

AN INSIGHTFUL REVIEW ON PROS AND CONS OF COLLABORATIVE AND SHARED LEADERSHIP

Sami Ullah^{1*}, Fouzia Bibi²

¹Department of Urdu and Oriental Languages, G.C. University Faisalabad, Pakistan.

²Persian Department, G.C. University Lahore, Pakistan.

Submitted January 23, 2026; Revised April 11, 2026; Accepted April 16, 2026; Published August 20, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study highlights certain difficulties, like striking a balance between efficiency and inclusivity while filling in the gaps in participatory decision-making procedures. By analyzing the relationship between shared governance, which emphasizes participatory institutional processes, and collaborative leadership, which entails inclusive, team-based decision-making, within higher education institutions, the study investigates the possibility of new perspectives on leadership. This study suggests avenues for further theoretical growth by elucidating collaborative leadership, particularly its emphasis on decentralizing authority and promoting collective efficacy. Similarly, by encouraging inclusive and participatory decision-making processes, shared governance improves the real-world implementation of collaborative leadership. In addition to demonstrating potential for leadership in education, the interplay between these frameworks advances organizational behavior (OB) more broadly. By strengthening organizational theory and leadership practices, this integrated viewpoint can be further developed, opening the door for creative and flexible governance models in higher education.

Keywords: Collaborative leadership, Shared governance, Higher education institutions.

*Corresponding Author. E-mail: drsamiullah@gcuf.edu.pk

INTRODUCTION

There are several leadership theories in the domains of education and organizational behavior (OB), many of which have similar underpinnings. Educators contend that leadership models based in business and management practices may not sufficiently meet the particular demands of educational settings, despite the fact that leadership research in education significantly draws

from principles in organizational sciences. There is a paradox despite the increasing use of managerial approaches in educational leadership, which are usually founded on standard organizational science ideas: management professionals themselves frequently believe that these conventional theories are not sufficiently effective. Though these shortcomings are

IMS is published by AMMANIF Publisher. The authors retain the copyright without restriction. This article is an open access article published under the terms and conditions of [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



acknowledged, there is still a lack of creative leadership models that incorporate organizational and educational viewpoints [1-3].

Significant obstacles have been faced by leadership theory, especially with relation to the contentious application of management principles to education, misunderstandings of important concepts, contradictory concept translations, and the absence of widely recognized definitions. This has led to a situation where more theories could seem to increase complexity rather than clarity. However, by examining the relationships between shared governance and collaborative leadership in postsecondary education, this study seeks to address these issues. This effort aims to improve understanding of a new leadership paradigm by exploring and elaborating on previous literature discussions. The research provided here offers a useful path for building this emergent theoretical approach, even though there are still questions regarding the cognitive frameworks supporting collaborative leadership [4, 5].

The idea of collaborative leadership is directly related to the shared governance concepts in higher education administration and organization. According to the researchers, the terms democratic, shared, and participatory leadership are frequently used interchangeably with collaborative leadership. However, the theory's criteria have broadened and become more inclusive as it gained popularity in conversations about school management and leadership. Collaborative leadership's theoretical underpinnings are essential to expanding our understanding of its tenets and real-world applications. These psychologists helped create constructivist and social constructivist paradigms, in contrast to behavioral approaches to organizational and learning psychology. These contributions,

however, fall short of creating a thorough and widely recognized theory of social cognition. However, the continued development of collaborative leadership theory depends on these cognitive underpinnings.

Though it faces obstacles like conceptual ambiguity and the need to dispel myths and misconceptions, collaborative leadership is becoming acknowledged as an important and developing approach. By improving leadership frameworks and fortifying governance models, integrating collaborative leadership with shared governance in higher education presents significant chances for reciprocal enrichment. A thorough understanding of both disciplines is necessary for meaningful development in these areas, underscoring the need of multidisciplinary collaboration in forming effective leadership practices. Democratic principles place a strong emphasis on equality, responsibility, and participation in government, guaranteeing that people have a say in how decisions are made and that the rule of law is respected. On the other hand, managerialism, which frequently applies private-sector management concepts to public institutions, places a higher priority on efficiency, uniformity, and performance measures. This can be at odds with inclusivity and participatory governance.

The concept of academic freedom gave rise to the AAUP's Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities, a foundational framework for the governance of educational institutions [6, 7]. Despite some important differences, shared governance as an organizational framework is strikingly similar to the idea of collaborative leadership. Similar to how shared governance distributes authority and responsibilities within higher education institutions, collaborative leadership stresses leaders serving as motivators and

servants, decentralizing power and decision-making. Although each model has distinct characteristics, their overlapping principles emphasize the possibility of mutual enrichment. The theoretical underpinnings of shared governance aid in clarifying the fundamental principles ingrained in collaborative leadership, even in the face of current criticisms of shared governance as an organizational model and reforms that question its goals.

