

# ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



**ISRG PUBLISHERS**

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

**ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)**

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - II (March – April) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



## Leadership Growth Mindset among College Deans and its Relationship to Faculty Performance: The Case of Cagayan State University

**Dianne Mae L. Sinco**

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus, Aparri, Cagayan, Philippines

| **Received:** 18.03.2026 | **Accepted:** 23.03.2026 | **Published:** 02.04.2026

\*Corresponding author: Dianne Mae L. Sinco

### Abstract

*This study examined how the leadership growth mindset of college deans influences faculty performance in teaching, research, and professional activities at two campuses of Cagayan State University. Leadership growth mindset, which emphasizes the belief that abilities can develop over time, is known to affect performance, yet limited research exists on its impact in Philippine state universities.*

*The study assessed the leadership growth mindset of deans and its relationship with faculty performance. A descriptive-correlational design was used, with faculty members as respondents. Survey questionnaires were employed to measure deans' leadership traits and faculty performance in teaching, research, and professional engagement.*

*The results showed that deans were rated highly in empowerment, accountability, and humility but lower in forgiveness dimension. Faculty performance was strong in teaching but moderate in research and professional engagement with differences based on their age, rank, and education. In particular, a significant positive relationship was found between deans' leadership growth mindset and faculty performance, specifically in teaching effectiveness and professional development.*

*The study recommends implementing leadership development programs that focus on fostering a growth mindset among deans to further improve faculty performance and support institutional success.*

**Keywords:** leadership growth mindset, college deans, faculty performance, teaching effectiveness, professional engagement.

## INTRODUCTION

Improving institutional effectiveness and academic quality is closely associated with the quality of leadership in higher education institutions. Academic leaders play a critical role in shaping institutional culture, guiding faculty development, and promoting improvement in teaching, research, and community engagement. In an increasingly complex and competitive academic environment, universities require leaders who can adapt to change while encouraging professional growth among faculty members. One leadership perspective that has gained significant attention in educational research is the concept of the growth mindset introduced by Carol Dweck. A growth mindset refers to the belief that intelligence, competence, and leadership capacity can be developed through sustained effort, learning, and reflection rather than being fixed traits. Leaders who embrace this perspective are more likely to cultivate development-oriented environments. According to Burnette et.al. (2023), leaders with a growth mindset tend to empower their teams, encourage resilience and promote instructional improvement.

Although leadership research often emphasizes managerial competencies and leadership styles, fewer studies examine how leaders' growth-oriented beliefs influence faculty performance in higher education. When leadership is grounded in growth-oriented principles, it can become a catalyst for change that motivates faculty members to maximize their potential while fostering institutional cultures that value learning and continuous improvement.

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) emphasizes the importance of transformative leadership in public higher education institutions to improve teaching quality, research productivity and community engagement. Despite policy reforms and leadership development initiatives, gaps between leadership practices and faculty performance remain evident. Some academic leaders continue to rely on conventional approaches that may limit faculty initiative, creativity and motivation.

Within this context, Cagayan State University (CSU), one of the leading state universities in Region II, provides a relevant setting for examining leadership practices and faculty performance. CSU's multi-campus structure and diverse academic community require effective leadership from college deans heads. Variations in leadership styles and attitudes may influence faculty performance in instruction, research and extension activities and may reflect whether academic leaders demonstrate a growth mindset.

Despite global recognition of growth-oriented leadership and national efforts to strengthen academic management, empirical studies linking academic leaders' growth mindset to faculty performance remain limited in the Philippine higher education context, particularly in regional state universities such as CSU.

This study seeks to fill in this gap by looking how the growth mindset of college deans and department heads at CSU relates to faculty performance and identifies challenges encountered in their leadership roles. The findings aim to inform policies on leadership development, professional training, and performance evaluation to support sustained improvement in higher education.

### Statement of the Problem

This study examined the leadership mindset of college deans at Cagayan State University (CSU) and its effect on faculty

performance in terms of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and professional engagement.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the college deans and faculty members in terms of the following variables?
  - a. Age
  - b. Sex
  - c. Civil status
  - d. Faculty rank
  - e. Educational attainment
  - f. Length of service in CSU
  - g. Duration of deanship
  - h. Designation (as faculty)
2. What is the extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans as perceived by the faculty members along the following dimensions?
  - a. Empowerment
  - b. Standing back
  - c. Accountability
  - d. Forgiveness
  - e. Courage
  - f. Authenticity
  - g. Humility
  - h. Stewardship
3. What is the performance of the faculty members along the following aspects?
  - a. Teaching Effectiveness
  - b. Research Productivity
  - c. Professional Engagement
4. Is there a significant difference in the performance of the faculty members when grouped according to their profile?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans and the performance of the faculty members?

## METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design to find out the relationship between the leadership growth mindset of college deans and department heads and the performance of faculty members at Cagayan State University.

This design was chosen because it allowed the researcher to measure the two main variables – leadership growth mindset and faculty performance – and to statistically determine if they were related.

The leadership growth mindset of academic leaders was assessed using an adapted survey that covered areas such as empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship. On the other hand, faculty performance was measured in three specific areas:

1. *Teaching Effectiveness* – evaluated through the faculty evaluation tool used in CSU;
2. *Research Productivity* – determined by the number of published articles in refereed journals or conference proceedings; and
3. *Professional Engagement* – reflected in the expert services rendered such as trainings and seminars attended, involvement in professional organizations.

The data that were gathered were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage to summarize the responses. To test the relationship between the variables, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was applied. A 0.05 level of significance was used as the basis in deciding whether or not the relationships found were statistically significant.

### Respondents and Sampling Techniques

The respondents of the study were college deans and faculty members from two selected campuses of Cagayan State University (CSU). One campus was large and the other was small. These campuses were chosen to show differences in size and population within the university system.

Purposive sampling was used in selecting the two campuses. They were chosen because they clearly represent large and small campuses in terms of number of faculty members and organizational structure.

Total enumeration was used for the college deans and department heads in the two campuses. It was used because the number of deans and department heads was small and they directly hold leadership positions that are important to the study.

