

# Management Practices, Faculty Self-Efficacy, and Institutional Performance: A Narrative Review

Eugelyn R. Felix<sup>id</sup>  
Isabela State University, Angadanan,  
Philippines

Rodel B. Guzman<sup>id</sup>  
College of Education, Isabela State  
University, Echague, Isabela, Philippines

## Abstract

The relationship between management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance is a critical area of study in higher education research. Effective management practices provide strategic leadership, governance, and resource allocation that influence faculty experiences and institutional efficiency. Faculty self-efficacy, defined as educators' belief in their ability to teach, conduct research, and engage in institutional activities, serves as a mediating factor that determines how well management strategies translate into academic success. Institutional performance, measured through indicators such as effectiveness, efficiency, equity, transparency, accountability, and sustainability, reflects the overall success of an institution in fulfilling its mission and adapting to evolving educational landscapes. These three constructs interact in a dynamic and reciprocal manner, where management practices shape faculty confidence, faculty engagement drives institutional outcomes, and institutional performance influences future management strategies and faculty experiences. This literature review explores the interrelationship among these constructs, drawing from empirical studies and theoretical frameworks to analyze how leadership approaches, faculty development programs, and governance structures affect faculty self-efficacy and institutional success. The findings suggest that institutions with strong management practices and high faculty self-efficacy tend to perform better in student learning outcomes, research productivity, and stakeholder satisfaction. However, research gaps remain in understanding the long-term impact of faculty self-efficacy on institutional performance, cross-cultural variations in management strategies, and the role of digital transformation in shaping these relationships. Addressing these gaps will provide valuable insights for higher education leaders seeking to enhance institutional effectiveness through evidence-based policies and faculty support initiatives.

**Keywords:** faculty self-efficacy, higher education, institutional performance, management practices

## Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) serve as key drivers of knowledge creation, innovation, and societal progress. Their ability to fulfill this role is shaped by various factors, among which management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance stand as fundamental pillars. Management practices provide the strategic direction, leadership, and operational support necessary for institutional growth, while faculty self-efficacy influences teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and overall faculty engagement. Institutional performance, encompassing dimensions such as effectiveness, efficiency, equity, transparency, accountability, and sustainability, serves as a measure of an institution's ability to achieve its mission and adapt to evolving educational landscapes. These three constructs do not operate in isolation; rather, they interact in complex and reciprocal ways, shaping the overall success of HEIs.

Understanding the interrelationship between these constructs is essential for optimizing higher education governance and improving institutional effectiveness. Management practices directly influence faculty self-efficacy by creating supportive environments, professional development opportunities, and clear academic policies that enhance faculty confidence in their teaching and research roles. In turn, faculty self-efficacy mediates

the relationship between management practices and institutional performance, as confident faculty members are more likely to engage in innovative teaching, contribute to research excellence, and support institutional development. Furthermore, institutional performance feeds back into management strategies and faculty experiences, reinforcing effective leadership approaches and faculty motivation when positive or highlighting areas for improvement when challenges arise. Recognizing these dynamic interactions provides valuable insights for higher education leaders aiming to cultivate an environment of continuous improvement and academic excellence.

Despite the importance of these interconnections, existing research often examines management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance in isolation rather than as an interdependent system. There remains a need for a comprehensive examination of how these factors collectively shape the success of HEIs, particularly in light of global shifts in education, such as digital transformation, increasing accountability measures, and the need for sustainable institutional models. This literature review aims to explore the intricate relationships between management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance, highlighting their interconnected nature and identifying gaps in the current body of knowledge that warrant further investigation.

© 2025 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2025v13i3.54189>. Journal homepage: <https://journals.innovareacademics.in/index.php/ijoe>.

**Acknowledgment:** The authors would like to thank all the students who participated in our study. **Authors' Contributions:** ERF wrote the manuscript with the guidance of RBG who served as her research adviser. **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declared no conflicts of interest concerning this article's research, authorship, and publication. **Funding Source:** The authors received no financial support for this review article and publication.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Eugelyn R. Felix, College of Education, Isabela State University, Echague, Isabela, Philippines. Email: [eugelyn.r.felix@isu.edu.ph](mailto:eugelyn.r.felix@isu.edu.ph)

## Management Practices

In the literature, management practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) encompass three critical dimensions—instructional leadership, strategic leadership, and organizational management.

### *Instructional Leadership*

Instructional leadership in higher education institutions (HEIs) refers to the active involvement of school heads, department chairs, deans, and academic administrators in enhancing teaching and learning processes. Effective instructional leadership is characterized by the ability to support faculty members, provide opportunities for professional development, ensure curriculum alignment, and create a student-centered learning environment (Brown, 2016; Gonzales, 2024). Unlike traditional leadership approaches, instructional leadership focuses on improving teaching practices and student achievement rather than administrative tasks alone.

One of the primary functions of instructional leadership is fostering a culture of continuous learning and professional growth among faculty members. Studies indicate that faculty members who perceive their administrators as instructional leaders report higher levels of motivation, job satisfaction, and engagement in their teaching roles (Lazcano et al., 2022). Leaders who prioritize faculty development encourage instructors to adopt innovative teaching methodologies, integrate active learning strategies, and utilize evidence-based instructional practices that improve student learning outcomes (Macaluso et al., 2020).

Furthermore, instructional leaders play a crucial role in fostering collaboration among faculty members. When school heads actively involve instructors in discussions about learning objectives, assessment strategies, and instructional improvements, faculty members feel more empowered and engaged in their teaching responsibilities (Ghamrawi et al., 2024; Szeto & Cheng, 2017). Collaborative decision-making not only enhances faculty self-efficacy but also leads to improved institutional performance through shared accountability and goal alignment.

Another key aspect of instructional leadership is the provision of relevant and up-to-date learning resources. Effective instructional leaders ensure that faculty members have access to modern teaching tools, digital resources, and curriculum enhancement programs that support effective instruction (Frazier & Hearn, 2024). Institutions with strong instructional leadership tend to report higher student satisfaction rates, increased retention, and improved academic outcomes. Instructional leaders also encourage the use of student data and learning analytics to refine teaching strategies and address student learning needs proactively (Brown et al., 2020; Rahimi & Oh, 2024).

Despite its importance, instructional leadership in HEIs often faces challenges, including resistance to change, faculty workload concerns, and administrative constraints. Research suggests that leadership training programs tailored for academic administrators can enhance their ability to function as effective instructional leaders (Bertrand, 2018; Vaisben, 2018). Providing ongoing leadership development opportunities can equip school heads with the necessary skills to support faculty effectively, fostering an institutional culture that prioritizes teaching excellence and student success.

