

RESEARCH ARTICLE

How academic leaders induce motivation and productivity among faculty through faculty development management

Jason V. Ang¹, Erwin B. Berry², Jason V. Chavez^{3*}, Kier P. Dela Calzada⁴, Mary Anne M. Polestina⁵, Masnona S. Asiri⁶, Rowell L. Marquina⁷, Jinky M. Macabago¹, Sammy C. Paringit, Jr⁸

¹ School of Teacher Education, Biliran Province State University, Naval, Biliran, 6560, Philippines

² Department of General Teacher Training, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Rosario, Tandag City 8300, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

³ School of Business Administration, Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City 7000, Philippines

⁴ Extension Program Delivering Unit, Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City 7000, Philippines

⁵ Department of Public Administration, College of Public Affairs, Mindanao State University-Buug, Buug 7009, Zamboanga Sibugay, Philippines

⁶ School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines

⁷ College of Computing and Information Technologies, National University – Manila, City of Manila, Metro Manila, Philippines

⁸ College of Physical Education and Sports, Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City 7000, Philippines

* Corresponding author: Jason V. Chavez, jasonchavez615@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Despite the growing emphasis on faculty development in higher education, limited research has examined how academic leaders strategically manage these programs to enhance faculty motivation and productivity. This study addresses this gap by exploring the specific leadership strategies employed in faculty development management and assessing their influence on faculty behavior and performance. Using an exploratory qualitative design, the study involved one-on-one interviews with 18 academic leaders from selected State Universities and Colleges in the Philippines. Data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis to capture nuanced insights into leadership practices and faculty responses. While the scope is limited to Philippine higher education, the findings offer comparative insights for institutions in other collectivist and resource-constrained contexts. The study thus contributes to both local and broader discussions on how academic leadership shapes a motivated and productive workforce through strategic development initiatives.

Keywords: Academic leaders; motivation; productivity; faculty, management

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 July 2025 | Accepted: 5 August 2025 | Available online: 16 August 2025

CITATION

Ang JV, Berry EB, Chavez JV, et al. How academic leaders induce motivation and productivity among faculty through faculty development management. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2025; 10(8): 3913 doi:10.59429/esp.v10i8.3913

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by author(s). *Environment and Social Psychology* is published by Arts and Science Press Pte. Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

1. Introduction

In the evolving landscape of higher education, the demand for quality teaching, research productivity, and institutional competitiveness has placed increasing emphasis on faculty development ^[1-2]. Academic institutions invest heavily in programs aimed at enhancing the competencies and motivation of faculty members ^[3-4]. However, despite the growing recognition of faculty development's importance, there remains a notable gap in understanding how academic leaders manage these programs to effectively induce motivation and productivity among faculty ^[5-6]. Much of the existing literature focuses on the content and outcomes of faculty development, with limited attention paid to the leadership strategies that underpin their successful implementation ^[7-8].

The Academic leaders highlighted that confidence was not only a personal trait but a professional necessity, allowing them to communicate ideas persuasively and establish authority ^[9]. Academic leaders such as deans, department chairs, and program heads play a pivotal role in shaping the environment and culture of faculty development ^[10-11]. Their ability to design, manage, and align development initiatives with faculty needs and institutional goals can significantly influence faculty engagement and behavioral change ^[12-13]. For example, language delivery styles and emotional connection during academic training have been shown to influence lasting learning and engagement ^[14]. Yet, little is known about the specific strategies these leaders employ, the processes of decision-making in program planning, or the observable effects on faculty performance and professional behavior ^[15-16].

This study aims to address this gap by exploring the leadership strategies employed in faculty development management and examining the behavioral changes that result from such efforts. The research is grounded in the following key concepts: academic leadership, faculty development management, motivation, and productivity. The independent variable is academic leadership strategies in managing faculty development, while the dependent variables are faculty motivation and observable productivity-related behaviors. The inclusion of academic performance as a behavioral outcome has also been recognized in related studies on grammatical competence and educational strategy ^[17-18]

Using an exploratory qualitative design, the study draws on in-depth, one-on-one interviews with 18 academic leaders involved in faculty development initiatives. Through reflexive thematic analysis, the research seeks to uncover not only the methods and philosophies guiding leadership practices but also how these translate into motivated, engaged, and more productive faculty members ^[19-20].

The expected outcome of this study is a clearer understanding of how academic leaders use strategic management of faculty development to drive faculty motivation and performance. Insights derived from this research will contribute to leadership theory in the context of higher education, offer practical recommendations for faculty development planning, and support the advancement of academic institutions seeking to foster a high-performing, motivated teaching workforce ^[21-22].