The aforementioned statement delineates fundamental principles for the management of post-secondary institutions, with a focus on the collaborative and active participation of stakeholders in various processes, including the selection of administrators, budget planning, policy formulation, curriculum development, and improving student learning outcomes. While management approaches, especially those in line with the corporatization of higher education, undervalue collegial and democratic procedures inside post-secondary institutions, shared governance has been criticized for allegedly failing to provide sufficient checks and balances. Globally, institutions with similar governance traditions are facing similar controversial changes as a result of governments' growing demands for accountability. Institutions of higher learning that do not have a strong shared governance heritage are particularly sensitive to management trends and reforms, which increases their susceptibility to outside pressures.

The relevance of adopting democratic and collective management styles is becoming more widely recognized in organizational behavior (OB) and the organizational sciences. Compared to conventional management theories, these models are more in line with shared governance concepts and seek to improve human talents across the entire firm. According to

academics, organizations are intrinsically more complicated than traditional theories imply, necessitating leadership decentralization at several levels. Collaborative leadership shows promise as a shared governance concept when adapted to the post-secondary education setting. This strategy can strengthen institutional dynamics and develop collegial ties by encouraging deliberate and consistent group actions [8-11].

A better grasp of these frameworks is provided by specific instances of collaborative leadership and shared governance in higher education. The University of Saskatchewan, for example, employs shared governance through its University Council, where administration and academics work together to set strategic plans and other academic policies and projects. In a similar vein, the University of Alberta exemplifies collaborative leadership by bringing stakeholders together to solve important institutional issues through the General Faculties Council. The Governing Council's inclusive decision-making process, which involves staff, students, and faculty to guarantee equity and creativity, is a clear example of shared governance at the University of Toronto.

COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

The concept of collaborative leadership is straightforward at its core, but its application to formal structures and processes can be nuanced. Traditional leadership theories mainly focus on a single leader's power and authority to direct followers and organizational activities. Nonetheless, contemporary leadership theory places a strong emphasis on each member's collective contributions to the development of independent and capable individuals within an organization. This paradigm change acknowledges that no one person can lead successfully in every

situation [12-15]. It is clear that leaders cannot have all the answers, even while organizational theorists struggle with unsolved issues. Rather, they have to rely on the group's members' abilities, implicit knowledge, and collective expertise.

The shortcomings and discontent with traditional leadership ideas and methods give rise to collaborative leadership. This concept encourages a more integrated and inclusive approach to leadership by acknowledging that no single leader can unilaterally command or oversee every part of an organization. Collaborative leadership redefines this dynamic as the group's shared influence, whereas traditional leadership is the influence of an individual over a group to accomplish particular goals. In order to accomplish institutional goals, this all-encompassing view of organizational leadership encourages flexibility, teamwork, and creativity.

Researchers have identified a variety of approaches and applications within the current theoretical framework since leadership in educational settings is frequently defined by an expansive and collaborative approach. From unplanned cooperation and role-sharing to established connections, collaborative leadership involves a variety of collective action patterns. Scholars outline various uses of collaborative leadership, including promoting democratic processes, increasing productivity and effectiveness, and developing human potential. These many viewpoints broaden the theoretical framework, increasing its applicability and flexibility within organizational theory in higher education. Despite persistent doubts about its conceptual foundations, leadership's inherent unboundedness emphasizes the need for a cogent framework of common understanding and standardized reasoning to direct its successful deployment [16, 17].

A collaborative effort that divides responsibilities and makes use of both people's strengths is likely to be more productive than a situation where one person does the cleanup out of self-interest or for personal recognition, refusing any help. Instead of assigning work as a kind of severe punitive action, leadership must be genuinely collaborative. This entails choosing how to approach activities, spotting chances to repurpose resources, and figuring out what is important to the company. Despite continuous discussions, the fundamental cognitive concepts of collaborative leadership are still essential rather than depending on a behavioral framework with customized, skills-based divisions of labor. This viewpoint, which has psychological roots, emphasizes how people and their surroundings are intertwined. It contends that the growth of shared and socially distributed cognition is essential to collective action. This idea also applies to educational institutions and procedures. For instance, there is a growing movement among practitioners to reevaluate instructional leadership, which is typically thought of as an administrative position that specifies how teachers should conduct themselves in order to enhance classroom instruction. Adopting collaborative decision-making techniques that actively incorporate the opinions and input of people most impacted by organizational activities is crucial to achieving long-lasting and successful outcomes.