### *Strategic Leadership*

Strategic leadership in HEIs involves the formulation and execution of long-term institutional plans, policies, and objectives that align with the organization's mission, vision, and values. Unlike operational leadership, which focuses on daily administrative tasks, strategic leadership is concerned with shaping the institution's future by ensuring its adaptability to external changes, technological advancements, and evolving societal demands (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Doyle & Brady, 2018).

A key component of strategic leadership is the ability to develop and articulate a compelling institutional vision. Leaders

who effectively communicate a shared vision inspire faculty, students, and other stakeholders to work collectively toward achieving institutional goals (Bush, 2018; Canon-Shilon, 2020; Owusu-Agyeman, 2019). A well-defined strategic vision fosters a sense of purpose and direction within an institution, leading to enhanced organizational coherence and performance (Boyett, 1996; Gede, 2025).

Research has shown that institutions with strong strategic leadership exhibit greater resilience in the face of challenges such as declining student enrollment, funding constraints, and changes in educational policies (Britton et al., 2023; Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006; Hearn & Burns, 2021). Strategic leaders anticipate potential obstacles and proactively implement strategies to mitigate risks, ensuring institutional sustainability and continuous improvement (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Kebede et al., 2024).

One of the primary responsibilities of strategic leaders in HEIs is the efficient allocation of resources to support institutional growth. Effective resource management involves securing external funding, optimizing budget allocations, and investing in faculty development, research initiatives, and student support services (Kezar & Holcombe, 2017; Yadav et al., 2025). Institutions that prioritize strategic resource planning are better positioned to enhance faculty productivity, improve student learning experiences, and strengthen their reputation in the academic community.

Moreover, strategic leadership involves fostering partnerships with external stakeholders, including government agencies, industry leaders, alumni, and local communities. These partnerships enhance institutional visibility, increase funding opportunities, and provide students and faculty with access to research collaborations, internships, and industry-aligned learning experiences (Bryson, 2018; El Hajal & Losekoot, 2024). Strategic leaders also play a crucial role in driving innovation within HEIs by supporting research, adopting emerging educational technologies, and encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty members (Kayyali, 2024c; Leal Filho et al., 2023).

Despite its benefits, strategic leadership is often challenged by bureaucratic constraints, resistance to change, and misalignment between institutional objectives and stakeholder expectations. Research suggests that institutions that implement leadership development programs tailored to strategic planning and change management are more likely to achieve long-term success (Fullan, 2011; Holzer et al., 2019; Rawson & Davis, 2023;). Building a leadership pipeline within HEIs ensures a sustainable approach to strategic decision-making and institutional growth.

### *Organizational Management*

Organizational management in HEIs encompasses the effective coordination of administrative functions such as budgeting, scheduling, policy implementation, human resource management, and institutional governance. Organizational efficiency plays a crucial role in ensuring that faculty members, students, and stakeholders operate within a well-structured and supportive environment that facilitates academic success (Kaplan & Norton, 1996; Le et al., 2023).

Budgeting and financial planning are critical components of organizational management. Institutions that effectively manage their financial resources are able to invest in faculty development, infrastructure enhancements, and student support programs that contribute to institutional performance (Koomson, 2024; Leal Filho et al., 2018; Mgaíwa, 2020). Leaders responsible for financial planning must balance resource allocation between academic programs, research initiatives, and operational expenses to maintain institutional sustainability (Lower & Czekanski, 2019; Ruben et al., 2023). Institutions with transparent financial policies and accountable decision-making structures are more likely to gain stakeholder trust and secure external funding (Král & Cuskelly, 2017; Mason, 2019).

Another crucial aspect of organizational management is faculty workload distribution and scheduling. Efficient workload management ensures that faculty members can balance their teaching, research, and service responsibilities without experiencing burnout (García-Ramírez & Bijelić, 2024; Griffith &

Altinay, 2020). Institutions that provide workload flexibility, research sabbaticals, and professional development support create a more positive work environment for faculty members, leading to higher job satisfaction and retention (Baker et al., 2023; Gorard et al., 2024).

Policy implementation and institutional governance also fall under the purview of organizational management. Effective policies related to tenure, promotion, faculty evaluations, and academic integrity are essential for maintaining institutional credibility and fostering a culture of excellence (Bryson, 2018; Yadav et al., 2025). Institutions that engage faculty members in the policy development process and encourage shared governance report higher levels of faculty satisfaction and institutional performance (Curnalia & Mermer, 2018; Liu & Watson, 2020).

In addition, institutional leaders must prioritize student support services, including counseling, career guidance, and academic advising. Research indicates that institutions that invest in student well-being and support systems experience higher retention and graduation rates (Harrison et al., 2018). Organizational efficiency in delivering student services enhances the overall institutional climate, ensuring that students receive the necessary resources to succeed academically and professionally (Dominguez-Whitehead, 2018; Ruben et al., 2023).

Technology integration in administrative processes is another key trend in modern organizational management. The use of digital platforms for student enrollment, faculty evaluations, and learning management systems (LMS) has streamlined institutional operations and improved efficiency (AL-Nuaimi et al., 2022; Christensen et al., 2008; Woodman et al., 2023). Institutions that leverage data analytics and automation in administrative decision-making are better equipped to adapt to changing educational trends and enhance institutional performance (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Rožman et al., 2023).

However, organizational management in HEIs often faces challenges such as bureaucratic inefficiencies, resistance to policy changes, and financial constraints. Institutions that adopt adaptive leadership models and data-driven decision-making frameworks are more likely to navigate these challenges successfully (Elugbaju et al., 2024; Yadav et al., 2025). The integration of evidence-based management practices ensures that institutional operations remain effective, transparent, and aligned with educational best practices.

### **Faculty Self-Efficacy**

Faculty self-efficacy is a complex construct encompassing content knowledge, pedagogical skills, classroom management, technology integration, and student engagement.

#### **Content Knowledge**

Faculty self-efficacy is a critical factor that influences teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Content knowledge, which refers to an educator's mastery of subject matter, plays a fundamental role in shaping self-efficacy. Educators who have a deep understanding of their subject matter feel more confident in delivering lectures, answering student queries, and designing instructional activities that enhance learning (Roussinos & Jimoyiannis, 2019). Research indicates that teachers with high content knowledge are more likely to integrate complex concepts into their teaching, making them more effective in facilitating student comprehension (McCarthy & McNamara, 2021).

Furthermore, content knowledge influences how educators adapt to curriculum changes and incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives into their teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Timm & Barth, 2020). Teachers with strong content knowledge are also better equipped to develop assessment tools that accurately measure student understanding, reinforcing their instructional effectiveness (Grossman, 1990; Kang et al., 2018). In contrast, faculty members with lower content knowledge may struggle with self-efficacy, leading to anxiety and reduced effectiveness in the classroom (Bandura, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2019).