2. Literature review

Academic Leadership and Faculty Development

Academic leaders play a pivotal role in fostering an institutional culture that values growth, innovation, and excellence among faculty. According to Austin and Sorcinelli ^[23], effective academic leaders align faculty development programs (FDPs) with institutional goals and faculty needs, thereby creating supportive environments for professional growth. Leadership actions such as advocating for resources, recognizing faculty achievements, and facilitating mentoring directly impact the success of development efforts. In recent

studies, academic leadership has also been shown to influence faculty's confidence and motivation in both traditional and online educational contexts ^[24-25]. These leadership practices are particularly vital in ensuring the integrity of instruction and the humanized delivery of learning in increasingly digital environments.

Faculty Development Management as a Strategic Tool

Faculty Development Management (FDM) involves the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs designed to enhance faculty teaching, research, and service. When strategically managed, FDM contributes to increased faculty engagement, retention, and productivity. Leaders who integrate FDM into institutional priorities help faculty adapt to evolving academic demands and expectations. Chavez and Lamorinas ^[26] highlight that well-managed FDPs also serve as a response mechanism during crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, where academic leaders had to reconfigure strategies to maintain teaching quality. Furthermore, FDM initiatives that account for workload distribution, such as handling multiple subject areas, are critical to alleviating teacher stress and preserving instructional effectiveness ^[27].

Theories of Motivation in Academic Settings

Faculty motivation is shaped by psychological and leadership theories. Self-Determination Theory, Deci & Ryan ^[28] highlights autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs that FDPs can fulfill. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory in 1966 identifies intrinsic motivators such as achievement and professional growth as essential to job satisfaction. Transformational Leadership Theory, Bass ^[29] suggests that leaders who inspire, challenge, and support individuals can significantly enhance motivation and performance. While these frameworks are foundational, this study reinterprets them within the Philippine context, where collectivist cultural norms, hierarchical respect, and policy-driven mandates influence how such theories are applied. For example, recognition and collective achievements often reinforce intrinsic motivation more strongly than individual incentives. This contextualized application extends classical theories, adding depth to their relevance in non-Western academic environments. These ideas are echoed in recent findings by Dagoy et al. ^[30] and Chavez et al. ^[31].

Linking Development to Productivity

Research shows a strong correlation between well-designed faculty development programs and improved academic productivity. Steinert et al. ^[32] found that participation in FDPs leads to enhanced teaching effectiveness, increased research output, and greater institutional engagement. Academic leaders who prioritize and support ongoing development contribute directly to these outcomes. Chavez et al., ^[33] argue that addressing discriminatory practices through development initiatives promotes more inclusive and productive academic environments. Meanwhile, policy awareness initiatives such as those discussed by Chavez et al., ^[34] ensure faculty feel protected and empowered both key factors contributing to productivity.

Challenges and Gaps

Despite their benefits, FDPs often face challenges such as time constraints, limited funding, and inconsistent leadership support. Furthermore, there is a gap in empirical research examining how specific leadership behaviors in FDM directly influence faculty motivation and productivity. Addressing this gap is crucial to developing evidence-based leadership strategies in higher education. While regional studies ^[35-36] provide valuable insight into the Philippine context, broader integration with international scholarship enriches the discussion. For example, sustained faculty development initiatives can reshape academic culture globally, and Ikpuri et al., ^[37] emphasized how professional learning communities foster institutional productivity. Positioning local findings alongside such international perspectives strengthens critical synthesis and avoids reliance on descriptive citation alone.

This study was conducted in the Philippines, a collectivist-oriented society where interpersonal relationships and community values strongly influence organizational behavior, including in higher education. The culture emphasizes shared responsibility, respect for authority, and collaborative practices factors that shape how academic leaders motivate and support faculty. In terms of legislation, the Philippine higher education sector is regulated by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and guided by policies such as the Higher Education Act of 1994 (RA 7722), which mandates faculty development as an institutional responsibility. Institutional governance frameworks also provide academic leaders with authority to implement faculty development programs aligned with national priorities and accreditation standards. These cultural and legislative contexts are integral to understanding the leadership strategies explored in this study.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

This study employs an exploratory qualitative research design aimed at gaining an in-depth understanding of the strategies academic leaders use to manage faculty development programs and how these strategies influence faculty motivation and productivity. The exploratory approach allows for the discovery of new insights and perspectives in an area where limited prior research exists.

3.2. Population and sampling

The study involves 18 academic leaders who are actively engaged in faculty development initiatives within their respective institutions from selected State Universities and Colleges in the Philippines. Participants include deans, department chairs, and program heads responsible for planning and implementing faculty development programs. Purposive sampling was utilized to select these participants based on their leadership roles and involvement in faculty development.

