



Management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and board exam performance in Philippine higher education

Eugelyn R. Felix

College of Education, Isabela State University, Angadanan, Isabela 3307, Philippines

Article Info

Article history:

Received 30 November 2024

Revised 16 February 2025

Accepted 21 March 2025

Available online 01 September 2026

Keywords:

board performance,
Isabela State University
management practices,
quality education,
self-efficacy

Abstract

This study explores faculty perceptions of management practices, self-efficacy, and board performance at Isabela State University, emphasizing their interconnections and impact on academic success. Through qualitative interviews with 28 purposefully selected faculty members, five key themes emerged: faculty perceptions of management practices, self-efficacy, board performance, the relationship between these factors, and faculty recommendations for improvement. Faculty generally perceived ISU's management practices positively, particularly its collaborative leadership style and commitment to academic excellence, though challenges in policy implementation, resource management, and communication were identified. Faculty self-efficacy, influenced by experience, training, and administrative support, was found to positively impact teaching effectiveness. However, those with additional administrative responsibilities reported lower self-efficacy due to insufficient training. Faculty also expressed satisfaction with ISU's board exam performance but noted challenges, including disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Recommendations to improve faculty self-efficacy and board performance included continuous professional development, enhanced resource allocation, and better alignment of curricula with board exam requirements. The study reveals that effective management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and board performance are mutually reinforcing, with positive management practices enhancing faculty confidence and, in turn, improving student outcomes. These findings offer valuable insights for higher education institutions seeking to enhance leadership practices, faculty development, and academic performance.

© 2026 Kasetsart University.

E-mail address: eugelyn.r.felix@isu.edu.ph (Felix, E. R.)

Introduction

Higher education institutions are central to the development of students' intellectual, professional, and personal capacities, serving as vital centers for knowledge creation and societal progress. Central to these institutions is the faculty, whose effectiveness in teaching not only shapes student outcomes but also underpins the institution's overall academic success. Among the various factors influencing faculty performance, two interrelated elements have received considerable attention: faculty perceptions of management practices and their sense of self-efficacy. Faculty members' views on management practices—which encompass leadership style, institutional support, and the availability of resources—have been shown to influence their motivation, job satisfaction, and classroom performance (Dagdag et al., 2020; Goddard et al., 2004; Jamali et al., 2022). Concurrently, self-efficacy, defined as the belief in one's capability to execute actions necessary to achieve desired outcomes, has been consistently linked to enhanced teaching effectiveness, innovative instructional approaches, and improved student engagement (Bong, 2004; Dagdag et al., 2021; Karim et al., 2021; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). These factors are not only critical for individual faculty success but also for driving broader institutional achievements, such as student performance on high-stakes assessments like board examinations.

Existing research has provided valuable insights into the individual impacts of management practices and self-efficacy on teaching and learning. Studies indicate that when faculty perceive their institution's management practices as supportive and effective, they are more likely to experience higher levels of satisfaction and to implement innovative teaching practices that address diverse student needs (Hu, 2024; Zheng et al., 2018). Similarly, educators with robust self-efficacy are better equipped to adapt to challenges in the classroom and to employ creative strategies that lead to improved student outcomes, including performance in board exams (Klassen & Tze, 2014; Miller et al., 2017). Despite these advances, the literature has largely examined these dimensions in isolation, leaving a gap in understanding how the interaction between faculty perceptions of management practices and self-efficacy affects academic outcomes within a single institutional setting.

This gap is particularly evident when considering board exam performance—a critical indicator of educational quality and institutional success. Notably, board exam results can vary considerably across different

academic programs within the same institution. While some programs demonstrate exceptional performance, others struggle to meet expected standards. This variability suggests that underlying differences in how faculty experience and interpret management practices, as well as how they develop their self-efficacy, may be factors driving disparate academic outcomes. Integrating these factors into a comprehensive framework is essential for understanding the full spectrum of influences on teaching quality and student success.

The significance of the current study is heightened by the timely context in which it is conducted. The institution under investigation, which is the Isabela State University, has a storied history of academic achievement but currently faces challenges in maintaining its board exam performance across all programs. Recent shifts in leadership approaches, evolving institutional policies, and ongoing resource allocation strategies among the institution's academic programs have sparked a renewed interest in understanding how these internal dynamics affect faculty performance. Although external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic have been cited in previous research as catalysts for change, relying solely on such transient external events is insufficient for capturing the enduring factors that shape academic excellence. Instead, this study focuses on the long-term internal attributes of the institution—attributes that remain critical regardless of temporary crises. This approach allows for a deeper exploration of how faculty perceptions of management and their self-efficacy interact to influence student outcomes, particularly in the context of variable board exam performance.

