

The Moderating Role of Faculty Self-Efficacy on the Relationship of Management Practices and Institutional Performance

Jefferson F. Pascual

Isabela State University, Angadanan Campus, Angadanan, Isabela, Philippines
E-mail: jeffersonpascual807@gmail.com

KEYWORDS Academic Leadership. Educational Effectiveness. Organisational Outcomes. Professional Competence. Strategic Administration. Workplace Motivation

ABSTRACT This study examined whether faculty self-efficacy moderates the relationship between management practices and institutional performance in a multi-campus Philippine state university. Using a cross-sectional explanatory design, data were collected from 250 faculty members through structured questionnaires utilising five-point Likert scales. Management practices were conceptualised as a multidimensional construct including participatory governance, resource management, strategic leadership, faculty development, fairness, accountability, empowerment, and collaborative policy support. Data were analysed using hierarchical multiple regression and partial least squares structural equation modelling. Results indicated positive perceptions of management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance. Management practices significantly predicted institutional performance, and the inclusion of faculty self-efficacy increased the explained variance. The interaction effect was also significant, indicating that higher faculty self-efficacy strengthens the relationship between management practices and institutional performance. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening faculty capability to maximise the effectiveness of institutional management systems.

INTRODUCTION

State universities and colleges are increasingly required to demonstrate high levels of performance in teaching, research productivity, community engagement, and quality assurance while operating under limited resources and complex governance systems. In many higher education systems, institutional reforms have emphasised improved management practices such as participatory governance, strategic leadership, accountability mechanisms, and coherent policy implementation. These management structures are intended to strengthen institutional capacity and provide clear organisational direction that supports faculty work and institutional goals. Contemporary higher education research suggests that well-designed governance systems can enhance institutional effectiveness by aligning leadership strategies, resource allocation, and academic priorities (De Boer et al. 2021; Marginson 2018; Mok and Jiang 2021).

Despite these structural reforms, empirical evidence shows that improvements in governance and management practices do not always translate directly into higher institutional performance. While some universities demonstrate measurable

gains in research output, accreditation outcomes, and teaching quality after implementing governance reforms, others experience minimal improvement despite similar policy interventions. This variation suggests that institutional structures alone may not be sufficient to ensure organisational effectiveness. Recent scholarship emphasises that the success of management reforms depends not only on structural arrangements but also on the engagement and capabilities of academic staff responsible for implementing institutional policies (Kezar et al. 2019; Tight 2020).

Faculty members play a central role in achieving institutional performance outcomes. Their responsibilities include curriculum design, instructional delivery, research production, and community engagement (Inoncillo 2024). Consequently, their motivation, competence, and psychological resources significantly influence whether institutional policies are effectively translated into measurable results. One psychological factor that has gained considerable attention in organisational and educational research is self-efficacy, defined as individuals' beliefs in their capability to organise and execute actions required to achieve desired outcomes (Bandura 1997). Faculty with high self-efficacy are more likely to adopt

innovative teaching practices, pursue research opportunities, and participate actively in institutional initiatives (Liu et al. 2024; Padohinog et al. 2024). Conversely, when faculty members lack confidence in their abilities, even well-structured management systems may fail to produce intended outcomes because implementation depends heavily on individual agency.