Collaborative leadership places a strong emphasis on identifying and utilizing each participant's ability as a group in any given situation. It relies on the collective knowledge and behaviors of the entire group rather than just one person's expertise. But there are problems and misunderstandings with this idea. Problems including power disparities, disputes,

groupthink, or an excessively relaxed atmosphere might result from collaborative leadership. Disparities might occur, for example, if one person gets excessive credit while making less contributions, or if behavior goes against the core ideas of shared leadership. These difficulties highlight the necessity of meticulous execution in order to preserve the fundamental principles of collaborative leadership.

Although the leadership model's basic idea is straightforward in theory, there are several obstacles to overcome when implementing it in formal organizational structures. The fundamental principles of development are outlined by contemporary social cognition theory, but it provides little insight into the precise mechanisms by which growth occurs. A more comprehensive research program is needed to address these challenges and close the gap between conceptual knowledge and practical application when this cognitive theory-based leadership theory is applied to organizational frameworks in educational contexts [18, 19]. By distributing authority within an organization, shared governance creates a system of checks and balances, much like collaborative leadership. In any learning setting or company, this paradigm offers a strong framework for fostering collaborative leadership. However, there are particular difficulties due to the unique complexity of post-secondary education, which is marked by significant levels of differentiation. The kind, size, and organizational development stage of the organization, as well as the role and subject matter of leadership, all have a significant impact on how collaborative leadership is used.

Drawbacks

Despite their potential, shared governance and collaborative leadership have drawbacks. Critiques in organizational and

social psychology highlight legitimate concerns about collective processes, and misuse and misunderstandings can happen. While management strategies are typically inadequate as workable substitutes, shared governance itself has drawbacks and frequently encounters challenges to successful implementation. Understanding the important differences between shared governance and collaborative leadership, as well as the challenges of combining concepts from both frameworks, is essential. To bridge their potential and promote creative governance models in education, such comprehensive knowledge is crucial [20-23].

Although it emphasizes participatory decision-making, shared governance does not automatically guarantee group action or formal cooperation. This is particularly true considering how deeply embedded competitive individualism, which has its roots in classical management theory, is in the ethos of higher education. Even while shared governance is based on democratic principles, it frequently fails to advance a positive perception of human nature. Rather than promoting equitable distributions, it arranges a division of labor to balance institutional power, which may result in power disputes. These disputes and tensions frequently result in disjointed decision-making processes that jeopardize cooperative efforts and collegial relationships.

These organizational difficulties highlight areas that need more research and show gaps in our theoretical and practical understanding of shared governance. In contrast to collaborative leadership, shared governance, which is based on academic independence, was first created to shield teachers from administrative hierarchies. In its early beginnings, it was based on ideas similar to workforce unionization. By promoting a more connected and

cooperative governance framework, collaborative leadership theory shows potential in resolving these problems [24, 25]. Furthermore, the creation of collaborative leadership models can be enhanced and complemented by the shared governance principles, creating a mutually reinforcing relationship that fortifies institutional governance.

CONCLUSION

Organizations that fully adopt shared governance concepts create structures that facilitate cooperative leadership. Problems with shared governance systems can be solved by collaborative leadership, however there are still issues with facilitating cognitive interactions for reliable results. The collaborative leadership approach strengthens human capacity-building and encourages actions that support shared governance principles as managerialism in education grows.

Actionable initiatives for higher education institutions include faculty and administrator training programs that improve shared governance knowledge and collaborative leadership abilities. Before ramping up, departmental pilot programs to test governance models may yield insightful results. Establishing forums for continuous communication amongst interested parties would encourage openness and diversity in the decision-making process. Advocating for formal institutional regulations that promote shared governance and fend against outside pressures is part of policy proposals. The government and accrediting organizations ought to think about providing targeted financing or incentives to universities that embrace collaborative governance.

Both frameworks benefit from the synergy between collaborative leadership and shared governance, which also presents opportunity for the development of alternative ideas. We can improve leadership theories and

practices by integrating organizational sciences with education.

Author(s) Contribution: Analysis and supervision, U. Sami; resources data and proof-reading, B. Fouzia.

Funding: No funding involved.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable

Conflict of Interest: Nil.