Empirical studies suggest that professional development programs that focus on content enhancement can significantly

improve faculty self-efficacy (Li et al., 2019; Ravandpour, 2019). Faculty members who engage in subject-specific training, research collaborations, and knowledge-sharing communities are more likely to develop higher confidence in their expertise (Chen et al., 2021; Garet et al., 2001). Additionally, mentoring programs and peer observation practices have been found to reinforce content knowledge and bolster faculty confidence in their ability to teach effectively (Chea, 2024; Cutucache et al., 2017).

### **Pedagogical Skills**

Pedagogical skills refer to an educator's ability to plan, implement, and assess instructional strategies that cater to diverse learning needs. Faculty self-efficacy is closely linked to an instructor's pedagogical competence, as those who employ effective teaching methods feel more confident in their ability to engage students and facilitate learning (Hatlevik, 2016). High levels of pedagogical self-efficacy lead to greater willingness among faculty to experiment with innovative teaching methods and adapt to changing educational contexts (Wason, 2023).

Studies suggest that pedagogical training enhances self-efficacy by providing educators with a repertoire of instructional techniques that can be tailored to different learning styles (Fabriz et al., 2021; Hoy & Spero, 2005; Kuyini et al., 2021). Teachers who feel confident in their pedagogical skills are more likely to incorporate active learning strategies, such as collaborative learning, problem-based learning, and formative assessments, into their teaching practices (Okolie et al., 2021). These methods have been shown to improve student engagement and academic performance, further reinforcing faculty self-efficacy (Guskey, 1988).

Moreover, research highlights that pedagogical self-efficacy can be strengthened through continuous professional development (CPD) and mentorship programs (Avalos, 2010). Faculty members who receive feedback from colleagues, engage in peer discussions and participate in instructional workshops report higher levels of confidence in their teaching abilities (Flodén, 2016). Additionally, institutions that support faculty in curriculum design, assessment development, and classroom innovation contribute to higher self-efficacy among educators (Li et al., 2019).

### **Classroom Management**

Effective classroom management is another crucial aspect of faculty self-efficacy, as it directly affects an instructor's ability to create a conducive learning environment. Faculty members who feel confident in managing their classrooms tend to establish clear behavioral expectations, minimize disruptions, and maintain student engagement (Patall et al., 2023). Classroom management self-efficacy is particularly important in higher education, where diverse student populations require adaptable and inclusive teaching approaches (Emmers et al., 2019).

Research shows that faculty who experience difficulties in classroom management often struggle with student behavior, engagement, and instructional pacing (Gunersel et al., 2023). However, educators with strong self-efficacy in this area are more likely to implement proactive strategies such as structured lesson planning, student-centered instruction, and clear communication of classroom rules (Ciampa & Reisboard, 2024).

Furthermore, classroom management self-efficacy can be enhanced through training in conflict resolution, student motivation techniques, and culturally responsive teaching practices (Pevac-Zimmer et al., 2024). Faculty members who undergo professional development in these areas report increased confidence in handling classroom challenges and maintaining a positive learning environment (Hitch et al., 2017). Additionally, mentorship programs that pair new faculty with experienced educators have been found to improve classroom management self-efficacy (Burger, 2023; Preechawong et al., 2021).

### **Technology Integration**

The rapid advancement of educational technology has necessitated the integration of digital tools into teaching and learning processes. Faculty self-efficacy in technology

integration refers to an educator's confidence in using digital platforms, multimedia resources, and learning management systems (LMS) to enhance instruction (Sharma & Saini, 2022). Studies suggest that technology integration self-efficacy is a strong predictor of an educator's willingness to adopt new technological innovations in the classroom (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010; Su & Chen, 2024).

Educators with high technology self-efficacy are more likely to incorporate interactive elements such as online quizzes, virtual simulations, and collaborative learning platforms into their teaching (Beck & Warren, 2019). These tools have been shown to improve student engagement, increase accessibility, and facilitate personalized learning experiences (Alam & Mohanty, 2023). Conversely, faculty members who lack confidence in using technology may be hesitant to adopt digital resources, leading to a more traditional, lecture-based approach that may not fully engage modern learners (Sullivan et al., 2024).

Professional development in educational technology significantly enhances self-efficacy by providing faculty with hands-on training and exposure to digital teaching tools (Martin et al., 2020; Wong et al., 2022;). Institutions that offer workshops, instructional design support, and peer collaboration opportunities foster greater confidence among faculty in using technology effectively (Saroyan & Amundsen, 2023). Additionally, faculty who receive ongoing support and access to technological resources report higher levels of self-efficacy and are more likely to experiment with innovative teaching strategies (Zheng et al., 2018).

### **Student Engagement**

Faculty self-efficacy is also closely tied to student engagement, which refers to an educator's ability to capture students' interest, encourage active participation, and create a dynamic learning environment (Nizzolino & Canals, 2024). Research suggests that faculty members who feel confident in engaging students employ a variety of instructional techniques, such as interactive discussions, group activities, and problem-solving exercises, to enhance learning experiences (Fredricks et al., 2004).

Student engagement self-efficacy is particularly important in higher education, where students' intrinsic motivation and sense of belonging play a critical role in academic success (Adi Badiozaman et al., 2019; Gutiérrez & Tomás, 2019). Faculty members with high self-efficacy in student engagement are more likely to build meaningful relationships with students, provide constructive feedback, and create inclusive classroom environments that support diverse learning needs (Wilson et al., 2018).

Studies indicate that institutions that prioritize faculty development in student engagement techniques see improved learning outcomes and retention rates (Roberts, 2018). Faculty members who participate in workshops on active learning, inclusive teaching, and motivational strategies report higher confidence in their ability to engage students effectively (Barkley, 2010; Moríña, 2020). Additionally, research suggests that faculty who implement student-centered approaches, such as flipped classrooms and project-based learning, develop higher self-efficacy and foster greater student involvement (Sun et al., 2023).

### **Institutional Performance**

Institutional performance in higher education institutions (HEIs) is a multidimensional concept that encompasses various factors contributing to the overall effectiveness, efficiency, equity, transparency, accountability, and sustainability of an institution. The ability of an institution to meet its strategic goals, efficiently allocate resources, uphold ethical standards, and operate sustainably is crucial for its long-term success.