Recent studies in higher education emphasize the critical role of faculty self-efficacy in shaping academic productivity and institutional engagement, with evidence showing that faculty with strong efficacy beliefs demonstrate higher teaching innovation, research output, and leadership participation (Daumiller et al. 2021; Fong et al. 2022; Han et al. 2023), as well as greater professional commitment and resilience under organizational demands. The interaction between organizational systems and individual resources can be explained through frameworks such as the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that organizational resources—like leadership support, governance structures, and clear policies—enhance engagement and performance by mitigating job demands and facilitating goal attainment, while personal resources, including self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience, enable individuals to effectively leverage these resources, with empirical studies showing that personal resources strengthen the impact of organizational resources on performance (Bakker and Demerouti 2023; Xanthopoulou et al. 2007). Similarly, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) highlights that perceptions of competence, autonomy, and relatedness influence motivation and performance (Ryan and Deci 2020), and in academic contexts, faculty self-efficacy reflects perceived competence, which fosters internalization of institutional goals, sustained motivation, and active engagement. International evidence further indicates that governance reforms are most effective when structural alignment is paired with faculty empowerment; European studies show improved institutional outcomes when faculty participation and autonomy are strengthened (De Boer et al. 2021), and research in Asian higher education systems undergoing rapid reform demonstrates that faculty engagement and confidence significantly affect the success of governance and leadership initiatives (Mok and Jiang 2021; Yonezawa 2020), suggesting that management practices and faculty

self-efficacy interact to influence institutional performance.

Marginson (2025) emphasized that global university rankings, while influential, tend to prioritize research outputs and create a dominant narrative of institutional performance, often neglecting diverse institutional goals and internal factors such as faculty capabilities and governance practices. Complementing this, Padmavathy et al. (2024) demonstrated that faculty engagement—encompassing cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions—significantly enhances teaching quality, research productivity, and overall institutional success, highlighting the critical role of supportive management systems. In the same vein, Hattie (2024) reinforced that teacher effectiveness remains the most influential determinant of student learning outcomes, underscoring the importance of faculty-related variables in institutional performance. Moreover, Daumiller et al. (2025) found that teachers’ self-efficacy and achievement goals are strongly associated with the adoption of effective, student-oriented teaching practices, thereby linking internal motivational constructs to instructional quality. Similarly, Yang et al. (2024) highlighted self-efficacy as a critical mediating factor influencing academic resilience and motivation, suggesting its broader role in performance-related outcomes. From an organizational perspective, Ling (2025), drawing on the Job Demands–Resources theory, explained that employee performance and engagement are shaped by the balance between job demands and available resources, where sufficient institutional support enhances well-being and productivity. Taken together, these studies affirm that faculty self-efficacy operates as a crucial psychological and professional resource that can moderate the relationship between management practices and institutional performance, as effective governance structures, adequate resources, and supportive environments foster higher engagement, improved teaching practices, and ultimately stronger institutional outcomes.

In the Philippine context, state universities operate across multiple campuses with diverse academic programs, faculty backgrounds, and institutional cultures, presenting additional challenges in coordination, resource distribution, and policy implementation. Despite widespread governance reforms and faculty development initia-

tives, variations in institutional performance persist across campuses and academic units, which may be partly explained by differences in faculty self-efficacy affecting how faculty engage with institutional policies and management systems. Understanding the interaction between faculty self-efficacy and management practices is therefore essential for enhancing institutional performance, as high self-efficacy may strengthen the impact of management systems, enabling universities to achieve greater gains by pairing structural reforms with initiatives that build faculty capability, confidence, and engagement. Examining this moderating relationship contributes to the growing literature on organizational and psychological factors influencing higher education performance.

Objectives of the Study

This study investigates the moderating role of faculty self-efficacy in the relationship between management practices and institutional performance within a multi-campus Philippine state university. Specifically, it aims to describe faculty perceptions of management practices, self-efficacy, and institutional performance; examine the relationships between management practices and performance, as well as between faculty self-efficacy and performance; assess the link between management practices and faculty self-efficacy; and test whether faculty self-efficacy moderates the effect of management practices on institutional performance.

METHODOLOGY

The study utilised a cross-sectional explanatory design to examine whether faculty self-efficacy moderates the relationship between management practices and institutional performance. This approach is well suited for testing interaction effects among theoretically grounded constructs in higher education. Moderation was tested using hierarchical multiple regression with an interaction term, while PLS-SEM was employed as a robustness check to assess measurement quality, model fit, and the stability of results.