For faculty members, stratified random sampling with proportional allocation was applied. The faculty members were first grouped according to their colleges or departments. The number of respondents from each group depended on the size of the faculty in that group. Colleges with more faculty members had more respondents while those with fewer faculty had fewer respondents. After this, the required number of faculty members from each group was randomly selected to ensure that everyone had an equal chance of being chosen.

### Selection Criteria of Respondents

The following criteria were used in selecting the respondents:

- a) College deans and department heads must have served in their position for at least one school year to ensure that they have enough leadership experience.
- b) Faculty members must be full-time employees and must have worked at the same campus for at least one year to ensure familiarity with campus policies and management practices.

Strata	College Dean Population	Faculty Population	Faculty Sample Size
<i>Lal-lo Campus (Small Campus)</i>	4	45	34
▪ College of Agriculture	1	12	8
▪ College of Hospitality Management	1	9	7
▪ College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	9	7
▪ College of Teacher Education	1	15	12
<i>Aparri Campus (Big Campus)</i>	7	55	43
▪ College of Business,	1	6	5

Entrepreneurship & Accountancy			
▪ College of Criminal Justice Education	1	4	3
▪ College of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences	1	7	6
▪ College of Hospitality Management	1	7	6
▪ College of Industrial Technology	1	6	5
▪ College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	10	9
▪ College of Teacher Education	1	15	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>

### Research Instruments

The main instrument in this study was a survey questionnaire designed to gather quantitative information on how faculty members perceived the leadership growth mindset of their college deans and how this mindset was related to faculty performance in higher education. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part elicited basic information about the respondents' personal and professional profile such as age, sex, civil status, academic rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching. The second part of the questionnaire assessed the leadership growth mindset of the college deans and department heads using an adapted version of the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) developed by Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011). The SLS was selected due to its alignment with the study's objectives and the leadership theory under investigation. This tool is specifically designed to measure the fundamental traits of servant leadership which emphasize empowering others and promoting a people-centered, ethical approach to leadership. The SLS describes eight essential leadership traits: empowerment, accountability, standing back, forgiveness, authenticity, courage, humility and stewardship. These traits are central to the concept of a leadership growth mindset in which this study aimed to explore. A four-point Likert scale was also used and the instrument included 30 items reflecting leadership behaviors important to academic settings.

In addition to the main survey, a separate questionnaire was administered to college deans to gather supplementary data on their personal and professional profiles as well as the problems and challenges they faced while assuming their leadership roles. This additional questionnaire provided a more complete view of leadership within the institution complementing the faculty-perceived data obtained through the main instrument.

The faculty performance outcomes were obtained separately through the assistance of the Campus Human Resource (HR) and Records Office. Faculty performance was evaluated in three areas:

Teaching Effectiveness – based on the official Faculty Evaluation Tool used in CSU.

Research Productivity – measured by the number of articles published in refereed journals or conference proceedings.

Professional Engagement – determined through expert services rendered, such as active involvement in professional organizations.

To validate and complement these data, two rating periods (S.Y. 2023-2024) of Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) of faculty members was also requested from the Records Office.

**Data Gathering Procedures**

The study followed a systematic process to ensure accurate reliable and ethical data collection. Formal letters were sent to the University President and Campus Executive Officers of the two selected CSU campuses to request approval. After approval, informed consent forms were given to college deans department heads and faculty members. The forms explained the purpose of the study assured confidentiality and emphasized voluntary participation with the option to withdraw at any time.

All college deans and department heads were included through total enumeration. Faculty members were selected using stratified random sampling to represent all departments. Questionnaires were completed online or in printed form based on participants’ preference. Informal interviews were conducted with selected faculty members to check the clarity of the survey items.

To reduce bias from self-assessment, triangulation was used. Faculty members’ most recent Individual Performance Commitment and Review Forms (IPCRF) were collected with approval from the Office of the Campus Executive Officer and Human Resource Office. Relevant information such as performance ratings was extracted while identities were coded for confidentiality.

**Data Analysis**

The study used a quantitative approach. The data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical tools to determine the relationship between the leadership growth mindset of academic leaders and the performance of faculty members. Descriptive statistics, such as mean and standard deviation, were used to summarize the responses providing an overview of how leadership qualities and faculty performance were perceived. Inferential statistics were employed to identify significant relationships and differences between the variables under study.

Data from the survey questionnaires were processed using SPSS version 27. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were computed to summarize the participants’ responses. These statistics provided an overview of how faculty members perceived the leadership qualities of their college deans

and department heads and how they evaluated their own performance in teaching, research, extension, and professional development.

The responses were measured using a 4-point Likert scale as seen below.

Numerical Rating	Mean Range Score	Interpretation
4	3.26 – 4.00	Very High
3	2.51 – 3.25	High
2	1.76 – 2.50	Low
1	1.00 – 1.75	Very Low

To examine the relationship between leadership growth mindset and faculty performance, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used. This statistical tool helped determine whether a significant connection existed between the two variables and whether that relationship was positive or negative.

When comparisons between groups were necessary – for example, comparing faculty responses from large and small campuses – t-tests or ANOVA were applied to analyze group differences. All statistical tests were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance, meaning that results were considered statistically significant if the probability of error was less than 5%.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section discusses of the findings after thorough research design, data collection and analysis. The findings have been presented according to the purposes of the study for clear and systematic presentation.

**Profile of the Respondents**

Table 1 provides a comprehensive profile of college deans and faculty members. Deans are generally older, with a mean age of 44.64 years, mostly within the 41–50 range (54.5%), while faculty average 38.51 years, largely in the 31–40 group (48.1%). Sex distribution is relatively balanced, though females slightly outnumber males among faculty (54.5%). Most respondents in both groups are married. Deans are predominantly Associate Professors (63.6%), whereas faculty are more varied, with many serving as Assistant Professors (44.2%) and Instructors (35.1%). A large majority of deans (81.8%) hold doctoral degrees, compared to 42.9% of faculty, with the rest holding master’s degrees. Deans also have longer service (12.91 years) than faculty (8.5 years), with most serving as dean for 5–9 years. Many faculty hold administrative or hybrid roles.