Moreover, the investigation is significant because it addresses a practical need. The variability in board exam performance across programs suggests that there is considerable room for improvement in how the institution supports its faculty. By exploring the experiences of educators regarding management practices and self-efficacy, this study aims to uncover specific mechanisms that can inform interventions. Such interventions could lead to more effective faculty development programs and institutional policies that are finely tuned to enhance teaching quality and student success. In this way, the research has the potential to contribute both to academic theory and to practical strategies for educational improvement.

Research Questions

How do faculty members experience and interpret management practices in their institution, and in what

ways do these practices shape their teaching self-efficacy? How do faculty members perceive the influence of their self-efficacy on students' board exam performance, and what improvements do they recommend to enhance these outcomes?

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative research design was selected for this study because it allows for a deep understanding of the participants' perceptions, beliefs, and experiences regarding their roles as faculty members, the management practices in their respective institutions, and their self-efficacy in impacting student outcomes. This design is particularly useful for exploring complex social phenomena where quantitative methods may not fully capture the nuances of individual experiences. The qualitative approach enables the exploration of the interrelationships among faculty perceptions, self-efficacy, and board exam performance in a naturalistic setting, without reducing the experiences to numerical data (Lim, 2024; Maxwell, 2013).

Research Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 28 purposefully selected faculty members holding administrative designations in board programs across the nine campuses of Isabela State University. Considering purposeful sampling to effectively identify key informants with the specific knowledge required for this research (Campbell et al., 2020), the participants were chosen based on their roles in departmental decision-making, a minimum of five years of teaching experience, and demonstrated involvement in the development or implementation of institutional policies. Moreover, the sample was purposefully diverse in terms of academic disciplines (e. g., teacher education, criminology, engineering, forestry, agriculture), ranks (e. g., instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor), and administrative responsibilities (e. g., college secretary, program chairperson, college dean, academic affairs director, university director, vice president).

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted using semi-structured interviews—a widely used qualitative method for

gathering rich, in-depth data—which involved a set of pre-determined questions on faculty members' perceptions of management practices at ISU, their self-efficacy beliefs, and how these factors might influence student performance in board exams, while still allowing for exploration of unanticipated topics (Naz et al., 2022). Interviews were conducted one-on-one in person, and lasted between 30 minutes to 1 hour (averaging approximately 45 minutes), providing a comfortable and confidential setting for participants to share their experiences. A total of 28 interviews were conducted, with this sample size determined by reaching data saturation, where no new themes emerged. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy. Credibility was further enhanced through data triangulation and member checking with a subset of participants, both of which helped ensure that the findings accurately reflected the participants' perspectives.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze the data collected from the semi-structured interviews—a widely used qualitative method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006)—with MAXQDA software assisting in coding and organizing the data; the analysis involved several key stages including familiarizing with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing the report, all aimed at interpreting the meaning behind the data and understanding the underlying themes emerging from participants' responses.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were paramount in this study, and all participants provided informed consent before taking part in the interviews. Participants were informed of the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Confidentiality was assured by assigning pseudonyms to all participants, and all data were stored securely. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the relevant institutional review board prior to data collection.

Results

Faculty Perceptions of Management Practices

Faculty perceptions of management practices at their university can be understood into three subthemes: Effective Management Practices, Challenges and Areas for Improvement, and Recommendations for Enhancing Management Practices.

Effective Management Practices

Several participants expressed positive perceptions of the management practices at ISU, highlighting a focus on academic excellence, student support, collaborative efforts, and a proactive approach to improving educational outcomes.

Many respondents emphasized the institution's commitment to sustaining academic standards and supporting students' board exam preparations. Faculty members highlighted the importance of aligning syllabi with board exam content and maintaining strict grading policies to uphold quality.

"The institution sustains academic excellence and quality in instruction." (R4)

"We monitor the employment status of graduates after graduation, as well as their performance in board exams. Faculty are dedicated to delivering lessons effectively, and the syllabi are aligned with board exam requirements." (R8)

Respondents also noted the positive impact of participative leadership and a collaborative management style, which fosters an inclusive and supportive environment for faculty and staff.