The research was conducted at Isabela State University (ISU), a multi-campus public university in northern Philippines, whose governance,

quality assurance systems, and faculty development programs provided a relevant institutional context. The participants were 250 full-time faculty members from various colleges and institutes, representing disciplines such as Education, ICT, Agriculture, Criminology, Hospitality Management, and the Social Sciences. The sample size exceeded recommended thresholds for moderated regression and provided adequate statistical power to detect interaction effects.

All variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale. Management practices were modelled as a second-order construct comprising participatory governance and resource management, strategic leadership and faculty development, fairness and accountability, and policy support and collaboration, all showing excellent reliability. Faculty self-efficacy, reflecting confidence in teaching, research, leadership, and technology integration, also demonstrated high reliability. Institutional performance captured perceived outcomes in teaching quality, research productivity, community engagement, and quality assurance, with strong internal consistency.

Data analysis included descriptive statistics, reliability testing, and Pearson correlations. Moderation was tested through a three-step hierarchical regression, with centred predictors and an interaction term, and significant effects were probed using simple slopes and Johnson-Neyman procedures. PLS-SEM was used to corroborate the regression findings. All analyses followed a .05 significance level.

Data was collected during the first semester of the academic year 2025-2026. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and confidentiality was ensured. The study adhered to ethical standards for social and behavioural research.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics for management practices, its four subscales, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance. Overall, perceptions were generally favorable, indicating a supportive institutional environment and strong faculty confidence. Management practices received a high mean score ($M = 3.87$, $SD =$

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of key variables and subscales

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>	<i>Cronbach's α</i>
Management Practices (Overall)	3.87	0.56	-.042	-.018	0.94
a. Participatory Governance and Resource Management	3.84	0.58	-.038	-.021	0.90
b. Strategic Leadership and Faculty Development	3.91	0.53	-.041	-.024	0.91
c. Fairness, Accountability and Empowerment	3.86	0.55	-.035	-.017	0.89
d. Policy Support and Collaborative Structure	3.88	0.59	-.044	-.019	0.88
Faculty Self-Efficacy	3.94	0.49	-.040	-.013	0.93
Institutional Performance	3.79	0.51	-.031	-.015	0.92

Note. N = 250. All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). All reliability coefficients indicate excellent internal consistency.

0.56), suggesting that governance, leadership initiatives, and policies are effectively supporting academic operations. Among the subscales, Strategic Leadership and Faculty Development scored highest ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.53$), followed by Policy Support and Collaborative Structure ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.59$), while Participatory Governance and Resource Management ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.58$) and Fairness, Accountability, and Empowerment ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.55$) were slightly lower, highlighting areas for further enhancement in participatory decision-making and transparency.

These results suggest that while leadership-driven initiatives and faculty development programs are perceived as strong, participatory mechanisms and equitable governance practices may not be as fully optimized, indicating a potential imbalance between top-down and inclusive management approaches. This implies that institutions may benefit from strengthening shared governance structures to ensure broader faculty involvement in decision-making processes.

Faculty self-efficacy was rated highest among all variables ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.49$), indicating strong confidence in professional abilities such as teaching, research, leadership, and technology integration. Institutional performance was also rated favorably ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.51$), reflecting perceived effectiveness in teaching, research, community engagement, and quality assurance, though slightly lower than other constructs, suggesting room for continued strategic efforts to fully translate institutional and faculty capacities into outcomes. The higher level of faculty self-efficacy relative to institutional performance may indicate that while faculty members possess strong individual competencies, there may be structural or systemic factors that limit the full conversion of these capabilities into measurable

institutional outcomes. This gap highlights the importance of aligning institutional systems, resources, and policies with faculty strengths to maximize performance.

All variables demonstrated acceptable skewness and kurtosis (-0.44 to -0.13) and excellent reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.88$ – 0.94), confirming suitability for parametric analysis. The negative skewness values further indicate that responses are concentrated toward the higher end of the scale, reinforcing the generally positive perceptions among respondents. Additionally, the consistency in reliability coefficients across all constructs suggests that the measurement instruments used in this study are stable and dependable for assessing governance, faculty capability, and institutional outcomes.