*Table 1. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their profile.*

Variables	College Deans		Faculty Members	
	F (n=11)	Percentage	F (n=77)	Percentage
<i>Age</i>				
30 or below	0	0.0	14	18.2
31 to 40	3	27.3	37	48.1
41 to 50	6	54.5	17	22.1
51 to 60	1	9.1	8	10.4
61 or above	1	9.1	1	1.3
<i>Mean</i>	44.64 years old		38.51 years old	

	<i>SD</i>	<i>9.05</i>	<i>9.11</i>		
<b>Sex</b>					
Male		6	54.5	35	45.5
Female		5	45.5	42	54.5
<b>Civil status</b>					
Single		4	36.4	25	32.5
Married		7	63.6	51	66.2
Widowed		0	0.0	1	1.3
<b>Academic rank</b>					
Instructor		1	9.1	27	35.1
Assistant Professor		2	18.2	34	44.2
Associate Professor		7	63.6	10	13.0
Professor		1	9.1	6	7.8
<b>Highest educational attainment</b>					
Masteral graduate		2	18.2	44	57.1
Doctorate graduate		9	81.8	33	42.9
<b>Length of service in CSU</b>					
5 or below		1	9.1	26	33.8
6 to 14		7	63.6	41	53.2
15 to 23		1	9.1	5	6.5
24 or above		2	18.2	5	6.5
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>12.91 years</i>		<i>8.50 years</i>	
	<i>SD</i>	<i>8.60</i>		<i>7.28</i>	
<b>Duration as College Dean</b>					
4 or below		3	27.3	-	-
5 to 9		6	54.5	-	-
10 or above		2	18.2	-	-
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>5.98 years</i>		<i>-</i>	
	<i>SD</i>	<i>3.35</i>		<i>-</i>	
<b>Designation (as faculty)</b>					
None		-	-	17	22.1
Administration		-	-	34	44.2
Research		-	-	5	6.5
Extension		-	-	9	11.7
Hybrid		-	-	12	15.6

**Extent of Leadership Growth Mindset of the College Deans as Perceived by the Faculty Members**

**Empowerment**

Table 2a presents faculty ratings of college deans' leadership growth mindset in CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri regarding empowerment, showing an overall extremely high level (mean = 3.51). Faculty perceive their deans as fostering autonomy and

shared authority, supporting independent decision-making, and creating a work environment where responsibilities are effectively managed. The statement "Enables me to solve problems myself instead of just telling me what to do" had the highest rating (3.62), reflecting the campuses' need for faculty to balance teaching, research, extension, and administrative tasks with minimal supervision. Conversely, "Helps me to further develop myself" received the lowest mean (3.38), suggesting that professional

growth opportunities may be influenced by workload and available resources. Across both campuses, deans are seen as trusting, supportive, and empowering, which enhances motivation, accountability, and engagement. These findings align with Dweck's growth mindset theory, emphasizing that leaders who encourage autonomy and continuous learning foster faculty development, adaptability, and collaboration (Liu & Tong, 2022).

Table 2a. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of empowerment as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Gives me the information I need to do my work well.	3.55	Very high
2. Encourages me to use my talents.	3.51	Very high
3. Helps me to further develop myself.	3.38	Very high
4. Encourages staff to come up with new ideas.	3.53	Very high
5. Gives me the authority to take decisions which make work easier for me.	3.51	Very high
6. Enables me to solve problems myself instead of just telling me what to do.	3.62	Very high
7. Offers me abundant opportunities to learn new skills.	3.45	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>Very high</b>

#### Standing back

Table 2b presents faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset in terms of standing back at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a very high level (mean = 3.46). Faculty view their deans as humble leaders who prioritize the welfare of others and support team success. The statement "Is not chasing recognition or rewards for the things he/she does for others" had the highest mean (3.56), reflecting leaders who focus on collective goals rather than personal praise. The lowest mean (3.38) was for "Keeps himself/herself in the background and gives credit to others," indicating that while humility is evident, acknowledgment of others occurs slightly less frequently. Across both campuses, these behaviors foster collaboration, trust, and engagement, enabling faculty to manage multiple responsibilities effectively. Research confirms that such humility, balanced with decisiveness, enhances team performance and institutional outcomes (Eva et al., 2019; Owens & Hekman, 2016; Carter & Kline, 2021).

Table 2b. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of standing back as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Keeps himself/herself in the background and gives credits to others.	3.38	Very high

2. Is not chasing recognition or rewards for the things he/she does for others.	3.56	Very high
3. Appears to enjoy his/her colleagues' success more than his/her own.	3.43	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>Very high</b>

#### Accountability

Results in Table 2c presents faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset regarding accountability at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a very high level (mean = 3.62). Faculty view deans as leaders who promote both individual and collective responsibility. The statement "Holds me accountable for my performance" had the highest mean (3.65), reflecting clear communication of expectations and motivation for faculty to manage multiple tasks effectively. The lowest mean (3.57) was for "Holds me and my colleagues responsible for the way we handle a job," indicating that collective accountability is slightly less emphasized than individual performance. Across both campuses, these practices foster professionalism, motivation, and engagement. Literature confirms that effective leaders pair high standards with support to prevent stress, suggesting that CSU deans balance accountability with guidance to help faculty meet responsibilities successfully (Graham & Resnick, 2016; Khan et al., 2020).

Table 2c. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of accountability as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Holds me responsible for the work I carry out.	3.64	Very high
Holds me accountable for my performance.	3.65	Very high
Holds me and my colleagues responsible for the way we handle a job.	3.57	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>Very high</b>

#### Forgiveness

Findings in Table 2d presents faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset in terms of forgiveness at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a high level (mean = 2.62). Faculty view deans as leaders who encourage learning from mistakes rather than fault-finding. The highest mean (2.69) was for "Refrains from criticizing people for mistakes they make in their work," reflecting a supportive environment where risk-taking and innovation are encouraged. The lowest mean (2.57) was for "Finds it easy to forget things that go wrong in the past," indicating that deans sometimes revisit past errors to provide guidance and ensure improvement. This balance between forgiveness and accountability fosters confidence, collaboration, and professional growth. Research confirms that leaders who combine empathy with clear expectations enhance trust, learning, and team effectiveness, while maintaining standards (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2017; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2015; Euwema et al., 2017).