#### **Effectiveness**

Effectiveness refers to the degree to which an institution achieves its objectives and meets the expectations of its stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, policymakers, and the broader community. Institutions that demonstrate

effectiveness successfully accomplish their mission, fulfill academic goals, and continuously improve performance indicators (Varouchas et al., 2018). The effectiveness of an institution is often measured by its ability to meet predefined goals, such as student retention rates, graduation rates, employment outcomes, and research productivity. Institutions with strong leadership and strategic planning mechanisms tend to perform better in achieving their goals (Doyle & Brady, 2018). A study by Kayyali (2025) emphasized that institutions that set clear performance metrics and continuously assess progress are more likely to sustain long-term success. Higher education institutions serve multiple stakeholders, including students, employers, policymakers, and society at large. Institutions that prioritize student support services, career counseling, and alumni engagement tend to exhibit higher stakeholder satisfaction (Pedro & Andraz, 2019). Furthermore, institutions that align their academic programs with labor market demands enhance their effectiveness by ensuring graduates are employable and well-prepared for the workforce (Brennan & Teichler, 2008). Effective institutions engage in ongoing assessment and adaptation to respond to evolving educational landscapes. Regular program reviews, faculty evaluations, and student feedback mechanisms contribute to institutional agility and resilience (Yadav et al., 2025). Institutions that actively collect and analyze data to inform decision-making demonstrate a stronger capacity to adapt to changing conditions, such as technological advancements and policy reforms (Barlette & Bailleite, 2020).

#### **Efficiency**

Efficiency in higher education refers to how well an institution utilizes its resources—financial, human, and infrastructural—to achieve its objectives with minimal waste. Efficiency is a key determinant of institutional sustainability and competitiveness in the global academic landscape (Popowska, 2024). Institutions that efficiently allocate their resources tend to operate with higher levels of financial sustainability. Budgeting strategies, cost management initiatives, and performance-based funding models contribute to institutional efficiency (Madsen, 2024). Studies indicate that institutions that reduce operational waste without compromising academic quality demonstrate higher levels of productivity and competitiveness (Jongbloed, 2004). Efficiency is also reflected in faculty workload management, administrative procedures, and the utilization of digital tools to streamline operations (Christensen et al., 2008). Institutions that invest in automation and digitalization tend to enhance administrative efficiency while allowing faculty members to focus more on research and teaching rather than bureaucratic tasks (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Comparative assessments between institutions help identify best practices in resource management and operational efficiency. Higher education institutions that benchmark their performance against national and international standards can improve efficiency by adopting innovative models of academic governance and financial sustainability (Hazelkorn, 2018).

#### **Equity**

Equity in higher education refers to an institution's commitment to providing fair and impartial opportunities to all stakeholders, regardless of their background, socio-economic status, or demographic characteristics. An equitable institution ensures that all individuals have access to quality education, resources, and support systems (Alam & Mohanty, 2023). Institutions that uphold equity principles ensure that their policies and decision-making processes are free from discrimination and bias (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Higher education institutions that promote fairness in admissions, hiring, and resource allocation tend to have higher levels of institutional trust and credibility (Boliver & Powell, 2022). Equity-focused institutions actively support marginalized communities by offering financial aid, mentorship programs, and targeted academic support services (Gale & Parker, 2012). Research has shown that universities that prioritize inclusivity and diversity

policies experience increased student engagement and social cohesion (Scott, 2020). An equitable institution ensures that all students and faculty have equal access to learning materials, research funding, and institutional services. Digital inclusivity, accessibility policies, and need-based scholarship programs contribute to equitable institutional performance (Kayyali, 2024b).

### **Transparency**

Transparency refers to the openness of an institution in providing accurate, timely, and accessible information to stakeholders. Transparency fosters trust, accountability, and informed decision-making within higher education institutions (Deem et al., 2007). Institutions that openly communicate their mission, goals, and performance indicators establish stronger relationships with stakeholders. Regular publication of institutional reports, rankings, and quality assessments enhances institutional credibility (Hazelkorn, 2015). Transparent institutions involve students, faculty, and external stakeholders in governance structures and policy-making (Altbach, 2011). Research indicates that participatory governance models improve institutional effectiveness and promote shared responsibility (Burgos & Mertens, 2017). Institutions that adhere to national and international higher education regulations demonstrate higher transparency levels. Compliance with accreditation standards, ethical research practices, and financial accountability regulations ensures institutional integrity and public trust (Kayyali, 2024a).

### **Accountability**

Accountability in higher education is the responsibility of institutions to uphold ethical, academic, and operational standards while addressing the concerns of stakeholders (Franco D'Souza et al., 2024). Accountability ensures that institutions take ownership of their decisions and actions, especially regarding policy implementation and performance outcomes. Institutions with strong accountability frameworks demonstrate higher levels of institutional reliability and effectiveness (Khan et al., 2021). Higher education institutions that establish clear grievance redress mechanisms and actively respond to stakeholder concerns enhance institutional accountability (Burke, 2005). Institutions that integrate student and faculty feedback into decision-making processes improve overall academic satisfaction and engagement (Miller, 2018). Ethical governance ensures that academic integrity, financial transparency, and student rights are upheld. Institutions that prioritize ethical responsibility in leadership and decision-making build stronger reputations and long-term institutional success (Ginsberg, 2011).

### **Sustainability**

Sustainability refers to an institution's ability to plan for the long term, minimize environmental impact, and ensure the responsible use of resources while meeting present and future educational demands (Balan, 2024; Sharma, 2017). Institutions that develop strategic long-term plans aligned with sustainability goals experience stable growth and innovation. Future-oriented planning enhances institutional resilience and adaptability (Taylor et al., 2020). Sustainability involves integrating green practices, reducing carbon footprints, and adopting energy-efficient policies in campus management (Anser et al., 2023). Institutions that implement sustainability initiatives gain recognition and support from policymakers and the community. Universities that actively involve students and faculty in sustainability programs create a culture of environmental consciousness and social responsibility (Alkahter & Avissar, 2017).

### **Link Between Management Practices, Faculty Self-Efficacy, and Institutional Performance**

The interrelationship between management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance is a dynamic and reciprocal process that influences the overall effectiveness of

higher education institutions (HEIs). Management practices serve as the foundation for institutional operations, shaping faculty experiences and engagement, which in turn influence institutional performance. Faculty self-efficacy acts as both a mediating and moderating variable, determining the extent to which management practices translate into institutional success. At the same time, institutional performance can reinforce or weaken management strategies and faculty confidence, creating a continuous feedback loop that shapes the long-term sustainability of an institution.