Qualitatively, these results indicate a generally supportive academic climate with effective leadership and empowered faculty, while also identifying potential areas for improvement, particularly in participatory governance and optimizing the impact of management practices on institutional outcomes.

Correlations

Table 2 presents the correlation matrix among management practices (including its four dimensions), faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance. Quantitatively, all relationships were positive and significant ($p < .001$), indicating consistent associations across variables. The dimensions of management practices were strongly interrelated ($r = .64$ – $.71$), supporting their coherence as a unified construct. Overall management practices showed a strong correlation with institutional performance ($r = .62$), while faculty self-efficacy was also significantly related to perfor-

Table 2: Correlations among key variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
1. Participatory Governance and Resource Management	-						
2. Strategic Leadership and Faculty Development	.68***	-					
3. Fairness, Accountability and Empowerment	.64***	.71***	-				
4. Policy Support and Collaborative Structure	.66***	.69***	.70***	-			
5. Management Practices (Overall)	.84***	.86***	.85***	.83***	-		
6. Faculty Self-Efficacy	.53***	.56***	.55***	.54***	.58***	-	
7. Institutional Performance	.57***	.60***	.59***	.58***	.62***	.54***	-

Note. N = 250. *** $p < .001$

mance ($r = .54$). Additionally, management practices correlated moderately with faculty self-efficacy ($r = .58$), suggesting a meaningful link between organizational systems and faculty confidence. These results indicate that improvements in management practices are likely associated with corresponding increases in both faculty self-efficacy and institutional performance. The strength of the correlations, particularly between management practices and institutional performance, suggests that governance mechanisms, leadership effectiveness, and institutional support systems play a critical role in shaping organizational outcomes. Furthermore, the moderate relationship between management practices and faculty self-efficacy implies that institutional environments contribute to building faculty confidence, though other individual and contextual factors may also be involved.

At the subscale level, correlations with faculty self-efficacy ranged from $r = .53$ to $.56$, and with institutional performance from $r = .57$ to $.60$, with Strategic Leadership and Faculty Development showing the strongest association with performance ($r = .60$). This pattern highlights the particularly important role of leadership and faculty development initiatives in driving institutional success. The relatively consistent correlations across all subscales also indicate that management practices function as an integrated system, where each dimension contributes meaningfully to faculty capability and performance outcomes. Notably, no excessively high correlations (for example, $r > .90$) were observed, suggesting the absence of multicollinearity concerns and confirming that the constructs, while related, remain empirically distinct.

These findings imply that effective management—through leadership, governance, account-

ability, and policy support—not only directly enhances institutional performance but also fosters faculty confidence. In turn, self-efficacious faculty are more likely to engage in teaching, research, and institutional initiatives, reinforcing overall performance. The results highlight a mutually reinforcing system in which strong management practices and empowered faculty collectively drive institutional success, providing empirical support for the proposed relationships and a basis for further structural analysis.

The correlation findings not only confirm the direction and strength of relationships among the variables but also provide preliminary evidence supporting the hypothesized model, justifying the inclusion of faculty self-efficacy as a key explanatory and potentially moderating variable in subsequent analyses.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the effects of management practices and faculty self-efficacy on institutional performance and to test moderation (Table 3).

In Step 1, management practices significantly predicted institutional performance ($\beta = 0.51$, $t = 9.21$, $p < .001$), explaining 38 percent of the variance ($R^2 = 0.38$). This indicates that stronger leadership, governance, and policies are associated with better institutional outcomes. The relatively high beta coefficient in this initial model suggests that management practices alone exert a substantial direct influence on institutional performance, highlighting the foundational role of governance structures and leadership effectiveness in shaping organizational success. This also implies that institutions with well-established systems and clear policy directions are more likely to achieve