Table 2d. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of forgiveness as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Refrains from criticizing people for the mistakes they make in their work.	2.69	High
Does not maintain a hard attitude towards people who offend him/her at work.	2.60	High
Finds it easy to forget things that go wrong in the past.	2.57	High
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>High</b>

### Courage

Table 2e illustrates faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset in terms of courage at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a high level (mean = 3.29). Faculty view deans as bold and decisive leaders who take calculated risks to advance institutional goals. The highest mean (3.31) was for "Takes risks and does what needs to be done in his/her view," reflecting leaders willing to make tough decisions amid uncertainty. The lowest mean (3.26) was for "Takes risks even when he/she is not certain of the support from his/her own manager," indicating independence and confidence in decision-making. Such courageous leadership fosters innovation, problem-solving, and institutional progress. Faculty recognize that this quality inspires them to embrace challenges. Research confirms that thoughtful risk-taking strengthens team resilience, drives innovation, and supports effective leadership while balancing judgment to prevent negative outcomes (Luthans & Avolio, 2015; Sekerka et al., 2017; Peterson et al., 2019).

Table 2e. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of courage as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Takes risks even when he/she is not certain of the support from his/her own manager.	3.26	Very high
Takes risks and does what needs to be done in his/her view.	3.31	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>Very high</b>

### Authenticity

Table 2f highlights faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset regarding authenticity at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a high level overall. Faculty view deans as open and honest leaders who foster trust and transparent communication. The highest mean (3.32) was for "Shows his/her true feelings to his/her staff," reflecting emotional transparency that encourages collaboration and idea-sharing. The lowest mean (3.12) was for "Is open about his/her limitations and weaknesses," suggesting that deans are somewhat less comfortable revealing personal vulnerabilities. Faculty note that acknowledging limitations more fully could deepen trust and strengthen relationships. Overall,

deans are seen as approachable and professional, creating an environment that supports engagement and confidence. Research confirms that authentic leadership promotes loyalty, trust, and team commitment, while balancing openness with authority enhances effectiveness (Gardner et al., 2017; Leroy et al., 2015).

Table 2f. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of authenticity as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Is open about his/her limitations and weaknesses.	3.12	High
Is often touched by the things he/she sees happening around him/her.	3.27	Very high
Is prepared to express his/her feelings even if this might have undesirable consequences.	3.23	High
Shows his/her true feelings to his/her staff.	3.32	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>High</b>

### Humility

Table 2g discusses faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset in terms of humility at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a very high level (mean = 3.40). Faculty view deans as humble leaders who admit mistakes and foster trust, accountability, and openness. The highest mean (3.47) was for "Admits his/her mistakes to his/her superior," reflecting transparency that strengthens professional relationships. The lowest mean (3.34) was for "Tries to learn from the criticism he/she gets from his/her superior," suggesting opportunities to model more active responsiveness to feedback. Overall, deans' humility encourages collaboration, engagement, and a supportive work environment, promoting faculty participation and professional growth. Research supports that leaders who combine openness, acknowledgment of errors, and receptiveness to feedback enhance trust, teamwork, and learning-focused cultures (Yang, Shen, & Ma, 2022; Owens & Hekman, 2016; Chan et al., 2024).

Table 2g. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of humility as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Learns from criticism.	3.36	Very high
Tries to learn from the criticism he/she gets from his/her superior.	3.34	Very high
Admits his/her mistakes to his/her superior.	3.47	Very high
Learns from the different views and opinions of others.	3.43	Very high
If people express criticism, tries to learn from it.	3.40	Very high

<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>Very high</b>
-----------------------	-------------	------------------

### Stewardship

Table 2h summarizes faculty perceptions of college deans' leadership growth mindset in terms of stewardship at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, showing a very high level (mean = 3.54). Faculty view deans as leaders who prioritize collective welfare, social responsibility, and sustainable practices. The highest mean (3.57) was for "Emphasizes the importance of focusing on the good of the whole" and "Emphasizes the societal responsibility of our work," reflecting encouragement to consider broader impacts beyond individual or departmental concerns. The lowest mean, for "Has a long-term vision," indicates that while stewardship is evident in daily practices, future plans could be more clearly communicated. Overall, deans' stewardship fosters faculty engagement, institutional development, and community connection. Research supports that ethical, people-centered, and strategically minded leadership strengthens sustainability and shared responsibility in organizations (April, 2010; Laguitao, 2023).

Table 2h. Weighted means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in terms of stewardship as perceived by the faculty members

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Emphasizes the importance of focusing on the good of the whole.	3.57	Very high
Has a long-term vision.	3.48	Very high
Emphasizes the societal responsibility of our work.	3.57	Very high
<b>Dimension Mean</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>Very high</b>

### Summary of Leadership Growth Mindset

Table 2i reflects faculty perceptions of the leadership growth mindset of college deans at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, with an overall weighted mean of 3.33, indicating a Very High level. Faculty consistently view deans as demonstrating growth-oriented leadership across multiple dimensions. Accountability received the highest mean (3.62), showing that deans emphasize responsibility, clear expectations, and performance standards, which help faculty manage teaching, research, extension, and administrative tasks effectively. Forgiveness had the lowest mean (2.62), suggesting that while deans are forgiving, such practices are applied more cautiously, especially in situations involving repeated errors or critical responsibilities. Overall, faculty perceive deans as leaders who balance strong accountability with professional support, fostering a culture of responsibility and continuous improvement. Enhancing forgiveness practices alongside accountability could further strengthen a safe, learning-oriented environment, as perceptions were consistent across both campuses.