3.3. Instrument

The interview guide was carefully structured around the study's objectives and comprised open-ended questions designed to gather in-depth insights from academic leaders. Participants were asked about the specific strategies or initiatives they have implemented to motivate faculty members through faculty development programs. They were also prompted to explain how they determine the needs and interests of faculty when planning development activities. To understand the impact of these programs, leaders were asked to describe any changes they have noticed in faculty behavior or performance following participation in faculty development initiatives. Additionally, questions explored how faculty members typically respond to the development opportunities provided under their leadership. Collectively, these questions aimed to elicit detailed information about leadership approaches, decision-making processes, and the observable outcomes of faculty development management. Table 1 presents the list of guide questions used by this research study.

Table 1. Interview guide questions.

Objectives	Interview question
1. To explore the strategies employed by academic leaders in managing faculty development programs to enhance faculty motivation.	1. What specific strategies or initiatives have you implemented to motivate faculty members through faculty development programs?
	2. How do you determine the needs and interests of faculty when planning development activities?
	3. Can you describe how your leadership approach influences faculty engagement in development programs?

Objectives	Interview question
2. To examine the behavioral changes observed among faculty members as a result of academic leaders' implementation of faculty development management strategies.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What changes in faculty behavior or performance have you noticed following their participation in faculty development programs? 2. How do faculty members typically respond to the development opportunities provided under your leadership? 3. 6. Can you share specific examples of how faculty development initiatives have impacted teaching practices or work habits?

Table 2. (Continued)

3.4. Data gathering procedure

Data were collected through one-on-one semi-structured interviews to allow participants to elaborate on their experiences and perspectives regarding faculty development management. The interview questions were designed to explore two primary areas: (1) the specific strategies or initiatives implemented to motivate faculty through development programs, and (2) the observable behavioral changes among faculty members following participation in these programs. Interviews were conducted in a flexible manner to encourage rich, detailed responses.

3.5. Data analysis

The collected data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a flexible method that may be used with both inductive and deductive approaches to data analysis because it is not restricted by any particular theoretical framework [38]. Despite its advantages, its implementation is still unclear, especially when it comes to reflexive theme analysis, where researcher subjectivity is valued rather than downplayed.

This process involved familiarization with the data, systematic coding, theme generation, and iterative refinement to ensure analytical rigor. To enhance trustworthiness, the criterion of triangulation was addressed through multiple strategies: (1) data triangulation by including academic leaders from diverse institutions and leadership roles, (2) methodological triangulation by combining structured interview guides with open-ended, emergent questioning. These measures strengthened the credibility and dependability of the findings.

4. Results

Research Objectives 1. To explore the strategies employed by academic leaders in managing faculty development programs to enhance faculty motivation.

Question No. 1. What specific strategies or initiatives have you implemented to motivate faculty members through faculty development programs?

1.1 Recognition and Incentivization Through Structured Credentialing

Ten (10) respondents expressed that one of the most effective strategies they've implemented is offering micro-credentialing and certification programs for faculty. These are tied to specific skill areas like digital pedagogy, research methodologies, or leadership. Faculty members feel a sense of achievement when they complete these programs, and it adds value to their professional portfolios. Additionally, they mentioned that they also provide small financial incentives or teaching load adjustments for those who complete more intensive tracks. This recognition has significantly increased participation and motivation.

"One of the most effective strategies we've implemented is offering micro-credentialing and certification programs for faculty. These are tied to specific skill areas like digital pedagogy, research methodologies, or leadership."

" We also provide small financial incentives or teaching load adjustments for those who complete more intensive tracks."

1.2 Collaborative and Contextualized Faculty Development

Ten (10) respondents shared that they realized that faculty development needs to feel relevant and immediately applicable. So, they started co-creating development programs with faculty input through surveys and focus groups. One initiative was launching a 'Faculty Innovation Lab' a space where faculty could experiment with new teaching methods or technologies. Additionally, they mentioned that they supported this with mentoring and regular feedback sessions. Faculty felt more empowered and were more willing to try new approaches in their classrooms because they had a support system in place.

"We realized that faculty development needs to feel relevant and immediately applicable. So, we started co-creating development programs with faculty input through surveys and focus groups."

"Faculty felt more empowered and were more willing to try new approaches in their classrooms because they had a support system in place."

1.3 Peer Feedback and Cultural Sensitivity in Preparation

Five (5) respondents expressed that their approach centers on relationship-building and continuous support. They meet regularly with faculty in informal settings like 'coffee and conversation' sessions to understand their challenges and aspirations. From these conversations, they've created targeted workshops on stress management, classroom engagement, and inclusive teaching. Additionally, they shared that one small but powerful initiative was instituting 'Faculty Appreciation Week' with peer-nominated awards and public recognition. It built community and made faculty feel seen, which in turn boosted their motivation to participate in development programs.