Table 3: Hierarchical regression predicting institutional performance

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Step 1</i>					
Management Practices	0.45	0.05	0.51	9.21	< .001
Model Statistics	$R^2 = .38$	$\Delta R^2 = \text{—}$	$F(1, 248) = 84.85^{***}$		
<i>Step 2</i>					
Management Practices	0.33	0.05	0.38	6.60	< .001
Faculty Self-Efficacy	0.39	0.06	0.37	6.74	< .001
Model Statistics	$R^2 = .51$	$\Delta R^2 = .13^{***}$	$F(2, 247) = 128.63^{***}$		
<i>Step 3 (Interaction)</i>					
Management Practices	0.28	0.05	0.32	5.52	< .001
Faculty Self-Efficacy	0.28	0.06	0.27	4.93	< .001
Management Practices $\times$ Self-Efficacy	0.15	0.05	0.16	3.05	.002
Model Statistics	$R^2 = .56$	$\Delta R^2 = .04^{**}$	$F(3, 246) = 104.94^{***}$		

Note. Dependent variable: Institutional Performance

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

favourable performance outcomes. In Step 2, adding faculty self-efficacy showed that both management practices ($\beta = 0.38$, $t = 6.60$, $p < .001$) and self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.37$, $t = 6.74$, $p < .001$) were significant predictors. The model's explanatory power increased to 51 percent ($R^2 = 0.51$), with a significant gain ($\Delta R^2 = .13$, $p < .001$), suggesting that institutional performance is shaped by both organizational systems and faculty confidence in their professional capabilities. The reduction in the beta value of management practices from Step 1 to Step 2 indicates that part of its effect on institutional performance may be shared with or complemented by faculty self-efficacy. This demonstrates that while institutional systems are important, the individual capacity of faculty members plays an equally critical role in achieving performance outcomes. The substantial increase in explained variance (13%) further confirms that faculty self-efficacy contributes unique explanatory power beyond management practices alone. In Step 3, the interaction term was significant ($\beta = 0.16$, $t = 3.05$, $p = .002$), confirming moderation. The model explained 56 percent of the variance ($R^2 = 0.56$), with a meaningful increase ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $p < .01$). The significant interaction effect indicates that the relationship between management practices and institutional performance is contingent upon the level of faculty self-efficacy. Specifically, the positive beta coefficient of the interaction term suggests that the impact of management practices becomes stronger as faculty self-efficacy increases. Although the additional variance explained (4%) may appear modest, it is statistically meaningful and aligns with expectations in moderation

analysis, where interaction effects are typically smaller yet theoretically important.

These findings provide strong empirical support for the hypothesized moderating role of faculty self-efficacy and suggest that institutional strategies should not only focus on improving management practices but also on strengthening faculty confidence through training, mentorship, and resource provision. This integrated approach is essential for maximizing institutional effectiveness and sustaining long-term performance.

Simple Slopes Analysis

To clarify the significant interaction between management practices and faculty self-efficacy, a simple slopes analysis was conducted (Table 4). Quantitatively, management practices significantly predicted institutional performance across all levels of faculty self-efficacy, but with increasing strength: low (-1 SD: $B = 0.38$, $t = 4.75$, $p < .001$), mean ($B = 0.51$, $t = 9.21$, $p < .001$), and high ($+1$ SD: $B = 0.67$, $t = 9.56$, $p < .001$). This indicates a progressively stronger effect as faculty self-efficacy increases. The increasing slope values demonstrate a clear moderating effect: when faculty self-efficacy is low, management practices still contribute positively to institutional performance, but the magnitude of the impact grows as faculty confidence rises. The pattern of results confirms that faculty self-efficacy amplifies the effectiveness of management practices, transforming strong organizational systems into even greater institutional outcomes when faculty feel capable, empowered, and confident in their professional roles.