Table 2i. Summary of dimension means and extent of leadership growth mindset of the college deans in perceived by the faculty members

Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Empowerment	3.51	Very high
2. Standing back	3.46	Very high

3.	Accountability	3.62	Very high
4.	Forgiveness	2.62	High
5.	Courage	3.29	Very high
6.	Authenticity	3.24	High
7.	Humility	3.40	Very high
8.	Stewardship	3.54	Very high
<b>Overall Mean</b>		<b>3.33</b>	<b>Very high</b>

### Performance of the Faculty Members

#### Teaching effectiveness

Table 3a shows faculty teaching performance at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri based on evaluations from students and immediate supervisors, with a mean of 94.75 (SD = 1.66), indicating consistently high effectiveness. Most faculty (45.5%) scored between 95.01 and 97.50, and 41.6% scored 92.51 to 95.00, demonstrating stable instructional quality across the university. Only a small proportion (2.6%) achieved scores above 97.50, highlighting opportunities for further refinement. Faculty are recognized for engaging students, delivering clear instruction, and fostering supportive learning environments, reflecting practices encouraged by growth-oriented leadership (Ke & Qin, 2023). The results underscore the importance of continuous professional development through mentoring, targeted training, and peer collaboration, enabling faculty to enhance teaching strategies, respond to evolving student needs, and sustain instructional excellence (Sousa & Clark, 2025). Overall, teaching quality is strong, with room for continued growth.

Table 3a. Distribution of the faculty members in terms of their performance along teaching effectiveness

Teaching Effectiveness Rating	Frequency (n=77)	Percentage
90.00 or below	0	-
90.01 to 92.50	8	10.4
92.51 to 95.00	32	41.6
95.01 to 97.50	35	45.5
97.51 or above	2	2.6
<b>Mean = 94.75</b>		<b>SD = 1.66</b>

#### Research Productivity

Table 3b shows that faculty research productivity at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri is generally low and uneven, with a mean of 1.84 publications and a high standard deviation (3.61). Nearly half (48.1%) reported one to two publications, indicating moderate engagement despite heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities. However, 32.5% reported no published research, suggesting that a significant proportion of faculty remain inactive in research. This pattern reflects constraints such as limited time, insufficient mentoring, and lack of funding or technical support, consistent with findings in Philippine higher education (Sayao et al., 2023). Overall, while research engagement exists, productivity remains modest. These results highlight the need for stronger institutional support, including mentoring programs, research training, funding access, and workload adjustments to enhance

faculty research output and strengthen institutional research capacity.

Table 3b. Distribution of the faculty members in terms of their performance along research productivity

Number of Published Articles/Research	Frequency (n=77)	Percentage
None	25.0	32.5
1 to 2	37.0	48.1
3 to 4	7.0	9.1
5 or more	8.0	10.4
<i>Mean = 1.84 articles/researches</i>		<i>SD = 3.61</i>

### Professional Engagements

Table 3c indicates a moderate level of faculty professional engagement at CSU Lal-lo and CSU Aparri, reflected in a mean of

Table 3c. Distribution of the faculty members in terms of their performance along professional engagements

Professional Engagements	Frequency (n=77)	Percentage
<i>Number of seminars and trainings attended</i>		
6 or below	18	23.4
7 to 12	26	33.8
13 to 18	27	35.1
19 or above	6	7.8
		<i>Mean = 12.22 seminars and trainings for the past 3 years</i> <i>SD = 9.47</i>
<i>Number of memberships in professional organizations</i>		
None	4.0	5.2
1 to 2	37.0	48.1
3 to 4	16.0	20.8
5 to 6	17.0	22.1
7 or more	3.0	3.9
		<i>Mean = 3.01 memberships</i> <i>SD = 2.57</i>

### Differences in the Performance of the Faculty Members when grouped by Profile

#### Teaching Effectiveness by Profile

Table 4a provides the comparison of faculty performance in terms of teaching effectiveness when grouped by different profile variables. The analysis shows that none of the profile variables had a statistically significant effect on teaching effectiveness. The F-values and t-values for these variables were all relatively low, with p-values exceeding the 0.05 significance level.

The lack of significant results across these variables means that factors such as age, sex, marital status, faculty rank, educational attainment, length of service and designation do not significantly affect teaching effectiveness. This indicates that faculty performance in teaching is relatively consistent across these different groups.

12.22 seminars or trainings attended and 3.01 professional organization memberships. However, the high standard deviation (9.47) suggests uneven participation. Most faculty attended 13–18 (35.1%) or 7–12 (33.8%) seminars, demonstrating active involvement in professional development despite workload demands. Such participation enhances instructional practices and effectiveness (Bender & Laverty, 2020). In terms of organizational membership, 48.1% belong to one to two groups, while 22.1% are members of five to six, indicating moderate engagement in professional networks that support collaboration and knowledge exchange (Nguyen & Pham, 2024). Only a small proportion shows very high engagement, with 7.8% attending 19 or more trainings and 3.9% joining seven or more organizations. Sustained engagement has been linked to reduced burnout and improved job satisfaction (Chen & Huang, 2021). Overall, expanding institutional support may enhance broader faculty participation.

Table 4a. Comparison test results of the performance of the faculty members in terms of teaching effectiveness when they are grouped according to their profile

Grouping Variable	F- or t-value	Probability	Statistical Inference
Age	0.648	0.630	Not significant
Sex	0.104	0.748	Not significant
Civil status	0.148	0.863	Not significant
Faculty rank	1.364	0.260	Not significant
Educational	0.958	0.331	Not

attainment			significant
Length of service	0.907	0.442	Not significant
Designation	1.610	0.181	Not significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

#### Research Productivity by Profile

Table 4b shows that research productivity significantly differs across faculty profile variables, including rank ( $F = 14.478$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), age ( $F = 4.128$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ), educational attainment ( $F = 5.312$ ,  $p = 0.024$ ), length of service ( $F = 7.894$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and designation ( $t = 3.286$ ,  $p = 0.016$ ). Faculty rank exerts the strongest influence, with senior academics demonstrating higher productivity due to experience, networks, and research involvement, consistent with Kwiek and Roszka (2024). Age is also significant, indicating that productivity increases with experience and familiarity with research systems, supporting Eckhaus and Davidovitch (2021). Higher educational attainment, particularly doctoral degrees, enhances research capability and output. Length of service further contributes by providing greater exposure to institutional research processes. Designation also matters, as faculty in advanced roles often have more access to resources and leadership opportunities. Overall, these findings confirm that research productivity is shaped by structural academic factors, reinforcing the study's evidence-based conclusions.