Management practices in HEIs encompass leadership approaches, governance structures, faculty development initiatives, and resource allocation strategies. Institutions that adopt participatory management styles, transparent governance, and well-structured faculty support systems tend to foster a positive academic environment. Effective leadership, particularly transformational and instructional leadership, has been found to enhance faculty engagement, motivation, and self-efficacy (Cansoy et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019). When institutional leaders create a culture of collaboration, provide regular feedback, and offer opportunities for professional growth, faculty members feel more confident in their teaching and research abilities (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Conversely, rigid, bureaucratic management structures that fail to address faculty concerns can lead to low self-efficacy, disengagement, and diminished institutional productivity (Garofalo & Graziano, 2023).

Faculty self-efficacy, defined as an educator's confidence in their ability to teach, conduct research, and contribute to institutional goals, mediates the relationship between management practices and institutional performance. Faculty members with high self-efficacy are more likely to adopt innovative teaching strategies, engage in interdisciplinary research, and contribute to institutional governance (Bandura, 1997). Institutions that provide faculty with strong mentorship programs, research funding, and pedagogical training see greater faculty commitment and performance, which in turn enhances institutional effectiveness (Scutelnicu Todoran, 2023). Furthermore, faculty members with high self-efficacy demonstrate resilience in the face of challenges, adapting to new educational technologies, assessment methodologies, and shifting institutional priorities (Guskey, 1988). When faculty confidence is high, student engagement and academic outcomes improve, which ultimately strengthens institutional rankings, research output, and global reputation (Hazelkorn, 2018).

Institutional performance is influenced not only by management strategies and faculty self-efficacy but also serves as a feedback mechanism that shapes future management decisions and faculty experiences. Institutions that achieve high levels of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, transparency, accountability, and sustainability tend to reinforce positive management practices and faculty morale. When HEIs perform well in national and international rankings, they attract better funding, recruit high-quality faculty, and enhance their research capabilities, creating a cycle of sustained growth and improvement (Hong, 2018). High-performing institutions are more likely to implement data-driven governance, faculty support initiatives, and adaptive leadership strategies, further strengthening faculty self-efficacy and institutional outcomes (Bryson, 2018). On the other hand, institutions that struggle with low student retention, weak research impact, and financial instability often experience a decline in faculty morale and engagement. Poor institutional performance can lead to reactive, short-term management decisions that undermine faculty autonomy and innovation, further exacerbating institutional decline (Burke, 2005).

The interplay among these three constructs creates a complex yet interdependent system that determines the long-term success of HEIs. Strong management practices foster faculty self-efficacy, which enhances institutional performance. In turn, institutional performance influences the refinement of management strategies and faculty confidence, reinforcing or disrupting institutional stability. For instance, institutions that experience growth and positive academic recognition often expand their faculty development programs, increase research funding, and improve governance structures, leading to greater

faculty engagement and continued success (Nasser, 2017). Conversely, institutions facing financial constraints or declining student enrollment may impose restrictive policies, reduce faculty development investments, and implement cost-cutting measures that lower faculty self-efficacy and further diminish institutional performance (Jongbloed, 2004).

### Conclusion

Despite the critical nature of this interrelationship, several research gaps remain. There is limited longitudinal research on how faculty self-efficacy evolves in response to changing management practices and institutional performance. Most studies focus on short-term faculty perceptions, leaving a gap in understanding the long-term impact of institutional policies on faculty engagement and effectiveness. Additionally, cross-cultural studies are needed to compare how different higher education systems manage faculty development and institutional governance, as contextual differences may shape the strength and direction of these relationships. Furthermore, with the increasing role of digital transformation in HEIs, more research is needed to examine how artificial intelligence, online learning platforms, and data-driven decision-making influence faculty self-efficacy and institutional outcomes. Future research should also explore the impact of leadership adaptability in times of crisis, such as during economic downturns or global disruptions like the COVID-19 pandemic, on faculty morale and institutional performance.

To ensure sustainable growth, HEIs must adopt an integrated approach that aligns management practices with faculty development strategies and institutional performance metrics. Institutions that actively monitor faculty self-efficacy, invest in leadership training, and implement evidence-based management reforms are better positioned to enhance academic quality and institutional reputation. Additionally, fostering an institutional culture that values innovation, inclusivity, and continuous improvement will strengthen the interrelationship between management effectiveness, faculty confidence, and institutional success. As the higher education landscape continues to evolve, understanding and optimizing these interconnections will be critical for shaping resilient and high-performing academic institutions.

### References

- Adi Badiozaman, I. F., Leong, H., & Jikus, O. (2019). Investigating student engagement in Malaysian higher education: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(10), 1364–1378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1688266>
- Alam, A., & Mohanty, A. (2023). Cultural beliefs and equity in educational institutions: Exploring the social and philosophical notions of ability groupings in teaching and learning of mathematics. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2023.2270662>
- Alkahr, I., & Avissar, I. (2017). Assessing the impact of a program designed to develop sustainability leadership amongst staff members in higher education institutes: A case study from a community of practice perspective. *Environmental Education Research*, 24(4), 492–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1291799>
- Al-Nuaimi, M. N., Al Sawafi, O. S., Malik, S. I., Al-Emran, M., & Selim, Y. F. (2022). Evaluating the actual use of learning management systems during the COVID-19 pandemic: An integrated theoretical model. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(10), 6905–6930. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2055577>
- Altbach, P. G. (2011). *Leadership for world-class universities: Challenges for developing countries* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Anser, M. K., Khan, K. A., Umar, M., Awosusi, A. A., & Shamansurova, Z. (2023). Formulating sustainable development policy for a developed nation: Exploring the role of renewable energy, natural gas efficiency and oil efficiency towards decarbonization. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 31(3), 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2023.2268586>
- Avalos, B. (2010). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- Baker, V. L., Lunsford, L. G., Neisler, G., Pifer, M. J., & Terosky, A. L. (2023). *Success after tenure: Supporting mid-career faculty* (1st ed.). Taylor & Francis.
- Balan, A. (2024). Examining the ethical and sustainability challenges of legal education's AI revolution. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 31(3), 323–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2024.2421179>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Barkley, E. F. (2010). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Barlette, Y., & Baillellette, P. (2020). Big data analytics in turbulent contexts: Towards organizational change for enhanced agility. *Production Planning and Control*, 33(2–3), 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1810755>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
- Beck, D., & Warren, S. (2019). Rural art teachers' access: One museum's online art curriculum. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 15(2), 146–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2019.1684921>
- Bertrand, D. W. (2018). The practice of executive coaching to improve leadership capacity in academic deans at American higher education institutions. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(2), 110–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2018.1545136>
- Boliver, V., & Powell, M. (2022). Competing conceptions of fair admission and their implications for supporting students to fulfill their potential at university. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 27(1), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2022.2063429>
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (6th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Boyett, J. (1996). *The guru guide: The best ideas of the top management thinkers*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brennan, J., & Teichler, U. (2008). The future of higher education and of higher education research: Higher education looking forward: An introduction. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9124-6>
- Britton, T., Rall, R. M., & Commodore, F. (2022). The keys to endurance: An investigation of the institutional factors relating to the persistence of historically black colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 94(3), 310–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2022.2082786>
- Brown, A., Lawrence, J., Basson, M., & Redmond, P. (2020). A conceptual framework to enhance student online learning and engagement in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 41(2), 284–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1860912>
- Brown, G. (2016). Leadership's influence: A case study of an elementary principal's indirect impact on student achievement. *Education*, 137(1), 101–115.
- Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Burger, J. (2023). Constructivist and transmissive mentoring: Effects on teacher self-efficacy, emotional management, and the role of novices' initial beliefs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 75(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231185371>
- Burgos, A., & Mertens, F. (2017). Participatory management of community-based tourism: A network perspective. *Community Development*, 48(4), 546–565. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2017.1344996>
- Burke, J. C. (2005). *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Bush, T. (2018). Research on educational leadership and management: Broadening the base. *Educational Management*