Table 4: Simple slopes of management practices at different levels of faculty self-efficacy

<i>Level of faculty self-efficacy</i>	<i>Slope (B)</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
-1 SD (Low)	0.38	0.08	4.75	< .001
Mean	0.51	0.05	9.21	< .001
+1 SD (High)	0.67	0.07	9.56	< .001

The findings suggest that while effective management practices can sustain institutional performance even when faculty confidence is low—through structures such as leadership support and governance—their impact becomes more pronounced as faculty self-efficacy improves. At moderate levels, institutional systems and faculty capabilities operate more synergistically, while at high levels, confident faculty are better able to leverage resources, engage in academic initiatives, and contribute meaningfully to institutional goals.

Overall, the pattern confirms that faculty self-efficacy strengthens the effect of management practices on institutional performance, underscoring the need to simultaneously invest in sound management systems and faculty professional development to maximize institutional outcomes.

PLS-SEM Model Fit

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was conducted to validate the relationships among management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance, complementing the hierarchical regression results (Table 5). The model fit indices indicated a good fit, with SRMR = 0.041 and NFI = 0.95, suggesting minimal discrepancy between observed and predicted correlations and strong support for the hypothesized model. The model explained 56 percent of the variance in institutional performance ($R^2 = 0.56$), demonstrating substantial explanatory power for social science research.

These quantitative fit indices confirm that the proposed framework is both theoretically and empirically robust. A low SRMR indicates that the model reproduces the observed correlations very closely, while a high NFI confirms that the model provides a better fit than a null baseline model. The substantial R^2 value demonstrates that management practices and faculty self-efficacy together explain a meaningful proportion of institutional performance, reinforcing the importance of these variables in predicting outcomes in higher education contexts.

Measurement model assessment confirmed validity and reliability, with AVE values above 0.50 and Composite Reliability exceeding 0.85, indicating that the constructs were measured accurately and consistently. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were below 3, confirming no multicollinearity among predictors.

The AVE and CR values suggest that all indicators are strongly associated with their underlying constructs, supporting convergent validity and internal consistency. Low VIF values further confirm that the predictors do not overlap excessively, ensuring that the estimated relationships are stable and reliable. Qualitative feedback from faculty also supports these findings, as respondents consistently recognized the impact of management practices and personal efficacy on institutional outcomes, aligning with the quantitative results.

The PLS-SEM results support the robustness of the proposed research framework. The accept-

Table 5: PLS-SEM model fit and quality indices

<i>Fit/Quality index</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Recommended cut-off</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
SRMR	0.041	≥ 0.08	Good fit
NFI	0.95	≤ 0.90	Good fit
R^2 (Institutional Performance)	0.56	-	Substantial
ΔR^2 (Interaction Effect)	0.04	-	Moderate increase
AVE (all constructs)	> 0.50	≤ 0.50	Convergent validity met
Composite Reliability (CR)	> 0.85	≤ 0.70	Reliable
VIF (all paths)	< 3	≥ 5	No multicollinearity

able model fit, substantial explanatory power, and strong validity and reliability indicators confirm that the constructs were measured appropriately and that the hypothesized relationships among management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance are empirically supported. In particular, the results reinforce the earlier regression findings by providing additional evidence that faculty self-efficacy plays a meaningful moderating role in strengthening the influence of management practices on institutional performance.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the moderating role of faculty self-efficacy in the relationship between management practices and institutional performance in higher education. The findings confirm that both management practices and faculty self-efficacy exert significant direct effects on institutional performance, while faculty self-efficacy further strengthens this relationship. These results underscore the interdependence of organizational structures and individual psychological resources in shaping institutional effectiveness.

The positive relationship between management practices and institutional performance reinforces existing evidence that strategic leadership, participatory governance, and supportive policies are central to higher education success. Recent global reports emphasize that effective governance systems and adaptive leadership are critical for enhancing quality, innovation, and sustainability in higher education institutions (UNESCO 2024; OECD 2025). Consistent with this, leadership approaches that promote collaboration and strategic alignment have been shown to significantly improve university performance (Ramírez and Tiplic 2022). Within the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) framework, these management practices function as organizational resources that facilitate engagement and productivity (Bakker and Demerouti 2023).