Table 4b. Comparison test results of the performance of the faculty members in terms of research productivity when they are grouped according to their profile

Grouping Variable	F- or t-value	Probability	Statistical Inference
Age	4.128	0.005	Significant
Sex	1.713	0.195	Not significant
Civil status	0.471	0.626	Not significant
Faculty rank	14.478	0.000	Significant
Educational attainment	5.312	0.024	Significant
Length of service	7.894	0.000	Significant
Designation	3.286	0.016	Significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

#### Professional Engagement by Profile

Table 4c reveals that faculty members' professional engagement significantly varies according to age, faculty rank, educational attainment, and length of service, with F-values of 4.112 ( $p = 0.005$ ), 3.657 ( $p = 0.016$ ), 5.121 ( $p = 0.027$ ), and 15.706 ( $p = 0.000$ ), respectively. The findings indicate that older and more experienced faculty are more actively involved in professional development, likely due to stronger commitment and accumulated experience, consistent with Kwiek and Roszka (2024). Similarly, faculty with higher ranks and advanced degrees exhibit greater engagement, reflecting sustained efforts to enhance expertise, as supported by Sayao et al. (2023). Length of service also plays a

critical role, suggesting that tenure reinforces participation in professional growth activities (Sayao et al., 2023). These results imply that institutions should design differentiated professional development programs. Junior faculty may benefit from mentorship and foundational training, while senior faculty may require leadership and research-focused opportunities. Such targeted approaches can enhance engagement across all career stages and strengthen overall academic development.

Table 4c. Comparison test results of the performance of the faculty members in terms of professional engagement when they are grouped according to their profile

Grouping Variable	F- or t-value	Probability	Statistical Inference
Age	4.112	0.005	Significant
Sex	0.131	0.719	Not significant
Civil status	0.173	0.842	Not significant
Faculty rank	3.657	0.016	Significant
Educational attainment	5.121	0.027	Significant
Length of service	15.706	0.000	Significant
Designation	0.953	0.439	Not significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

#### Relationship between the Leadership Growth Mindset of the College Deans

##### and the Performance of their Faculty Members

#### Leadership Growth Mindset to Teaching Effectiveness

Analysis of Table 5a indicates that empowerment and accountability are the only leadership growth mindset dimensions of college deans that have statistically significant positive relationships with faculty teaching effectiveness. Empowerment ( $r = 0.378$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ) shows a moderate positive correlation, suggesting that when faculty experience autonomy, trust, and participation in decision-making, they become more confident, reflective, and engaged in their instructional practices. This freedom to innovate and exercise professional judgment enhances teaching quality and commitment. Meanwhile, accountability ( $r = 0.397$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) demonstrates a slightly stronger relationship, emphasizing the importance of clear expectations, performance monitoring, and adherence to academic standards. Mechanisms such as evaluations and classroom observations guide faculty toward continuous improvement without being punitive. Together, empowerment and accountability function as complementary leadership practices—balancing autonomy with responsibility—thereby creating a supportive yet structured environment. These findings highlight that effective teaching is shaped not only by individual capability but also by leadership conditions that promote both professional independence and instructional accountability.

Table 5a. Correlation test results between the leadership growth mindset of the college deans and the performance of their faculty members along teaching effectiveness

Variables	r-value	Probability	Statistical
-----------	---------	-------------	-------------

			Inference
<b>Teaching effectiveness</b>			
<b>Leadership growth mindset</b>			
Empowerment	0.378	0.001	<b>Significant</b>
Standing back	0.058	0.617	Not significant
Accountability	0.397	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Forgiveness	0.203	0.076	Not significant
Courage	0.069	0.549	Not significant
Authenticity	0.060	0.605	Not significant
Humility	0.036	0.753	Not significant
Stewardship	0.069	0.549	Not significant

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

#### **Leadership Growth Mindset to Research Productivity**

Table 5b reveals that among the leadership growth mindset dimensions of college deans, only courage and humility have statistically significant positive relationships with faculty research productivity. Courage ( $r = 0.281$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ) suggests that deans who support innovation, encourage risk-taking, and defend academic initiatives help create an environment where faculty feel confident pursuing ambitious research projects. Such leadership fosters motivation to engage in complex studies, interdisciplinary work, and competitive funding opportunities. Meanwhile, humility ( $r = 0.319$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ) indicates that faculty who perceive their deans as open, appreciative, and receptive to feedback tend to exhibit higher research productivity. Humble leadership promotes trust, collegiality, and collaboration, making faculty feel valued and supported in their scholarly efforts. Overall, the findings highlight that leadership behaviors combining courage and humility are essential in fostering a research-supportive academic climate, motivating faculty to sustain research engagement, pursue publications, and contribute meaningfully to institutional knowledge production and academic excellence.

*Table 5b. Correlation test results between the leadership growth mindset of the college deans and the performance of their faculty members along research productivity*

Variables	r-value	Probability	Statistical Inference
<b>Research productivity</b>			
<b>Leadership growth mindset</b>			
Empowerment	0.126	0.273	Not significant
Standing back	0.145	0.208	Not

			significant
Accountability	0.176	0.125	Not significant
Forgiveness	0.109	0.347	Not significant
Courage	0.281	0.013	<b>Significant</b>
Authenticity	0.117	0.312	Not significant
Humility	0.319	0.005	<b>Significant</b>
Stewardship	0.128	0.268	Not significant

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

#### **Leadership Growth Mindset to Professional Engagement**

Table 5c shows that among the leadership growth mindset dimensions of college deans, only empowerment and humility have statistically significant positive relationships with faculty professional engagement. Empowerment ( $r = 0.275$ ,  $p = 0.016$ ) indicates that faculty who perceive their deans as supportive and autonomy-granting are more likely to participate in professional development activities such as seminars, advanced studies, and collaborations. This suggests that leadership practices promoting trust, shared decision-making, and institutional support enhance motivation for continuous growth. Similarly, humility ( $r = 0.245$ ,  $p = 0.031$ ) is positively associated with professional engagement, implying that approachable, open, and appreciative leaders foster a respectful and collaborative academic environment. Such conditions increase faculty willingness to engage in professional learning. Overall, the findings highlight that leadership behaviors combining empowerment and humility effectively encourage faculty engagement, suggesting the need for leadership development programs that promote autonomy, trust, and collegiality to strengthen institutional performance and academic excellence.