- Administration and Leadership*, 46(3), 359–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218758555>
- Cansoy, R., Parlar, H., & Polatcan, M. (2020). Collective teacher efficacy as a mediator in the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher commitment. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(6), 900–918. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1708470>
- Chea, C. (2024). Mentorship's role in shaping professional identity: Insights from Cambodian teaching practicums. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2419710>
- Chen, S., Geesa, R. L., Izci, B., & Song, H. (2021). Investigating preservice teachers' science and mathematics teaching efficacy, challenges, and support. *The Teacher Educator*, 57(3), 304–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2021.2007560>
- Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., & Johnson, C. W. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ciampa, K., & Reisboard, D. (2024). Empowering teacher educators: Advancing culturally responsive practices through professional development. *Action in Teacher Education*, 46(4), 350–371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2024.2357088>
- Curnalia, R. M. L., & Mermer, D. (2018). Renewing our commitment to tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance to navigate challenges in higher education. *Review of Communication*, 18(2), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1438645>
- Cutucache, C. E., Leas, H. D., Grandgenett, N. F., Nelson, K. L., Rodie, S., Shuster, R., Schaben, C., & Tapprich, W. E. (2017). Genuine faculty-mentored research experiences for in-service science teachers: Increases in science knowledge, perception, and confidence levels. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 28(8), 724–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1415615>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement A review state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>
- Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199265909.001.0001>
- Dominguez-Whitehead, Y. (2018). Non-academic support services and university student experiences: Adopting an organizational theory perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(9), 1692–1706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1287168>
- Doyle, T., & Brady, M. (2018). Reframing the university as an emergent organisation: Implications for strategic management and leadership in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(4), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1478608>
- Eddy, P. L., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education: New visions of leadership or same old "hero" leader? *Community College Review*, 34(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552106289703>
- El Hajal, G., & Losekoot, E. (2024). Gen Z talent management: Hospitality industry insights. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 24(1), 139–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2024.2405790>
- Elugbaju, W. K., Okeke, N. I., & Alabi, O. A. (2024). Conceptual framework for enhancing decision-making in higher education through data-driven governance. *Global Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 2(2), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.58175/gjarr.2024.2.2.0055>
- Emmers, E., Baeyens, D., & Petry, K. (2019). Attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards inclusion in higher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1628337>
- Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 255–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782551>
- Fabriz, S., Hansen, M., Heckmann, C., Mordel, J., Mendzheritskaya, J., Stehle, S., Schulze-Vorberg, L., Ulrich, I., & Horz, H. (2021). How a professional development programme for university teachers impacts their teaching-related self-efficacy, self-concept, and subjective knowledge. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 40(4), 738–752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1787957>
- Farris, D. A., & Gmelch, W. H. (2020). *Understanding university committees: How to manage and participate constructively in institutional governance* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Flodén, J. (2016). The impact of student feedback on teaching in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(7), 1054–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1224997>
- Franco D'Souza, R., Mathew, M., Mishra, V., & Surapaneni, K. M. (2024). Twelve tips for addressing ethical concerns in the implementation of artificial intelligence in medical education. *Medical Education Online*, 29(1), Article 2330250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2024.2330250>
- Frazier, M., & Hearrington, D. (2024). *Technology coordinator's handbook: A guide for edtech facilitators and leaders* (4th ed.). International Society for Technology in Education.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gale, T., & Parker, S. (2012). Navigating change: A typology of student transition in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(5), 734–753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.721351>
- Ganon-Shilon, S., Shaked, H., & Schechter, C. (2020). Principals' voices pertaining to shared sense-making processes within a generally outlined pedagogical reform implementation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(6), 941–965. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1770864>
- García-Ramírez, Y., & Bijelić, V. (2024). Assessing task prioritization for professors through affinity and satisfaction scores. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2321355>
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915–945. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915>
- Garofalo, M. A., & Graziano, M. J. (2023). Resignation and resilience: Bridging effective teaching to the impacts of complex and layered school culture. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 8(1), 88–140. <https://doi.org/10.30828/real.1072648>
- Gede, D. U. (2025). Strategic alignment and its effects on employee engagement: Empirical evidences from Ethiopian education sector. *International Review of Public Administration*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2025.2454058>
- Ghamrawi, N., Shal, T., & Ghamrawi, N. A. R. (2024). Cultivating teacher leadership: Evidence form a transformative professional development model. *School Leadership and Management*, 44(4), 413–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2024.2328056>
- Gibbs, G. (2010). *Dimensions of quality*. Higher Education Academy.
- Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The fall of the faculty: The rise of the all-administrative university and why it matters*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199782444.001.0001>
- Gonzales, K. (2024). *How educational leaders make instructional decisions for reading instruction* [Unpublished masters' dissertation]. Texas A&M University-Commerce.
- Gorard, S., Ledger, M., See, B. H., & Morris, R. (2024). What are the key predictors of international teacher shortages? *Research Papers in Education*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2024.2414427>
- Griffith, A. S., & Altinay, Z. (2020). A framework to assess higher education faculty workload in U.S. universities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(6), 691–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1786432>
- Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. Teacher's College Press.