"Our approach centers on relationship-building and continuous support. I meet regularly with faculty in informal settings like 'coffee and conversation' sessions to understand their challenges and aspirations. From these conversations, we've created targeted workshops on stress management, classroom engagement, and inclusive teaching."

" One small but powerful initiative was instituting 'Faculty Appreciation Week' with peer-nominated awards and public recognition. It built community and made faculty feel seen, which in turn boosted their motivation to participate in development programs."

Question No. 2. How do you determine the needs and interests of faculty when planning development activities?

2.1 Data-Driven and Dialogic Needs Assessment

Ten (10) respondents expressed that they start with an annual professional development needs survey, which includes both quantitative and open-ended questions. Faculty are asked to rank areas of interest such as curriculum design, research funding, or digital tools. But surveys alone aren't enough, so they also conduct one-on-one consultations, especially with department chairs, to capture more nuanced needs. Additionally, they mentioned that sometimes, faculty won't express their concerns in a formal survey, but faculties will share openly in a smaller setting. They then use all this input to create a development calendar that reflects real faculty priorities.

"We start with an annual professional development needs survey, which includes both quantitative and open-ended questions."

"Sometimes, faculty won't express their concerns in a formal survey, but they'll share openly in a smaller setting."

2.2 Interpreting Implicit Feedback and Institutional Data for Faculty Development Planning

Ten (10) respondents expressed that they've found that faculty often express their needs indirectly through their behavior such as low engagement with past workshops or questions raised during faculty meetings. They keep track of these indicators and complement them with mid-semester pulse surveys. Additionally, they mentioned that they also partner with the institutional research office to review teaching evaluations and student performance data, which help them identify areas where faculty might benefit from additional support. Listening carefully to both spoken and unspoken needs is key.

"I've found that faculty often express their needs indirectly through their behavior such as low engagement with past workshops or questions raised during faculty meetings."

"We also partner with the institutional research office to review teaching evaluations and student performance data, which help us identify areas where faculty might benefit from additional support."

2.3 Familiarity and Supportive Audience Recognition

Five (5) respondents mentioned that their approach is highly collaborative. They formed a Faculty Advisory Group that meets regularly to co-plan development activities. They serve as liaisons to their departments and bring back feedback from colleagues. This helps them stay current with evolving interests. Additionally, they mentioned that after each training or workshop, they gather feedback and suggestions for future topics. That feedback loop has been invaluable it tells them not only what worked, but what faculty want to see next.

"Our approach is highly collaborative. We formed a Faculty Advisory Group that meets regularly to co-plan development activities."

"In addition, after each training or workshop, we gather feedback and suggestions for future topics."

Question No. 3. Can you describe how your leadership approach influences faculty engagement in development programs?

3.1 Leading by Example and Collaborative Engagement

Ten (10) respondents expressed that their leadership approach is grounded in collaboration and visibility. They make a conscious effort to attend faculty development sessions themselves not just as a leader, but as a participant. When faculty see that they value these programs and actively engage in them, faculties are more likely to do the same. Additionally, they mentioned that they also ensure that faculty have a voice in what programs are offered, which gives them a sense of ownership. They believe leading by example and fostering a culture of shared decision-making significantly boosts engagement.

"My leadership approach is grounded in collaboration and visibility. I make a conscious effort to attend faculty development sessions myself not just as a leader, but as a participant."

"I also ensure that faculty have a voice in what programs are offered, which gives them a sense of ownership."

3.2 Supportive and Empowerment-Oriented Leadership

Ten (10) respondents expressed that they prioritize a supportive and non-punitive leadership style. Faculty need to feel safe and encouraged to grow, not judged. When promoting development programs, they frame them as opportunities for professional empowerment rather than performance improvement. Additionally, they mentioned that they also follow up individually with faculty who attend, asking for their feedback and suggestions. This personal touch builds trust and makes faculty feel their participation is valued, not just monitored.

"I prioritize a supportive and non-punitive leadership style. Faculty need to feel safe and encouraged to grow, not judged."

"This personal touch builds trust and makes faculty feel their participation is valued, not just monitored."

3.3 Responsive Leadership and Recognition-Based Motivation

Five (5) respondents expressed that their approach centers on being proactive and responsive. They stay in regular contact with faculty through informal check-ins and make it clear that they are open to adjusting their programs based on the faculty's evolving needs. Additionally, they mentioned that they also make efforts to recognize participation whether it's through certificates, mentions at faculty meetings, or small tokens of appreciation. By being responsive and appreciative, they've found faculty become more engaged and even begin to advocate for the programs themselves.