"The leadership and management styles entail productive and collaborative efforts of everybody." (R3)

"Management with a heart. Leaders inspire their team members to excel by providing full support, understanding their needs, and acknowledging their contributions." (R11)

There is recognition of ISU's support for faculty development, including opportunities for research, professional growth, and incentives for academic achievements.

"There are incentives for research and platforms for extension activities, encouraging even new faculty members to engage in these endeavors." (R13)

"Professional development opportunities are encouraged, allowing faculty to focus on achieving higher education." (R19)

Challenges and Areas for Improvement

While there were positive perceptions of management practices, several participants identified areas where improvement is needed, particularly in the implementation of policies, resource management, and communication.

A recurring issue mentioned by multiple respondents was the lack of consistent policy implementation, which has created confusion among faculty, staff, and students.

"There is a need for better cascading of approved university policies. Until now, many students and faculty members are not yet aware of the newly approved organizational structure." (R7)

"Not consistent in the implementation of policies." (R20, R21, R22)

Several participants pointed out the need to enhance infrastructure, physical resources, and human resources management, suggesting that these areas are currently lacking and require attention.

"Yes, there is a need for improvements in infrastructure management, as well as better handling of physical and financial resources." (R1, R6)

"Development of infrastructures, facilities, equipment, library, and laboratory is necessary." (R12)

Some respondents expressed concerns about faculty development plans, especially regarding the alignment of faculty assignments with their fields of expertise and the need for more training opportunities.

"The program assigned to faculty members should align with their field of specialization. Training should be provided for faculty through continuing programs to support their ongoing learning." (R11)

"There could be improvements in the Faculty Development Plan and better dissemination of information." (R5)

Faculty Self-Efficacy

In analyzing the responses to the questions on self-efficacy, several key themes emerged related to the confidence of faculty members in performing their roles, the variations in self-efficacy depending on different aspects of their work, and the factors influencing their confidence.

Confidence in Performing Job Effectively

Most participants expressed a strong sense of confidence in their ability to perform their roles effectively. This confidence was attributed to various factors, including personal commitment, training,

experience, and the outcomes observed in students' performance.

"I'm designed and trained to perform my tasks to the best of my abilities because I am guided by the principles of commitment, integrity, and passion." (R1)

Several respondents highlighted their extensive experience as a significant source of their confidence:

"I am confident. Maybe I can consider myself an expert in the subject due to long-time experience." (R11)

However, some faculty members noted a gradual increase in confidence, acknowledging initial challenges, especially for those new to the role:

"For a first-timer, it's hard, but as time goes by, I have learned how to become confident in performing my job effectively." (R5)

Others emphasized that their confidence stemmed from the performance and outcomes of their students:

"I am confident that I perform my job effectively based on the performance of my students." (R10)

Variations in Self-Efficacy Across Different Roles

Many participants acknowledged that their self-efficacy varied depending on the specific aspects of their roles, particularly when taking on additional designations or responsibilities outside their core teaching duties.

"Yes, it varies depending on your roles, especially when you hold a designation; your teaching loads may be reduced to accommodate the demands of the designation." (R8)

Faculty members with management roles observed that their confidence fluctuated due to a lack of specific training for these responsibilities:

"In terms of management, I am willing to learn more. We lack training for management. As a result, when someone is given a new designation, they often have to be self-taught and self-trained." (R13)

Some participants also noted that external perceptions, such as age and educational qualifications, impacted their confidence:

"My confidence is affected by how people see me. I am young and handle a very large responsibility already." (R15)

Factors Influencing Confidence

The respondents identified several factors that influence their confidence, ranging from personal achievements and educational background to the support from colleagues and the university environment.

"Administrative and co-employees' support" (R1) and "the condition/environment and people who I work with" (R17) were commonly cited as significant contributors to self-efficacy.

Experience was a recurring factor, with many faculty

members linking their confidence to years of teaching and professional exposure:

"Experience, skills, and knowledge" (R19) were seen as vital elements in building self-efficacy.