- Gunersel, A. B., Mason, B. A., Wills, H. P., Caldarella, P., Williams, L., & Henley, V. M. (2023). Effective classroom management in middle level schools: A qualitative study of teacher perceptions. *RMLE Online*, 46(8), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2023.2252714>
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(1), 63–69. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(88\)90025-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(88)90025-X)
- Gutiérrez, M., & Tomás, J. M. (2019). The role of perceived autonomy support in predicting university students' academic success mediated by academic self-efficacy and school engagement. *Educational Psychology*, 39(6), 729–748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1566519>
- Hallinger, P. (2015). Conceptual framework. In *Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale* (pp. 25–46). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15533-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15533-3_2)
- Harrison, N., Davies, S., Harris, R., & Waller, R. (2018). Access, participation and capabilities: Theorising the contribution of university bursaries to students' well-being, flourishing and success. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(6), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1401586>
- Hatlevik, O. E. (2016). Examining the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy, their digital competence, strategies to evaluate information, and use of ICT at school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 61(5), 555–567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1172501>
- Hazelkorn, E. (2015). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2018). Reshaping the world order of higher education: The role and impact of rankings on national and global systems. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 2(1), 4–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2018.1424562>
- Hearn, J. C., & Burns, R. (2021). Contingent faculty employment and financial stress in public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 92(3), 331–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1851570>
- Hitch, D., Mahoney, P., & Macfarlane, S. (2017). Professional development for sessional staff in higher education: A review of current evidence. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37(2), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1360844>
- Holzer, M., Ballard, A., Kim, M., Peng, S., & Deat, F. (2017). Obstacles and opportunities for sustaining performance management systems. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(2), 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1405445>
- Hong, M. (2018). A comparative study of the internationalization of higher education policy in Australia and China (2008–2015). *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(4), 768–779. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1553154>
- Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 343–356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007>
- Jongbloed, B. (2004). Regulation and competition in higher education. In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, & A. Amaral (Eds.), *Markets in higher education* (pp. 87–111). Springer-Verlag. [https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-2835-0\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-2835-0_5)
- Kang, E. J. S., Donovan, C., & McCarthy, M. J. (2018). Exploring elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and confidence in implementing the NGSS science and engineering practices. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 29(1), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1415616>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kayyali, M. (2024a). Exploring accreditation standards and processes. In *Quality assurance and accreditation in higher education* (pp. 1–60). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0_1)
- Kayyali, M. (2024b). Global benchmarking for educational quality assurance. In *Quality assurance and accreditation in higher education* (pp. 143–190). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0_3)
- Kayyali, M. (2024c). Quality enhancement frameworks in higher education. In *Quality assurance and accreditation in higher education* (pp. 61–141). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0_2)
- Kayyali, M. (2025). A practical guide to strategic planning in higher education. In M. Kayyali (Ed.), *Building organizational capacity and strategic management in academia* (pp. 1–34). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6967-8.ch001>
- Kebede, D. A., Werke, S. Z., & Kebede, T. A. (2024). Strategic leadership practices in emerging economies: A systematic review and empirical investigation. *Cogent Business and Management*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2418425>
- Kezar, A., & Holcombe, E. (2017). *Shared leadership in higher education: Important lessons from research and practice*. American Council on Education.
- Khan, I. U., Idris, M., & Amin, R. U. (2021). Leadership style and performance in higher education: The role of organizational justice. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(6), 1111–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1854868>
- Koomson, S. (2024). Contract fulfilment, quality management, ICT adoption, government, and co-worker support: A conceptual framework for student contentment in higher educational institutions. *Cogent Business and Management*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2333607>
- Král, P., & Cuskelly, G. (2017). A model of transparency: Determinants and implications of transparency for national sport organizations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 18(2), 237–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1376340>
- Kuyini, A. B., Major, T. E., Mangope, B., & Alhassan, M. (2021). Botswana teachers: Competencies perceived as important for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(7), 1224–1239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1988156>
- Lazcano, C., Guerrero, P., & Volante, P. (2022). Influence of instructional leadership on teacher retention. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2066187>
- Le, T. T., Phuong, H. Y., Pham, T. T., Nguyen, A. T., Huynh, T. A. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). The integral roles of supporting staff in bolstering academic performance: A qualitative study in Vietnamese higher education institutions. *T. and T. Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2264008>
- Leal Filho, W., Pallant, E., Enete, A., Richter, B., & Brandli, L. L. (2018). Planning and implementing sustainability in higher education institutions: An overview of the difficulties and potentials. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 25(8), 713–721. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2018.1461707>
- Leal Filho, W., Simaens, A., Paço, A., Hernandez-Diaz, P. M., Vasconcelos, C. R. P., Fritzen, B., & Mac-Lean, C. (2023). Integrating the sustainable development goals into the strategy of higher education institutions. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 30(5), 564–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2023.2167884>
- Li, C. J., Monroe, M. C., Oxarart, A., & Ritchie, T. (2019). Building teachers' self-efficacy in teaching about climate change through educative curriculum and professional development. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, 20(1), 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533015X.2019.1617806>
- Liu, Y., & Watson, S. (2020). Whose leadership role is more substantial for teacher professional collaboration, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A lens of distributed leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(6), 1082–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1820580>
- Lower, L. M., & Czekański, W. A. (2019). Effective management of scarce resources: A case study of American collegiate sport clubs. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 24(1–3), 119–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1591295>
- Macaluso, R., Amaro-Jiménez, C., Patterson, O. K., Martínez-Cosío, M., Veerabathina, N., Clark, K., & Luken-Sutton, J. (2020). Engaging