"My approach centers on being proactive and responsive. I stay in regular contact with faculty through informal check-ins and make it clear that I'm open to adjusting our programs based on their evolving needs."

"I also make efforts to recognize participation whether it's through certificates, mentions at faculty meetings, or small tokens of appreciation. By being responsive and appreciative, I've found faculty become more engaged and even begin to advocate for the programs themselves."

Research Objectives 2. To examine the behavioral changes observed among faculty members as a result of academic leaders' implementation of faculty development management strategies.

Question No. 1. What changes in faculty behavior or performance have you noticed following their participation in faculty development programs?

Enhanced Instructional Innovation and Student-Centered Teaching

Ten (10) respondents expressed that one noticeable change is increased innovation in teaching. After attending development sessions focused on active learning strategies and educational technology, many faculties started redesigning their courses to be more student-centered. Additionally, they mentioned that they've observed more use of flipped classrooms, project-based assessments, and digital platforms to engage students. Faculty also seem more confident trying new approaches, which has improved both student engagement and feedback.

"After attending development sessions focused on active learning strategies and educational technology, many faculties started redesigning their courses to be more student-centered."

"I've observed more use of flipped classrooms, project-based assessments, and digital platforms to engage students."

1.2 Strengthened Faculty Collaboration and Interdisciplinary Engagement

Five (5) respondents expressed that they've seen a marked improvement in collaboration among faculty. Development programs that included team-based projects or interdisciplinary workshops sparked ongoing partnerships that continued beyond the sessions. Additionally, they mentioned that faculty are now more likely to co-develop course materials or co-author research papers. There's a stronger sense of community and shared learning culture, which wasn't as prominent before.

"Development programs that included team-based projects or interdisciplinary workshops sparked ongoing partnerships that continued beyond the sessions."

"There's a stronger sense of community and shared learning culture, which wasn't as prominent before."

1.3 Promotion of Reflective Practice and Continuous Improvement

Ten (10) respondents expressed that a significant behavioral shift has been in reflective practice. Faculty are more open to evaluating and adjusting their teaching based on feedback. Additionally, they mentioned that they've noticed that after development programs on assessment and feedback, more faculty have begun incorporating student reflections, formative assessments, and regular course evaluations into their routines. This mindset of continuous improvement has led to noticeable gains in teaching effectiveness.

"Faculty are more open to evaluating and adjusting their teaching based on feedback."

"This mindset of continuous improvement has led to noticeable gains in teaching effectiveness."

Question No. 2. How do faculty members typically respond to the development opportunities provided under your leadership?

2.1 Positive Engagement Through Relevance and Practical Application

Ten (10) respondents expressed that faculty generally respond positively, especially when they see that the programs are tailored to their real needs. They've noticed higher engagement when sessions are practical, hands-on, and directly linked to the faculty's current teaching or research challenges. Additionally, they mentioned that many faculties have shared that they feel more supported and professionally valued, which encourages them to continue participating in future programs.

"Faculty generally respond positively, especially when they see that the programs are tailored to their real needs."

"Many faculties have shared that they feel more supported and professionally valued, which encourages them to continue participating in future programs."

2.2 Shift from Resistance to Ownership Through Relevance and Impact

Five (5) respondents expressed that initially, some faculty were hesitant or saw development activities as added workload. But once the faculty experienced the relevance and impact of the sessions, especially those tied to promotion or classroom effectiveness, their attitude shifted. Additionally, they mentioned that now, many not only attend but also recommend the programs to peers. They've even had faculty ask to facilitate sessions, which is a great sign of ownership and internal motivation.

"But once they experienced the relevance and impact of the sessions, especially those tied to promotion or classroom effectiveness, their attitude shifted."

"We've even had faculty ask to facilitate sessions, which is a great sign of ownership and internal motivation."

2.3 Tailored Engagement Strategies Across Faculty Career Stages

Ten (10) respondents expressed that the response has been mixed, but overall encouraging. Senior faculty can sometimes be harder to engage, but when they frame development as a chance to mentor or share expertise, faculties are more receptive. Additionally, they mentioned that younger faculty are usually enthusiastic, especially when the sessions help them with classroom management or instructional design. Across the board, participation improves when programs are flexible, relevant, and clearly connected to real classroom needs.

"Senior faculty can sometimes be harder to engage, but when we frame development as a chance to mentor or share expertise, they're more receptive."

"Younger faculty are usually enthusiastic, especially when the sessions help them with classroom management or instructional design."

Question No. 3. Can you share specific examples of how faculty development initiatives have impacted teaching practices or work habits?