*Table 5c. Correlation test results between the leadership growth mindset of the college deans and the performance of their faculty members along professional engagement*

Variables	r-value	Probability	Statistical Inference
<b>Professional engagement</b>			
<b>Leadership growth mindset</b>			
Empowerment	0.275	0.016	<b>Significant</b>
Standing back	0.143	0.215	Not significant
Accountability	0.150	0.193	Not significant
Forgiveness	0.028	0.810	Not significant
Courage	0.035	0.761	Not significant
Authenticity	0.144	0.213	Not

			significant
Humility	0.245	0.031	<b>Significant</b>
Stewardship	0.088	0.447	Not significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

## Conclusions

The faculty members perceived that the level of leadership growth mindset among the deans of Cagayan State University was very high level as measured in terms of this study. They demonstrated high levels of stewardship, accountability, empowerment, humility, courage and standing back. A little less so but still present and well rated was forgiveness and authenticity. These results were observational, in that they tell us that the deans consistently promote a culture of responsibility, collaboration and empowerment on their campuses. They contribute to an environment that fosters the growth and development of the academic community, with a positive and motivational atmosphere that helps faculty members excel in teaching, research and professional service.

## Recommendations

Deans should adopt structured leadership strategies that empower faculty through autonomy, participatory decision-making, and professional initiative, fostering ownership of teaching, research, and development. A climate of trust, shared responsibility, and leadership humility—expressed through recognition, openness, and collaborative practices—promotes collegiality and engagement. Reflective sessions, mentoring, and inclusive decision-making further support professional growth and research productivity. Universities must equip deans with tools, frameworks, and clear guidelines for effectively monitoring performance while providing constructive feedback and adequate resources. Encouraging innovation and thoughtful risk-taking enhances faculty confidence and continuous improvement. Moreover, leadership grounded in ethical decision-making, transparency, alignment with institutional goals, and attention to faculty well-being strengthens engagement and sustains excellence in teaching, research, and service across the institution.

## Declaration of no conflict of interest

The author hereby declares no conflict of interest and this article is her original work.

## References

1. **Aguilar, J. P., & Nkomo, S. M.** (2020). Diversity, inclusion, and leadership in education: Linking faculty experiences to student learning outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(6), 1137–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2019-0410>
2. **Alhaidani, A., Ahmed, S., & Rehman, A.** (2024). Ethical leadership and stewardship in academic institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership Research*, 39(1), 45–60.
3. **Alharthi, H.** (2024). Gender perspectives in academic leadership: Challenges and insights. *Gender & Education*, 36(2), 123–138.
4. **Alvarez, M. C., & Mendoza, J. F.** (2023). Fostering research culture in Philippine state universities: The role of academic leadership and mentoring. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(1), 82–91.

5. **April, K.** (2010). Stewardship and leadership: Creating a vision of shared success in higher education. *Leadership and Learning*, 19(3), 112–125.
6. **Ashraf, M. A., Amir, T., & Ratan, S. R. A.** (2025). Effects of faculty psychological empowerment and autonomy on sustainable quality education in the didactics of accreditation and green pedagogy. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 16(4), 705–728. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-10-2023-0170>
7. **Avery & Bergsteiner** co-authored the book *Sustainable Leadership: Honeybee and Locust Approaches* (1st ed., 2011) published by Routledge.
8. **Barton, L. C., & Ambrosini, V.** (2022). Leading transformational change in education: The role of courage, resilience, and values. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(2), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220981978>
9. **Bender, T., & Laverty, C.** (2020). Faculty learning communities: Enhancing professional growth in higher education. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 34(3), 12–25.
10. **Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E., VanEpps, E. M., Pollack, J. M., & Finkel, E. J.** (2023). Mindsets and leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(1), 78–102.
11. **Carter, D. R., & Kline, J. A.** (2021). Humility and leadership: The balance of collaboration and assertiveness in organizational settings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 45(4), 410–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101272>
12. **Chan, E. T., Hekman, D. R., & Foo, M. D.** (2024). An examination of whether and how leader humility enhances leader personal career success. *Human Resource Management*, 63(3), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22208>
13. **Chen, J., & Huang, C.** (2021). Leadership support and faculty well-being in higher education: A moderating role in burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(5), 616–633. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2020-0174>
14. **Collett, J., & Johnson, R. D.** (2023). Inclusive leadership in education: A framework for equitable practice. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 6(1), 77–93.
15. **Del Rosario, R. J., & Reyes, V. C.** (2022). Servant leadership and faculty trust in Philippine state universities. *Philippine Journal of Education and Leadership*, 35(2), 45–59.
16. **Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D.** (2017). The role of forgiveness in leadership: Trust and team collaboration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103(2), 263–276.
17. **Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., & Hoffman, E. M.** (2018). The influence of forgiveness in leadership on team performance. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 39(6), 738–752.
18. **Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S.** (2020). Mindsets: A view from two eras. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(2), 411–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618804166>
19. **Eckhaus, E. & Davidovitch, N.** (2021). Academic Rank and Position Effect on Academic Research Output – A