Educational background and continuous learning were also noted as essential components:

"Educational qualifications and continuous learning are essential. With two master's degrees and a Ph.D. earned abroad, I am confident in my abilities and in those of my colleagues as well." (R12)

Additionally, some respondents highlighted the importance of alignment between their expertise and the subjects they teach, noting that this congruence boosts their self-efficacy:

"Your professional preparation, including your background and educational qualifications, influences your confidence in your abilities. Engaging in research and extension activities further hones your abilities and enhances your self-efficacy." (R8)

Faculty Perceptions of Board Performance

The theme Board Exam Performance emerged from the participants' responses, revealing perceptions and evaluations of the institution's board exam results over the past five years. The analysis covers the general assessment of the institution's performance, notable achievements and challenges, as well as suggestions for further improvement.

Overall Performance Rating

Participants generally expressed satisfaction with the board exam performance, highlighting that it consistently surpasses the national passing rate. However, there were varying degrees of ratings, ranging from "satisfactory" to "excellent," indicating a recognition of the institution's achievements while acknowledging areas for improvement. Many participants pointed out the sustained efforts of faculty and administrators in achieving favorable results.

"Although it is consistently above the national passing rate for the CLE performance, we work closely with the administration, faculty members, and stakeholders to improve our CLE performance." (R1)

Despite this positive outlook, some respondents suggested a need for continuous enhancement, particularly to sustain academic excellence and instructional quality. For instance, R4 indicated that their licensure performance is "very satisfactory but needs to sustain academic excellence and quality in

instruction.”

A few respondents, particularly those newer to the institution, hesitated to provide a comprehensive assessment but acknowledged the positive trend in board performance.

“Since I am new, I can’t rate the institution’s board performance for the last five years, but being here for two years, I can see that the institution’s board performance is high above the national passing rate.” (R5)

Notable Achievements and Challenges

Several participants identified significant achievements during the review period, including producing national topnotchers, achieving high passing rates, and surpassing national averages. The institution was recognized for its strong performance in various licensure examinations and its ability to maintain competitive results.

“Our institution has performed well, as evidenced by our ability to produce national topnotchers and our strong partnerships with review centers.” (R12)

“The school ranked 8th in the region last March in 2024 LET exam. We have produced many civil engineers and are included in the top 20 best-performing schools nationwide.” (R9, R27)

However, notable challenges were also highlighted, particularly the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted traditional instruction methods and required a sudden shift to online learning. The transition posed difficulties for both students and faculty, affecting the preparation and performance of board examinees.

“The notable challenges included the COVID-19 pandemic and the shift from face-to-face to online learning modalities, which disrupted the instructional delivery and preparation for board exams.” (R14)

Another recurring issue involved the performance of certain programs, such as BSEd, which were affected by non-education graduates taking the licensure exams, thus lowering the overall passing rate.

“Regarding our board performance, we are having an issue with the low performance of the BSEd program because of non-education graduates taking the examination and affecting the overall performance.” (R13)

Relationship between Management Practices, Faculty Self-Efficacy, and Board Performance

The responses from the participants reveal a shared perspective on the interconnectedness between management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and board exam performance, suggesting a symbiotic relationship

where effective management fosters self-efficacy among faculty, which, in turn, contributes positively to student outcomes, including board exam success.

Influence of Management Practices on Faculty Self-Efficacy

Participants largely agree that management practices significantly influence faculty self-efficacy. Effective management practices, such as providing support, resources, and professional development, help in building confidence among faculty members. The responses emphasize that management's role in fostering a positive environment is critical:

“Management practices can definitely influence faculty self-efficacy when management provides support, resources, and clear communication. Faculty members are more likely to feel confident in their abilities to perform their role.” (R10)

The availability of training and retraining programs, along with opportunities for professional growth, was frequently mentioned as a core component in enhancing faculty self-efficacy:

“Definitely, management practices have an impact on building our self-efficacy because through the programs implemented by our management, we have opportunities for professional growth.” (R13)

Several participants highlighted that a supportive and appreciative management helps in creating a sense of belonging, which boosts self-efficacy:

“Faculty self-efficacy is greatly influenced by the type of management practices... It is very important that every member is counted and appreciated for whatever accomplishment they shared in the organization. Sense of belongingness is one effective management practice.” (R6)

However, respondents also noted the potential negative impact of poor management, such as demoralization and decreased self-efficacy:

“They would be demoralized if they experienced mismanagement and malpractice.” (R7)

Impact of Management Practices on Board Exam Performance

The relationship between management practices and board exam performance was also recognized by the participants, with many emphasizing that strong and consistent support from management plays a crucial role in student preparation and performance. Respondents indicated that when management prioritizes resources,

such as enhanced review sessions and alignment of the curriculum with board exam requirements, the board exam outcomes are positively influenced:

"The way management extend and provide all the necessary resources during the preparation for the board exam is considered vital in the result of board examination. The show of support will greatly motivate and encourages the examinees to give their best shot during the examination." (R6)

Several participants provided specific examples of effective management practices that could enhance board performance, such as collaborating with external review centers and implementing consistent review policies:

"Our review process lacks consistency and relies heavily on the initiative of the exam takers... Maybe we can foster partnerships with external review centers that have trustworthy and reliable track records." (R13)

Others highlighted practices from other state universities, where management provides moral and logistical support, as effective strategies to improve board performance:

"In other state universities, they have a practice of accompanying their exam takers during the examination for moral support and even helping them find accommodation. Additionally, they monitor those who will take the exam to ensure they are well-prepared." (R20)

Connection Between Faculty Self-Efficacy and Board Exam Performance

The participants also acknowledged a strong link between faculty self-efficacy and board exam performance. They noted that faculty members with high self-efficacy are more likely to deliver quality instruction and utilize effective teaching strategies, which directly contribute to student success in board examinations:

"Self-efficacy, namely, teachers' beliefs in their ability to effectively handle the tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their professional activity, plays a key role in influencing important academic outcomes like the board performance." (R6)

Additionally, participants described how self-efficacy empowers faculty to master their content and teaching methods, leading to better student preparation:

"When instructors have high self-efficacy, they can master the lessons to be taught, and their delivery of instruction becomes more effective. One of the university's commendable practices is requiring faculty to earn education units, which benefits us greatly." (R8)

In some responses, the impact of faculty self-efficacy

was framed in terms of the motivation and inspiration it provides to students:

"If the teacher's self-efficacy is high and observable, it will surely be an inspiration for the students to excel in the board examination." (R6)

In contrast, a lack of self-efficacy was seen as a barrier to effective instruction, potentially affecting board exam outcomes:

"At some point, if the management focuses on the advancement of the faculty through seminars, training, and conferences, it could help enhance their self-efficacy, which is needed to improve board exam results." (R27)

Faculty Recommendations to Enhance Board Performance and Faculty Self-Efficacy

In analyzing the responses, several themes emerged regarding strategies to enhance board exam performance and faculty self-efficacy, as well as suggestions for management practices that can support these objectives. The themes are presented with supporting quotes from the participants.

Faculty Professional Development

Many participants highlighted the need for continuous training and development opportunities for faculty. This includes attending seminars, workshops, and pursuing advanced studies to enhance teaching quality and expertise.

"Allow faculty to explore more like attending seminar-workshops in their field of specialization to enhance quality instruction." (R5)

"To enhance board exam performance and faculty self-efficacy, there must be collaborative learning communities and training, and professional development." (R10)

"Send faculty for advanced studies with scholarships. Bring out the best in every employee and support their professional growth and development." (R11)

Collaborative Efforts and Shared Responsibility

Participants suggested that both faculty and students must work together to achieve desired board exam outcomes. This involves creating collaborative learning environments and shared accountability.

"Collaborative efforts from both faculty and students are essential, rather than solely relying on management. Faculty and students must work together to achieve their desired results, with management serving as their strongest support." (R14)

"It is a two-way traffic, which means both have to be mindful of their respective roles in the teaching-learning process." (R6)

Management Support and Resource Allocation

Several responses pointed to the need for management to actively support faculty initiatives and provide adequate resources for professional development and review programs.

"Support of the management on interventions especially reviews and special lecture/seminars." (R2)

"Benchmarking with other universities and provide support in the form of scholarships for faculty pursuing master's and doctoral degrees." (R12)

"Lack of budget was the main problem in improving faculty performance which may affect board performance." (R5)

Implementation of Effective Policies and Feedback Mechanisms

Participants noted that implementing admission and retention policies, course audits, and regular evaluations could help in identifying gaps and improving both teaching performance and board exam readiness.

"Prepare plan of action and intervention and implement it." (R1)

"The policy should be amended to institutionalize in-house reviews and establish Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) with external review providers." (R13)

"Bring back the course audit." (R20)

Favorable Working Conditions and Faculty Load

Participants emphasized the need to adjust faculty workloads to allow them more time for preparation, student engagement, and personal development, which can directly impact board performance.