3.1 Adoption of Inclusive and Reflective Teaching Practices

Ten (10) respondents expressed that after participating in workshops on inclusive teaching, several faculty members revamped their syllabi to incorporate diverse perspectives and accessible materials. One professor introduced multiple assessment options to accommodate different learning styles, which led to improved student engagement and success. Additionally, they mentioned that faculty have also adopted more reflective teaching practices, regularly soliciting feedback and adjusting their methods accordingly.

"After participating in workshops on inclusive teaching, several faculty members revamped their syllabi to incorporate diverse perspectives and accessible materials."

"Faculty have also adopted more reflective teaching practices, regularly soliciting feedback and adjusting their methods accordingly."

3.2 Technology Integration for Enhanced Engagement and Efficiency

Ten (10) respondents shared that they launched a series of training sessions on integrating technology into the classroom, including learning management systems and virtual collaboration tools. Faculty who attended began using discussion boards, online quizzes, and video content more effectively. Additionally, they mentioned that this not only enhanced student participation but also streamlined faculty workflow, saving time on grading and communication.

"We launched a series of training sessions on integrating technology into the classroom, including learning management systems and virtual collaboration tools."

"This not only enhanced student participation but also streamlined faculty workflow, saving time on grading and communication."

3.3 Improved Time Management and Work-Life Balance

Five (5) respondents mentioned that one of the most noticeable impacts has been in time management and work-life balance. Through their faculty wellness and productivity workshops, many faculty members adopted strategies like setting clear boundaries for email response times and using planning tools. Additionally, they shared that this has reduced burnout and improved their overall efficiency and job satisfaction. This theme emphasizes how faculty development initiatives focused on wellness and productivity help faculty implement practical strategies to manage their time better, reduce burnout, and enhance both efficiency and job satisfaction.

"Through our faculty wellness and productivity workshops, many faculty members adopted strategies like setting clear boundaries for email response times and using planning tools."

"This has reduced burnout and improved their overall efficiency and job satisfaction."

5. Discussion

This study aimed to investigate how academic leaders induce motivation and productivity among faculty through faculty development management. Two key objectives framed the exploration: first, to

identify the strategies employed by academic leaders to enhance motivation through faculty development programs; and second, to examine the behavioral changes observed among faculty because of these strategies.

The findings reveal that academic leaders employ a range of intentional, context-sensitive strategies to motivate faculty through faculty development management. A recurring theme among interviewees was the emphasis on personalized development planning, whereby leaders actively assess faculty needs through surveys, informal consultations, and performance reviews. These assessments guide the creation of targeted training modules and workshops, thereby fostering a sense of relevance and personal investment among faculty members. This finding aligns with previous research suggesting that development programs tailored to individual professional goals are more likely to motivate participants ^[39].

Another strategy that emerged is the use of recognition and incentivization mechanisms, such as awarding certificates, publicly acknowledging achievements, or linking participation in development activities to promotion and tenure considerations. Leaders emphasized that such rewards signal institutional value for professional growth, which in turn encourages greater faculty engagement and intrinsic motivation. This supports Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory, which asserts that recognition and autonomy are key drivers of motivation.

Academic leaders also highlighted the importance of modeling leadership engagement in faculty development. Attending sessions themselves, participating in reflective dialogues, or inviting external experts, leaders demonstrate their commitment to continuous learning. This aligns with transformational leadership theory, which posits that leaders who model desired behaviors can inspire and motivate others ^[40].

These findings resonate with international studies on faculty development. For example, Nair et al. ^[41] observed similar patterns of increased teaching innovation and reflective practice after sustained faculty development initiatives. Likewise, Qiao et al. ^[42] highlighted the importance of aligning development programs with faculty needs to enhance engagement an approach echoed in the present findings.

At the same time, this study contributes newness by situating faculty development leadership within the Philippine higher education context, where cultural collectivism and policy frameworks (such as CHED mandates) uniquely influence implementation. Unlike studies in more individualistic contexts where faculty autonomy is dominant, the findings here underscore how collaborative and recognition-based leadership styles can be particularly effective. This contextual nuance highlights both the convergence with global research and the originality of this work in addressing cultural and policy-driven dimensions of faculty motivation.

In examining the impact of these leadership strategies on faculty behavior, several notable patterns emerged. Leaders reported observable improvements in teaching practices, including increased use of innovative pedagogies, integration of technology, and more reflective instructional planning. Many faculty members, according to the interviews, became more open to peer collaboration and cross-disciplinary engagement after participating in development initiatives.

Another key change observed was an enhancement in work productivity, particularly in scholarly output and student engagement strategies. Some leaders cited increased publication rates, greater participation in academic conferences, and stronger mentoring relationships with students as direct outcomes of development initiatives. These findings are consistent with the literature on professional learning communities, which suggest that structured development efforts contribute to a more active and committed academic workforce ^[43].