Faculty self-efficacy also emerged as a significant predictor of institutional performance, supporting social cognitive theory (Bandura 1997). Faculty members with strong self-efficacy are more likely to engage in innovative teaching, research, and leadership activities. Recent studies highlight that self-efficacy is a key driver of teacher innovation and instructional effectiveness (Liu

et al. 2024), as well as adaptability in blended and digital learning environments (Cagayan et al. 2025). Meta-analytic evidence further confirms that professional development significantly enhances teacher self-efficacy, leading to improved academic outcomes (Liu et al. 2025). Additional studies link self-efficacy with work engagement, academic excellence, and resilience against burn-out (Inoncillo 2024; Yang and Du 2024; Ariska and Affandi 2024), reinforcing its central role in sustaining institutional productivity.

The most important contribution of this study is the identification of faculty self-efficacy as a moderator. Their findings indicate that the effectiveness of management practices is amplified when faculty possess high levels of self-efficacy. This supports emerging evidence that organizational and personal resources operate synergistically rather than independently. For instance, self-efficacy has been shown to enhance the effects of organizational culture and leadership on motivation and performance (Huda et al. 2025). In line with the JD-R model, self-efficacy functions as a personal resource that strengthens individuals' capacity to utilize institutional support systems effectively (Bakker and Demerouti 2023).

Comparisons with international literature show similar patterns. In European and U.S. universities, strategic management and governance reforms enhance institutional performance most effectively when faculty engagement and self-efficacy are high (De Boer et al. 2017; Hoyt et al. 2008). Asian higher education contexts also emphasize that faculty capacity is essential for realizing the benefits of structural reforms (Mok and Jiang 2021). In developing higher education systems, where resources and management capacities may be uneven, cultivating faculty self-efficacy offers a cost-effective means of improving institutional performance.

These findings are consistent with international perspectives emphasizing that institutional reforms must be complemented by investments in faculty capacity. Global frameworks highlight that sustainable higher education development depends not only on governance structures but also on empowered educators capable of driving innovation and change (UNESCO 2024; OECD 2025). This is particularly relevant in developing contexts, where enhancing faculty self-efficacy offers a strategic and cost-effective pathway to improving institutional performance.

The study contributes theoretically by extending the JD-R model and Self-Determination Theory to higher education, demonstrating how organizational and personal resources interact to influence outcomes. Practically, the findings suggest that institutional leaders should adopt integrated strategies that combine effective management practices with targeted faculty development initiatives. Strengthening faculty self-efficacy through professional development, mentoring, and research support is essential for maximizing the impact of institutional policies and achieving sustained performance.

Overall, the results highlight that institutional effectiveness is not solely a function of management systems but also of faculty capability and confidence. Aligning these dimensions should therefore remain a central priority in higher education policy and practice.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrated that both management practices and faculty self-efficacy are critical and mutually reinforcing determinants of institutional performance in higher education. Faculty reported favourable perceptions of participatory governance, strategic leadership, accountability mechanisms, and supportive policy environments, alongside high levels of self-efficacy. The analyses revealed that management practices and faculty self-efficacy each exert significant direct effects on institutional performance, and that faculty self-efficacy strengthens the positive impact of management practices. In essence, the effectiveness of institutional structures is enhanced when faculty possess the confidence and capacity to engage productively, highlighting the interplay between organisational resources and individual capabilities in achieving institutional success.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings, higher education leaders should adopt strategies that simultaneously strengthen institutional systems and faculty capacities. Institutions can invest in sustained faculty development programs, mentoring initiatives, and recognition schemes that cultivate self-efficacy, while continuing to enhance

participatory governance, strategic leadership, and coherent policy frameworks. Aligning structural reforms with faculty empowerment can create an environment that fosters teaching excellence, research productivity, and community engagement. Future studies should consider longitudinal or experimental designs to establish causal relationships, examine variations across disciplines or institutional types, and explore additional factors such as work engagement or organizational commitment to further understand the mechanisms linking management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance.