"The faculty members should be unloaded with too much responsibilities to provide the necessary focus in preparing the board exam takers during their formative years." (R15)

"Lessen faculty workload, review new lesson of preparation, integrate course audit in the curriculum." (R16)

"Professional development opportunities. Encourage and allow faculty to focus on achieving higher education by letting them apply for a leave." (R19)

Focus on Quality Instruction and Student Preparation

Many participants highlighted the importance of matching the right faculty to the right subjects and ensuring that both teaching quality and student preparation are prioritized.

"The faculty assigned to teach the subject should really be exceptional in their field in order to share greater things to the students." (R24)

"Right faculty to teach the right courses/subjects." (R26)

"Selection of potential students with dedication of the faculty." (R28)

Innovative Teaching and Continuous Learning

Participants suggested the importance of continuous learning and innovation in teaching strategies to keep up with the latest developments in their fields.

"Continuous enhancement training for faculty, monitoring of the performance of teaching effectiveness of the faculty and intensify the conduct of academic enhancement program and review classes." (R7)

"They should be innovative; wide reader in order to share the recent trends and developments in their field." (R24)

Addressing Gaps in Management Practices

Responses also indicated areas for improvement in management practices, particularly in terms of supporting faculty professional growth, effective decision-making, and reducing administrative burdens.

"Allowing faculty to go outside the box will help them to become more knowledgeable and more productive." (R5)

"Consider focusing more on the academic preparation of the students rather than documenting papers to be submitted in certifying bodies." (R15)

"Partnership with other institutions to conduct seminars and workshops focusing on strategies and managements." (R21)

Discussion

This study examined faculty perceptions of management practices, self-efficacy, and board performance at ISU, revealing five key themes: perceptions of management practices, faculty self-efficacy, board performance, the interrelationships among

these factors, and recommendations for improvement. Faculty highlighted strengths in management practices, notably the academic alignment with board exam content and a collaborative leadership style, which together foster a positive academic environment and reinforce faculty growth through professional development opportunities and incentives (Meng, 2023; Meyer & Allen, 1991). These findings underscore how supportive administrative practices can serve as a foundation for academic excellence, aligning with broader trends in higher education that emphasize the importance of well-coordinated institutional strategies.

However, the study also identified significant challenges that extend beyond the immediate context of ISU. Despite generally strong self-efficacy among faculty—driven by personal commitment and extensive teaching experience (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001)—those holding additional administrative responsibilities reported fluctuating confidence levels due to inadequate training (Leithwood et al., 2004). This discrepancy suggests a critical need for assigning faculty to roles that match their expertise (Bañagale et al., 2020; Dagdag, 2018; Dagdag et al., 2017; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998) and for addressing issues such as inconsistent policy enforcement, insufficient resource management, and ineffective communication, which have been shown to undermine faculty morale (Cohen & March, 1986; Yue et al., 2019). The additional strain caused by the rapid shift to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic further exacerbated these challenges, even as ISU's consistent board exam success points to underlying academic strengths (Antiojo, 2017; Salta et al., 2022).

Building on these insights, the findings suggest that effective management practices not only directly enhance faculty self-efficacy but also indirectly improve board performance through better resource allocation and ongoing professional development (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Conversely, mismanagement can have a detrimental effect on both faculty morale and student outcomes (Goddard et al., 2004). Faculty recommendations for addressing these challenges include enhancing review programs, aligning faculty assignments with their areas of expertise, improving resource allocation, and fostering collaboration between faculty and students (Binayao & Dales, 2020; Dagdag, 2018; Dagdag et al., 2017; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Leithwood et al., 2004). These recommendations, interpreted in the context of broader trends in higher education, provide actionable strategies for institutions seeking to create a more supportive and effective academic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study reveals significant insights into the relationship between management practices and faculty self-efficacy, highlighting the critical role that leadership and institutional policies play in shaping faculty performance and student outcomes. It was evident that effective management practices, such as participative leadership, clear communication, and providing professional development opportunities, have a positive impact on faculty self-efficacy, which in turn enhances their teaching performance and students' success in board exams. Moreover, the study underscored the importance of fostering a supportive environment where faculty members feel confident in their ability to teach and contribute to students' academic achievement. As such, institutional policies should prioritize faculty development programs that focus not only on pedagogical skills but also on boosting faculty self-efficacy. Additionally, encouraging mentorship and peer support systems can enhance faculty confidence, particularly among less experienced educators. Policies that promote participative management and transparent communication within academic units are essential to create a sense of ownership and responsibility among faculty, leading to improvements in both teaching quality and student performance.

