds and recruitment of academics (Williams et al., 2013). Universities must have regular backups, develop proper system to align resources to mission and strategy. Effective leadership is the key to handle it expertly and creatively (Ewell, 2010). Internal educational efficiency includes roles about performance audits are made after regular intervals, flow through the system is monitored and efforts are made to maintain the enrolment level. Internal efficiency is related to provide facilities to the students so that quality must be enhanced in teaching, learning, research and other activities (Agasisti & Johnes, 2015). Roles for annual calendar of the programs includes notified each year, includes schedules of administrative and curriculum activities. University calendar should be regularly updated each year. This is the handbook that includes every details of the roles of the leaders (Murphy & Curtis, 2013). If it is not regularly updated it blur the picture of the roles and overlapping occur regarding the role of different tiers of the faculty and roles of the leaders and managers.

Educational leadership roles related to discipline are about record maintenance and that decisions of the discipline are recorded, communicated and followed. All these roles increase the learning environment quality if these are based on the principles of control, fairness and justice (Lindsay, 2009). Furthermore, roles that this paper researched are related to the institutional rules and regulations. They ensure that discipline rules exist, evaluation and examination rules exist, regulation followed for the confidentiality of the required matter exist, purchase, financial and leave rules exist and code of conduct of ethics exist. Quality is also affected by not enforcing the rules and regulations. These should be transparent, flexible and regularly reviewed. These administrative leader’s roles ensure the problem solving and deal with the complexity of the learning environment. They must come up with timely decisions frequently (Cardoso, Rosa, & Stensaker, 2016). Administrative leader’s roles for continuous professional development of faculty process and plan is to maintain the record the faculty participated or not, communicated, documentation is kept, professional experience, performance and technical competencies are published and certified, evaluation of faculty, proper support for professional advancement, academic freedom and faculty training. Practices of leaders include mentoring, reflection on teaching, peer observing, evaluation of faculty teaching and applied research in maintain the quality. In this way they implement and sustain quality learning environment (Rege Colet, 2017). Lastly the administrative practices of leaders
for admission policy includes admission policy exist and followed, advertised, prospectus is made available. All this must be done according to Higher education commission Pakistan. Flexibility, inclusivity and equity should be the key ingredient of admission policy while maintaining quality standards (Greenbank, 2006).

The second objective of the study was to find out different aspects of administrative leadership roles which are being reflected in different capacities by different leaders. So, this study affirms these roles for Deans, Directors/Chairmen, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Lecturers. It found the elements of administrative roles of educational leaders of the universities at Lahore. We found most researches talked about the roles of head of the departments (HODs) because they are considered as middle level leadership in the literature. Very few researches showed the roles regarding vice-chancellors (VCs) and Deans. Further professor’s roles are rarely explored. HODs are responsible to create a balance between administrative and academic activities in the departments. So that faculty must be engaged in research-oriented activities. Deans do extensive fund raising, budgetary allocations and involve everyone in open communication. They are concerned with challenges like budgetary concerns, lack of resources and team work (Van Wart, 2013a). He further elaborated that data and information are the very important tools deans and VCs take help from it and use it to enhance capabilities to tackle with the diverse faculty and their needs to work in these complex learning environments. Administrative roles are daily duties that are especially related to the institutional policies and goals. Due to the frequent and more interaction with the outer community and different stake holders they inculcate the strong sense of values among others. They allow trust, openness, collaborations, respect, fairness and safety in these learning environments. Thus, they are the cultivators of ethics and values. Thus we can say that they are the keepers and wearer of multiple lenses to understand the diversity, develop people and involve others effectively (Spendlove, 2007). Higher education is not simple but complex system that perform multiplicity of functions in the society with compatibility, employability and academic excellence (de Boer & Enders, 2017).

Conclusion
This research study portrays a complete picture of administrative aspects of the roles for quality learning environments in the public and private universities at Lahore. Different researches highlighted different aspects of the leadership roles. It is concluded that prominent higher administrative leadership roles in public sector universities are for discipline, financial and leave rules. Public universities are better options in discharging and practicing of their roles as well as quality of their learning environment. Overall administrative services roles are compromised by different tiers of faculty in the universities. Clear job descriptions should be available to all so that no overlapping occurs within different tiers of faculty and with managers also. Further the leadership or faculty is overburdened by extra roles that are not factual so these must be dust off from them. Lastly leadership must be understood in the realm of the context because leadership occurs is specific context and societal background.
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