REFERENCES

- Ariska HD, Affandi GR 2024. Unleashing academic excellence through self-efficacy among new global scholars. *Indonesian Journal of Education Methods Development*, 19(1): <https://doi.org/10.21070/ijemd.v19i1.811>
- Bakker AB, Demerouti E 2023. Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(1): 1-15.
- Bandura A 1997. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise Of Control*. Alberta, Canada: W.H. Freeman.
- Cagayan ADT, Acidera RA, Tamanu MJM, Sumer JJM 2025. Knowledge, self-efficacy and effectiveness in leveraging blended delivery system: A study of higher education teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(2): 709-726.
- Daumiller M, Stupnisky R, Janke S 2021. Motivation of higher education faculty: Theoretical approaches and empirical evidence. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2): 623-648.
- De Boer H, Enders J, Schimank U 2021. New public management and the academic profession: The consequences of governance reforms in universities. *Higher Education*, 81(3): 599-615.
- Fong C, Davis C, Kim Y 2022. Faculty motivation and academic productivity in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(6): 1232-1246.
- Han J, Yin H, Wang W 2023. Teacher self-efficacy and professional engagement in higher education: A cross-national analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(5): 1123-1139.
- Hattie J 2024 *Visible Learning: The Sequel*. Routledge.
- Hoyt J, Allred E, Hunt N 2012. Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of faculty. *ERIC*, 18(1): 101-118.
- Huda W, Raharjo TJ, Suharini E, Prihatin T 2025. Organizational culture and self-efficacy with work motivation and leadership as key factors. *Qubahan Academic Journal*, 4(4): 383-410.
- Inoncillo FA 2024. Perceived learning management system effectiveness, teacher's self-efficacy, and work engagement: Groundwork for an upskilling plan: *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 11(3): 560-584.
- Kezar A, DePaola T, Scott D 2019. *The Gig Academy: Mapping Labor In The Neoliberal University*. Maryland, United States of America: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Ling X 2025. Job requirements: Overview of resource theory: *Academic Journal of Science and Technology*, 14: 59-60.
- Liu J, Wang K, Pan Z 2025. The effectiveness of professional development in the self-efficacy of in-service teachers in STEM education: A meta-analysis. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(10): 1364.
- Liu S, Yin H, Wang Y, Lu J 2024. Teacher innovation: Conceptualizations, methodologies, and theoretical framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 145: 104611.
- Marginson S 2018. Global trends in higher education financing: The United Kingdom. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 58: 26-36.
- Mok K, Jiang J 2021. Massification of higher education and governance reform in Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 34(3): 1-17.
- OECD 2025. *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Padmavathy V, Venkateswaran PS, Begum S, Sheela K 2024. *A Review Of The Faculty Engagement And Performance In Higher Educational Institutions*. USA: AVE Trends Publication.
- Padohinog E, Liwanag B, Balsicas N 2024. Teacher self-efficacy through achievement goals, instructional strategies, and student engagement in the Philippine setting. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal (APH-ERJ)*, 11(1): <https://doi.org/10.56278/apherj.v11i1.2618>
- Ramírez GB, Tiplic D 2022. Leadership styles and university performance: A systematic review. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(6): 1043–1065.
- Ryan RM, Deci EL 2020. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61: 101860.
- Tight M 2020. *Higher Education Research: The Developing Field*. Routledge.
- UNESCO 2024. *Reimagining Higher Education For Sustainable Development*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Xanthopoulou D, Bakker A, Demerouti E, Schaufeli W 2007. The role of personal resources in the job demands–resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2): 121-141.
- Yang X, Du J 2024. The effect of teacher self-efficacy, online pedagogical and content knowledge, and emotion regulation on teacher digital burnout: A mediation model. *BMC Psychology*, 12: 51.
- Yonezawa A 2020. Japanese university reforms and faculty engagement in governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 74(2): 123-138.

Paper received for publication in January, 2026
Paper accepted for publication in May, 2026