For future research, this study opens several avenues to explore the role of faculty self-efficacy in different academic disciplines and institutional contexts. Future studies could investigate how varying levels of institutional resources, such as access to technology and faculty-student ratios, influence the relationship between management practices and faculty confidence. Longitudinal studies could track the long-term impact of management interventions on faculty performance and student success in board exams. Furthermore, examining external factors, such as collaboration with review centers or industry partnerships, may provide insights into how these elements contribute to enhancing faculty efficacy and improving board exam outcomes. These avenues of research will help further refine the understanding of how management practices can be leveraged to optimize both faculty development and student achievement in higher education.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Isabela State University for supporting the conduct of this study.

References

- Antiojo, L. P. (2017). Performance of education graduates in the licensure examination for teachers (LET). *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 1363–1384. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.32.13631384>
- Bañagale, A. C., Dagdag, J. D., & Galiza, C. C. (2020). Characterizing learning-motivating teachers among hospitality management students. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(5), 5638–5648. <https://bit.ly/43gz8mT>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman/ Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Binayao, B. S., & Dales, Z. I. (2020). A phenomenological study of the passers and non-passers in the licensure examination for teachers. *Framework*, 5(8), 1704–1721. <https://doi.org/10.38124/IJISRT20AUG828>
- Bong, M. (2004). Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.6.287-298>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. McGraw-Hill.
- Dagdag, J. D., Palapuz, N. A., & Calimag, N. A. (2021). Predictive ability of problem-solving efficacy sources on mathematics achievement. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1185–1191. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21416>
- Dagdag, J. D., Anoling Jr, O. C., Salviejo, R. P., Pascual, J. F., & Dagdag, J. M. H. (2020). Development of problem-solving efficacy scales in mathematics. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(6), 2397–2405. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080624>
- Dagdag, J. (2018). Predictors of performance in the licensure examination for agriculturists: Bases for a proposed plan of action. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(2), 113–120. <https://bit.ly/3CS53Pz>
- Dagdag, J., Sarmiento, C., & Ibale, J. C. (2017). Examining the factors of licensure examination for teachers performance for program strategy enhancement. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(4), 34–39. <https://bit.ly/4eIV0Jk>
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033003003>
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hu, T. (2024). Balancing the equation: Assessing the impact of management practices on staff and faculty wellbeing in Chinese higher education institutions. *Frontiers Psychology*, 15, 1385612. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1385612>
- Jamali, A., Bhutto, A., Khaskhely, M., & Sethar, W. (2022). Impact of leadership styles on faculty performance: Moderating role of organizational culture in higher education. *Management Science Letters*, 12(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2021.8.005>
- Karim, M. R., Masud, N. A., Subarna, N., Taherun, M., Billah, M. M., & Wienaah, P. (2021). Self-efficacy: A key component of teacher effectiveness. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 25(1), 24–34. <https://shorturl.at/qn9Wk>
- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.9734/AJESS/2021/v25i130590>
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning. The Wallace Foundation*. <https://bit.ly/4b3ovFG>
- Lim, W. M. (2024). What is qualitative research? An overview and guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Meng, S. (2023). Enhancing teaching and learning: Aligning instructional practices with education quality standards. *Research and Advances in Education*, 2(7), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.56397/RAE.2023.07.04>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Miller, A. D., Ramirez, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (2017). The influence of teachers' self-efficacy on perceptions: Perceived teacher competence and respect and student effort and achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64(2017), 260–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.02.008>
- Naz, N., Gulab, F., & Aslam, M. (2022). Development of qualitative semi-structured interview guide for case study research. *Competitive Social Science Research Journal*, 3(2), 42–52. <https://cssrjournal.com/index.php/cssrjournal/article/view/170>
- Salta, K., Paschalidou, K., Tsetseri, M., & Koulougliotis, D. (2022). Shift from a traditional to a distance learning environment during the COVID-19 pandemic: University students' engagement and interactions. *Science & Education*, 31(1), 93–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-021-00234-x>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202–248. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202>
- Yue, C. A., Men, L. R., & Ferguson, M. A. (2019). Bridging transformational leadership, transparent communication, and employee openness to change: The mediating role of trust. *Public Relations Review*, 45(3), 101779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2019.04.012>
- 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 & Information Technology*, 37(4), 311–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2018.1436590>