- faculty in student success: The promise of active learning in STEM faculty in professional development. *College Teaching*, 69(2), 113–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2020.1837063>
- Madsen, M. (2024). Performance-based funding and institutional practices of performance prediction. *Critical Studies in Education*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2024.2363391>
- Martin, D. A., McMaster, N., & Carey, M. D. (2020). Course design features influencing preservice teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in their ability to support students' use of ICT. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 36(4), 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2020.1781000>
- Mason, M. (2019). Transparency, accountability and empowerment in sustainability governance: A conceptual review. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 22(1), 98–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2019.1661231>
- McCarthy, K. S., & McNamara, D. S. (2021). The multidimensional knowledge in text comprehension framework. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(3), 196–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1872379>
- Mgaiwa, S. J. (2020). Leadership initiatives in response to institutional quality assurance challenges in Tanzania's private universities. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(9), 1206–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1860203>
- Miller, L. (2018). The level of decision-making, perceived influence, and perceived satisfaction of faculty and their impact on student retention in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 43(7), 515–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2018.1504700>
- Moriña, A. (2020). Faculty members who engage in inclusive pedagogy: Methodological and affective strategies for teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(3), 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1724938>
- Nasser, R. (2017). Qatar's educational reform past and future: Challenges in teacher development. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 4(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2016.1266693>
- Nizzolino, S., & Canals, A. (2024). Measuring learning presence as fourth dimension in the Community of Inquiry survey: Defining self-regulation items and subscales through a heutagogical approach. *Education Sciences*, 14(8), 862. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080862>
- Okolie, U. C., Igwe, P. A., Mong, I. K., Nwosu, H. E., Kanu, C., & Ojemuyide, C. C. (2021). Enhancing students' critical thinking skills through engagement with innovative pedagogical practices in Global South. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 41(4), 1184–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1896482>
- Owusu-Agyeman, Y. (2019). Transformational leadership and innovation in higher education: A participative process approach. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(5), 694–716. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1623919>
- Patall, E. A., Yates, N., Lee, J., Chen, M., Bhat, B. H., Lee, K., Beretvas, S. N., Lin, S., Man Yang, S., Jacobson, N. G., Harris, E., & Hanson, D. J. (2023). A meta-analysis of teachers' provision of structure in the classroom and students' academic competence beliefs, engagement, and achievement. *Educational Psychologist*, 59(1), 42–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2023.2274104>
- Pedro, I. H., & Andraz, J. M. (2019). Alumni commitment in higher education institutions: Determinants and empirical evidence. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 33(1), 29–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2019.1656138>
- Pevac-Zimmer, S., Juang, L. P., & Schachner, M. K. (2024). Promoting awareness and self-efficacy for culturally responsive teaching of preservice teachers through the *identity project* – A mixed methods study. *Identity*, 24(4), 288–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2024.2344086>
- Popowska, M. (2024). *Greening higher education in Europe: Institutional transitions to sustainable development*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003433033>
- Preechawong, S., Anmanatrakul, A., Pinit, P., Koul, R., & Easter, M. A. (2021). Relationship between mentoring and coaching experience, teaching self-efficacy and job satisfaction of vocational school teachers in Thailand. *Educational Studies*, 50(5), 722–742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2021.1994374>
- Rahimi, R. A., & Oh, G. S. (2024). Rethinking the role of educators in the 21st century: Navigating globalization, technology, and pandemics. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12(2), 182–197. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00303-4>
- Ravandpour, A. (2019). The relationship between EFL teachers' continuing professional development and their self-efficacy: A structural equation modeling approach. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2019.1568068>
- Rawson, J. V., & Davis, M. A. (2023). Change management: A framework for adaptation of the change management model. *IJSE Transactions on Healthcare Systems Engineering*, 13(3), 198–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24725579.2023.2201959>
- Roberts, J. (2018). Professional staff contributions to student retention and success in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(2), 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1428409>
- Roussinos, D., & Jimoyiannis, A. (2019). Examining primary education teachers' perceptions of TPACK and the related educational context factors. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 51(4), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2019.1666323>
- Rožman, M., Tominc, P., & Milfeler, B. (2023). Maximizing employee engagement through artificial intelligent organizational culture in the context of leadership and training of employees: Testing linear and non-linear relationships. *Cogent Business and Management*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2248732>
- Ruben, B. D., De Lisi, R., & Gigliotti, R. A. (2023). *A guide for leaders in higher education: Concepts, competencies, and tools* (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis.
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (2023). *Rethinking teaching in higher education: From a course design workshop to a faculty development framework* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446859>
- Schwartz, K., Cappella, E., & Aber, J. L. (2019). Teachers' lives in context: A framework for understanding barriers to high-quality teaching within resource deprived settings. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 12(1), 160–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2018.1502385>
- Scott, C. (2020). Managing and regulating commitments to equality, diversity and inclusion in higher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2020.1754879>
- Scutelnicu Todoran, G. (2023). The contribution of formal and informal mentorship to faculty productivity: Views of faculty in public affairs programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 29(4), 404–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2023.2220096>
- Sharma, S. (2017). *Competing for a sustainable world: Building capacity for sustainable innovation* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351285803>
- Sharma, S., & Saini, J. R. (2022). On the role of teachers' acceptance, continuance intention and self-efficacy in the use of digital technologies in teaching practices. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(6), 721–736. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1998395>
- Su, C.-Y., & Chen, C.-H. (2024). Exploring and comparing pedagogical beliefs of university instructors in relation to their behavioural patterns regarding learning management system use. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 44(2), 231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2024.2315321>
- Sullivan, R., Wintle, J., Campbell, N., & Roberts, W. M. (2024). Using the technological pedagogical content knowledge framework (TPACK) model to analyse teachers' use of information communication technology (ICT) in primary physical education. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2356719>
- Sun, Y., Zhao, X., Li, X., & Yu, F. (2023). Effectiveness of the flipped classroom on self-efficacy among students: A meta-analysis. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2287886>
- Szeto, E., & Cheng, A. Y.-N. (2017). Principal-teacher interactions and teacher leadership development: Beginning teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 21(3), 363–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2016.1274785>

- Taylor, Z., Fitzgibbons, J., & Mitchell, C. L. (2020). Finding the future in policy discourse: An analysis of city resilience plans. *Regional Studies*, 55(5), 831–843. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2020.1760235>
- Timm, J.-M., & Barth, M. (2020). Making education for sustainable development happen in elementary schools: The role of teachers. *Environmental Education Research*, 27(1), 50–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1813256>
- Vaisben, E. (2018). Ready to lead? A look into Jewish religious school principal leadership and management training. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 84(1), 79–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15244113.2018.1418108>
- Varouchas, E., Sicilia, M.-Á., & Sánchez-Alonso, S. (2018). Academics' perceptions on quality in higher education shaping key performance indicators. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 4752. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10124752>
- Wason, H. (2023). *Learning to teach critical thinking in Higher Education*. Open University. <https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0001568b>
- Wilson, C., Marks Woolfson, L., & Durkin, K. (2018). School environment and mastery experience as predictors of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards inclusive teaching. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(2), 218–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1455901>
- Wong, J. T., Bui, N. N., Fields, D. T., & Hughes, B. S. (2022). A learning experience design approach to online professional development for teaching science through the arts: Evaluation of teacher content knowledge, self-efficacy and STEAM perceptions. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 34(6), 593–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2022.2112552>
- Woodman, T. C., Whatley, M., & Glass, C. R. (Eds.). (2023). *Digital internationalization in higher education: Beyond virtual exchange*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003444237>
- Yadav, U., Pitchai, R., Gopal, V., Kumar, K. R. S., Talukdar, M., & Boopathi, S. (2025). Powers of higher education leadership: Navigating policy and management in academic institutions. In B. M. Agboola, C. S. Thompson (Eds.), *Navigating leadership and policy management in education* (pp. 103–136). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9215-7.ch004>
- Zheng, Y., Wang, J., Doll, W., Deng, X., & Williams, M. (2018). The impact of organisational support, technical support, and self-efficacy on faculty perceived benefits of using learning management system. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 37(4), 311–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2018.1436590>

Received: 01 March 2025

Revised: 19 March 2025

Accepted: 19 March 2025