Importantly, leaders noted that faculty receptiveness to development opportunities was contingent on the organizational climate and how development was framed. When programs were presented as optional but enriching, rather than remedial or mandatory, faculty were more likely to engage with intrinsic motivation. This reinforces the importance of psychological safety and trust in organizational settings, a key concept in educational leadership and adult learning theory ^[44].

The study underscores the critical role of academic leaders as facilitators of motivation and productivity through effective faculty development management. Leadership strategies that are participatory, recognition-based, and aligned with faculty interests appear to yield the most significant behavioral outcomes. As such, higher education institutions should invest in leadership training that enhances leaders' capacity to design and implement strategic development programs.

Moreover, the reflexive nature of the thematic analysis allowed for an iterative understanding of how leadership practices evolve in response to faculty feedback. This suggests that ongoing dialogue between leaders and faculty is essential for maintaining the relevance and effectiveness of development initiatives.

6. Conclusion

This study explored how academic leaders manage faculty development programs to enhance motivation and improve faculty behavior and productivity. The findings reveal that effective faculty development management is not merely about offering training sessions but about cultivating a supportive, responsive, and empowering academic environment.

Academic leaders applied multiple strategies to engage faculty, with three central themes: recognition through credentialing, collaborative program design, and community-building rooted in peer feedback and cultural awareness. Initiatives that provided micro-credentials, incentives, and visible leader participation significantly boosted engagement. Similarly, co-created programs shaped by faculty input proved more effective than top-down directives. Leaders emphasized listening to both explicit and subtle indicators of faculty needs, underscoring the value of responsive and evidence-informed planning.

Furthermore, the study confirmed that leadership style plays a pivotal role in shaping faculty engagement. Leadership approaches that emphasized support, shared ownership, and role modeling helped shift faculty attitudes from passive participation to active involvement. When development programs were framed as growth opportunities rather than evaluative interventions, faculty were more willing to engage and even champion the initiatives themselves.

In terms of behavioral outcomes, faculty development programs led to tangible improvements in teaching practice, collaboration, and professional mindset. Faculty exhibited greater instructional innovation, adopting student-centered pedagogies and integrating educational technologies. Development efforts also fostered interdisciplinary collaboration and reflective teaching, as well as improvements in time management and wellness. Notably, these behavioral changes were most significant when faculty felt their efforts were recognized and supported by leadership.

While the study provides valuable insights, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the qualitative design relied on self-reported accounts of academic leaders, which may be influenced by social desirability bias. Second, the sample was limited to 18 leaders from selected State Universities and Colleges, which constrains the generalizability of the findings across all Philippine higher education institutions. Third, the study did not include direct perspectives from faculty members, which could have provided complementary validation of leadership impact. Future research should address these gaps by incorporating

mixed methods and larger, more diverse samples to capture a broader picture of faculty development management.

Future studies should also explore comparative research across Southeast Asia to examine how variations in policy environments and cultural norms shape faculty development leadership. Quantitative follow-ups could measure the actual impact of leadership-driven development strategies on faculty performance indicators such as publication rates, teaching evaluations, and promotion outcomes.

Overall, this study underscores the power of strategically led, faculty-informed development programs in transforming not only how faculty teach, but also how they view their roles within the academic community. Faculty development, when managed with empathy, intentionality, and mutual trust, becomes a vehicle for both professional growth and institutional transformation.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

1. Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3), 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512>
2. Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40. *Medical Teacher*, 38(8), 769–786. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2016.1181851>
3. Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(1), 90–126. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312438409>
4. Caffarella, R. S., & Zinn, L. F. (1999). Professional development for faculty: A conceptual framework of barriers and supports. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 1999(81), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.8104>
5. Kelley, C., Heneman, H., & Milanowski, A. (2017). Teacher motivation and school-based performance awards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 372–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X02239697>
6. Devlin, M., & Samarawickrema, G. (2010). The criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903244398>
7. Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Anker Publishing.
8. Divinagracia, L. T. (2024). Macro and micromanagement practices of reading comprehension programs in selected grade schools in the post-pandemic. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v5i2.1664>
9. Español AC. Public speaking confidence as a crucial asset for leadership development in academic setting. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2025; 10(4): 3193. Doi:10.59429/esp.v10i4.3193
10. Leibowitz, B., van Schalkwyk, S., Ruiters, J., Farmer, J., & Adendorff, H. (2014). Curriculum inquiry in a South African higher education context: Discourse, knowledge and power. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 318–339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12048>
11. Chavez, J. V., & Unga, N. H. (2024). Confidence of implementation of new BSND curriculum among program administrators and faculty. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(6), 2128. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i6.2128>
12. Nguyen, Q., Rienties, B., & Toetenel, L. (2020). Understanding the impact of learning design on student satisfaction and performance in blended and online learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(2), 315–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12867>
13. Garil, B. A., Entong, M. B. M., Muarip, V. C., et al. (2024). Language delivery styles in academic trainings: Analysis of speaker's emotional connection to audience for lasting learning. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 326–342. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6533>
14. Ceneciro, C. C. (2025). Characterizing workshops promoting motivated engagement and retention beyond the sessions: Experiential narratives from education, language, and social science instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(4), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8373>
15. Carpio, L. B., Caburnay, A. L. S., Nollado, S. M., et al. (2024). Technology-based teaching among nursing instructors: Confidence and apprehension in using simulation equipment for training. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 2591. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.2591>