- Case Study of Ariel University. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(1), 295-307. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n1p295>
20. **Eva, N., Kath, M., & Hekman, D. R.** (2019). Humble leadership: Enhancing team collaboration through a focus on shared success. *Leadership Review*, 11(1), 22-35.
  21. **Frazier, M. L., Johnson, P. D., & Freeman, L. K.** (2023). Growing through leadership: How growth mindset enhances leader effectiveness and team outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 34(1), 101-118.
  22. **Gagnon, D. A., Hall, C. A., & Martin, S. L.** (2022). Meta-analysis of humble leadership: Implications for fostering collaboration and improving team dynamics. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 58(4), 345-367.
  23. **García-Salirrosas, E. E., Rojas-Huayta, V., & Vargas-Madrigal, M.** (2025). Leadership behavior and teacher performance in multi-campus universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 53(2), 78-92.
  24. **Gonzales, A. R., & De Vera, J. L.** (2023). Navigating leadership resistance in academic institutions: Barriers to innovation and mindset change. *Journal of Higher Education Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 58-72.
  25. **Graham, C. A., & Resnick, L. B.** (2016). Accountability and leadership in higher education: Fostering responsibility among faculty members. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(1), 52-68.
  26. **Gupta, S., & Yadav, A.** (2024). Psychological empowerment in higher education: Exploring its impact on linguistics and English language teaching (ELT) faculty. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 66(5), 39-55. <https://journals.eltai.in/jelt/article/view/JELT660506>
  27. **Huang, F., Lee, S. W., & Wang, K.** (2021). Collaborative leadership and its influence on faculty innovation: Evidence from higher education in Asia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(5), 480-494.
  28. **Huizinga, R. B.** (2016). An understanding of humility-based leadership impacting organizational climate. *English Leadership Journal*, 9(1). <https://regent.academia.edu/RobertHuizinga>
  29. **Janssen, O.** (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
  30. **Kasalak, G., Güneri, O., Ehtiyar, R., Apaydin, F., & Türker, A.** (2022). The relation between leadership styles in higher education institutions and academic staff's job satisfaction: A meta-analysis study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1038824. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1038824>
  31. **Ke, Y., & Qin, L.** (2023). Leadership mindset and instructional innovation in higher education. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 30(1), 44-59.
  32. **Khan, H., Rehmat, M., Butt, T., Farooqi, S., & Asim, J.** (2020). *Impact of transformational leadership on work performance, burnout and social loafing: a mediation model*. *Future Business Journal*, 6, Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00043-8>
  33. **Krause, S., & McNulty, C. P.** (2021). Courageous leadership: Making equity-focused decisions in difficult times. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 5(1), 36-49.
  34. **Kwiek, M. & Roszka, W.** (2024). Once highly productive, forever highly productive? Full professors' research productivity from a longitudinal perspective. *Higher Education*, 87, 519-549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01022-y>
  35. **Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D.** (2021). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(1-2), 5-22.
  36. **LePine, J. A., Zhang, Y., Crawford, E. R., & Rich, B. L.** (2020). Turning challenge stressors into positive outcomes: The role of courageous leadership. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(3), 384-400.
  37. **Lopez, A. P., & Del Mundo, C. T.** (2022). Institutional strategies for improving faculty research productivity in higher education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 30(2), 34-49.
  38. **Lötter, H.** (2021). Empowerment for Teaching Excellence Through Virtuous Agency. *SpringerBriefs in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82511-9>
  39. **Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J.** (2015). Authentic leadership: A positive approach to leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 494-508.
  40. **Luo, Y., Zhang, Z., Chen, Q., Zhang, K., Wang, Y., & Peng, J.** (2022). Humble leadership and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 80322. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.980322>
  41. **Miller, M. A., & Curry, K. A.** (2022). Inclusive leadership and faculty engagement: Promoting equity in schools through collaborative culture. *Journal of School Leadership*, 32(2), 139-155.
  42. **Mirzaei-Alavijeh, M., & Jalilian, F.** (2024). Motivation and leadership in academic performance. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 16(1), 83-91.
  43. **Mula-Falcón, C., & Caballero, R.** (2025). Evaluation fairness and its effects on faculty research productivity. *International Journal of Educational Assessment*, 41(1), 66-81.
  44. **Nasir, M. A., & Hamzah, M. I.** (2023). Emotional intelligence and courageous leadership in higher education: Managing resistance to change. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(4), 769-785.
  45. **Nguyen, H. M., & Pham, T. H.** (2024). Supportive academic leadership and research output: A comparative study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 46(2), 109-124.
  46. **Nguyen, M. T., Walker, A., & Le, A. T.** (2020). Transformational leadership in higher education: Evidence from COVID-19 crisis management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5), 793-810.
  47. **Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R.** (2016). How does leader humility influence team functioning? Exploring mechanisms and boundary conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(5), 1421-1449. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0853>
  48. **Peterson, S., Hester, R., & Bailey, B.** (2019). The impact of courageous leadership on research productivity. *Journal of Academic Leadership*, 23(2), 47-59.

49. **Ramirez, L. M., & Velasco, C. M.** (2023). Building trust in academic leadership: Impacts on faculty engagement and institutional participation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(2), 234–250.
50. **Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U.** (2021). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), 100715.
51. **Rego, A., Cunha, M. P., & Simpson, A. V.** (2022). The bright side of humility in leadership: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3), 101553.
52. **Sayao, L. M., Aves, B. J. M., Cerbo, A. L., Morales, M. E., Navarez, J., & Villasor, H. D.** (2023). Barriers of Faculty on Research Productivity. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(5), 406-422. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10230186>
53. **Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butarbutar, I., Robin, M., & Castles, S.** (2019). Creating leaders through servant leadership. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 25(1), 1–18.
54. **Sekerka, L. E., Latham, G. P., & Davies, E. D.** (2017). Courageous leadership: Encouraging innovation and risk-taking in academic environments. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(4), 456-469.
55. **Sharma, R., Gupta, S., & Jeswani, M.** (2024). Empowering leadership and professional engagement in higher education. *Educational Leadership Review*, 29(1), 92-104.
56. **Sousa, B. J., & Clark, A. M.** (2025). *Growth mindsets in academics and academia: A review of influence and interventions*. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 47(1), 38-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2024.2384003>
57. **SpringerLink.** (2024). Trends in transformational leadership and faculty engagement: A bibliometric analysis. *Springer Briefs in Education*, 23(4), 99–116.
58. **Suparman, R., Rahayu, Y., & Firmansyah, I.** (2024). Shared leadership and faculty satisfaction in higher education. *Journal of Educational Management*, 33(3), 70–85.
59. **Tan, E. R., & Bautista, R. V.** (2022). Faculty perceptions of institutional change: Leadership transparency and the culture of resistance. *Philippine Journal of Educational Change*, 9(2), 45–61.
60. **Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I.** (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249–267.
61. **Webb, J.** (2023). Data-informed leadership in higher education: Feedback, insight, and growth. *Educational Management & Leadership Journal*, 38(2), 102–117.
62. **Yang, B., Shen, Y., & Ma, C.** (2022). Humble leadership benefits employee job performance: The role of supervisor–subordinate guanxi and perceived leader integrity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 936842. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.936842>
63. **Zhao, Y., Wang, Q., & Liu, S.** (2022). Peer mentorship and leadership growth in universities. *Journal of Academic Leadership Studies*, 22(3), 130–144.