Consent for Publication: All authors approved the manuscript for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Bolden, R., Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2018). Tensions in higher education leadership: towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 358–76.
2. Coaldrake, P., Stedman, L. & Little, P. (2016). *Issues in Australian university governance*. Brisbane: QUT. Demetriou, A., Shayer, M. & Efklides, A. (2002) *Neo-Piagetian theories of cognitive development*. London: Routledge.
3. Dwumah Manu, B., Ying, F., Oduro, D., Antwi, J., & Yakubu Adjuik, R. (2023). The impact of social media use on student engagement and acculturative stress among international students in China. *Plos one*, 18(4), e0284185.
4. Lansing JS. Complex Adaptive Systems. *Annu Rev Anthropol*. 2003;32:183–204. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.061002.093440
5. Uhl-Bien M, Marion R, McKelvey B. Complexity leadership theory: shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadersh Q*. 2007;18(4):298–318. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002
6. Faraj S, Xiao Y. Coordination in fast-response organizations. *Manage Sci*. 2006;52(8):1155–1169. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.1060.0526
7. Gold, J. (2010) 'The rush to leadership – slight complications. *Education Review*, 8(1), 71–8.
8. Guthrie, J. W. & Pierce, C. C. (2000). The international economy and national education reform: a comparison of education reforms in the United States and

- Great Britain. Oxford Review of Education, 16(2), 179–205.
9. Hammond, D. (2022) The science of synthesis: exploring the social implications of general systems theory. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Press.
 10. MacNeill, N., Cavanaugh, R. F. & Silcox, S. (2023). Pedagogic principal leadership. *Management in Education*, 17(4), 14–17.
 11. Manu, B. D., Ying, F., Oduro, D., & Boateng, S. A. (2021). Student engagement and social media in tertiary education: The perception and experience from the Ghanaian public university. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 3(1), 100100.
 12. Manu, B. D., Zhang, H., Oduro, D., Krampah-Nkoom, A., Mensah, I. A., Anaba, O. A., & Isaac, A. (2020). School board efficiency in financial management and human resource in public senior high schools: An evidence from Ashanti region, Ghana. *Int'l J. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, 8, 79.
 13. Mayrowetz, D. (2018). Making sense of distributed leadership: exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 424–35.
 14. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R. & Diamond, J. B. (2011) 'Investigating school leadership practice: a distributed perspective'. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23–8.
 15. Zepke, N. (2017). Leadership, power and activity systems in a higher education context: will distributed leadership serve in an accountability driven world?. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(3), 301–14.
 16. Curşeu PL, Schruijer SGL. Leading without position power: preliminary validation of the multiparty collaborative leadership scale (MCLS). *Int J Conflict Manag.* 2024;35(2):411–426. doi: 10.1108/IJCMA-01-2023-0014
 17. van Knippenberg D, Pearce CL, van Ginkel WP. Shared leadership – vertical leadership dynamics in teams. *Organ Psychol Rev.* 2025;15(1):44–67. doi: 10.1177/20413866241292341
 18. Yun S, Faraj S, Sims HP Jr. Contingent leadership and effectiveness of trauma resuscitation teams. *J Appl Psychol.* 2005;90(6):1288. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1288
 19. Zhang G, Stalmeijer RE, Maulina F, Smeenk FWJM, Sehlbach C. Interprofessional collaboration in primary care for patients with chronic illness: a scoping review mapping leadership and followership. *BMJ Leader.* 2025;9(2):131–139. doi: 10.1136/leader-2024-001102
 20. Pasarakonda S, Grote G, Schmutz JB, Bogdanovic J, Guggenheim M, Manser T. A strategic core role perspective on team coordination: benefits of centralized leadership for managing task complexity in the operating room. *Human Factors.* 2021;63(5):910–925. doi: 10.1177/0018720820906041
 21. Reyes DL, Bisbey T, Day D, Salas E. Translating 6 key insights from research on leadership and management in times of crisis. *BMJ Leader.* 2021. doi: 10.1136/leader-2020-000349
 22. Mitchell R, Boyle B. Too many cooks in the kitchen? The contingent curvilinear effect of shared leadership on multidisciplinary healthcare team innovation. *Human Re Manag J.* 2021;31(1):358–374. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12309
 23. Muller-Juge V, Cullati S, Blondon KS, et al. Interprofessional collaboration between residents and nurses in general internal medicine: a qualitative study on behaviours enhancing teamwork quality. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(4). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0096160
 24. De Brún A, McAuliffe E. Identifying the context, mechanisms and outcomes underlying collective leadership in teams: building a realist programme theory. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2020;20(1):261. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-05129-1
 25. De Brún A, McAuliffe E. “When there’s collective leadership, there’s the power to make changes”: a realist evaluation of a collective leadership intervention (Co-Lead) in healthcare teams. *J Leadership Organ Stud.* 2023;30(2):155–172. doi: 10.1177/15480518221144895