16. Dela Calzada, K. P., Tacbobo, C. M. P., Lualhati, M. E. C., et al. (2025). Alternating environmental teaching through AI: Potential benefits and limitations. *Journal of Environmental & Earth Sciences*, 7(4), 138–151. <https://doi.org/10.30564/jees.v7i4.8340>
17. Garil, B. A. (2024). Socio-cultural factors affecting reading comprehension levels and demographic-based grammatical competence of higher education students. *Forum for Linguistics Studies*, 6(3), 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6465>
18. Garil, B. A., Abbas, T. S. C., & Limen, M. V. (2024). Analyzing the demographic-based grammatical competence and its relationship to academic performance in higher education setting. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 343–356. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6453>
19. Murro, R. A. (2024). Modular distance learning: Exploring the study habits and academic achievements of state-funded elementary school learners. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 2462. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.2462>
20. Bondoc, R. S. Jr. (2024). ICT-driven instructional and assessment strategies for physical education in the new normal. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 2155. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i4.2155>
21. Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(5), 407–417. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540710760183>
22. Knight, P. T., Tait, J., & Yorke, M. (2006). The professional learning of teachers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600680786>
23. Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Anker Publishing
24. Chavez, J. V. (2023). Assessing online academic integrity and humanized teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 19(1), 9–17.
25. Savellon, K. I. S., Asiri, M. S., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Public speaking woes of academic leaders: Resources and alternative ways to improve speaking with audience. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2871. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2871>
26. Chavez, J. V., & Lamorinas, D. D. (2023). Reconfiguring assessment practices and strategies in online education during the pandemic. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 10(1), 160–174.
27. Castro, F. L. T., Ventura, B. L. O., Estajal, R. S., et al. (2024). Teachers handling multiple subject areas: Difficulties and adaptive attributes in the delivery of instructions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2520. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2520>
28. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.
29. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
30. Dagoy, T. H. S., Ariban, A. I., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2024). Discourse analysis on the teachers' professional interest and integrity among teachers with multiple administrative functions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(12), 2521. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i12.2521>
31. Chavez, J. V., Gregorio, M. W., Araneta, A. L., & Bihag, C. D. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>
32. Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 497–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600902976>
33. Chavez, J. V., Lamorinas, D. D., & Ceneciro, C. C. (2023). Message patterns of online gender-based humor, discriminatory practices, biases, stereotyping, and disempowering tools through discourse analysis. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2), 1535. <http://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v5i2.1535>
34. Chavez, J. V., Gregorio, M. W., Araneta, A. L., & Bihag, C. D. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>
35. Chavez, J. V. (2020). Academic and health insecurities of indigent students during the pandemic: Study on adaptive strategies under learning constraints. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 16(3), 74–81.
36. Chavez, J. V., Cuilan, J. T., Mannan, S. S., et al. (2024). Discourse analysis on the ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in academic settings from ICT, science, and language instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
37. Ikpuri, Emmanuel & Peter, Gabriel. (2024). Professional Learning Communities: A Mechanism for Enhancing Teachers' Professional Agency. 7. 74-81.
38. Majumdar, A. (2019). Thematic analysis in qualitative research. In *Qualitative techniques for workplace data analysis* (pp. 197-220). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
39. Day, C., & Sachs, J. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*. Open University Press.
40. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

41. Nair, B. (Kichu) R., Bleasel, J., Mwangi, F., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2024). Reimagining faculty development: A paradigm shift from content to transformative learning processes. *Medical Teacher*, 47(6), 976–984. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2024.2390035>
42. Qiao, Thomas & McDermott, Brenda & Thannhauser, Jennifer. (2024). Faculty Engagement In Professional Development. *Papers on Postsecondary Learning and Teaching*. 7. 81-89. 10.55016/ojs/pplt.v7Y2024.78034
43. Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8>
44. Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Harvard Business Press.