

Capability, Academic, and E-Leadership Skills in Higher Education Institution as Drivers of Faculty Job Satisfaction

Ariel N. Layson, Trudy C. Cerbo

La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800054>

Received: 11 August 2026; Accepted: 16 August 2026; Published: 25 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the institutional capability, academic leadership, and e-leadership of a local higher education institution in relation to faculty job satisfaction. Employing a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, the study gathered data from full-time permanent and contractual faculty members using validated survey instruments. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the data. Findings revealed that the institution demonstrated very high levels of institutional capability, academic leadership, and e-leadership, while faculty job satisfaction was generally high. Furthermore, institutional capability, academic leadership, and e-leadership each exhibited significant positive relationships with faculty job satisfaction, indicating that effective organizational systems, competent academic leadership, and strategic digital leadership contribute to a more supportive and satisfying work environment for faculty members. The study concludes that strengthening institutional capability and leadership competencies can enhance faculty well-being, organizational effectiveness, and institutional performance. The findings provide an empirical basis for leadership development initiatives, organizational improvement strategies, and evidence-informed policy formulation in higher education institutions.

Keywords: Institutional Capability; Academic Leadership; E-Leadership; Faculty Job Satisfaction; Local Higher Education Institution

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions (HEIs) operate in a dynamic environment driven by rapid technological advancement, globalization, and growing demands for quality education. Navigating these developments requires institutions to strengthen their organizational capability while cultivating academic leadership and e-leadership competencies. Organizational capability reflects an institution's capacity to utilize its human, financial, technological, and administrative resources to achieve strategic goals. Academic leadership provides direction for teaching, research, and faculty development, whereas e-leadership enables leaders to manage, communicate, and collaborate through digital technologies. Collectively, these factors shape the academic work environment, influence motivation, and determine faculty job satisfaction. Satisfied faculty members are more likely to demonstrate organizational commitment, instructional effectiveness, and research productivity, all of which are vital to institutional excellence (Kasalak et al., 2022; Maheshwari et al., 2024; OECD, 2023).

Globally, the expansion of hybrid and technology-mediated learning has intensified the demand for leaders who possess traditional managerial competencies alongside strong digital leadership skills. Despite investments in digital infrastructure, many HEIs encounter difficulties aligning organizational capability with effective leadership, leading to varying levels of faculty engagement and satisfaction (Maheshwari et al., 2024; Smith & Egitim, 2024). In the Philippines, the institutionalization of flexible learning and quality assurance reforms by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has expanded academic leadership beyond conventional administrative roles (CHED, 2023). Although Philippine HEIs have advanced digital initiatives, disparities in institutional capability, technological readiness, and resource availability continue to impact faculty experiences (Lucero et al., 2022; Apdian & Prado, 2024).

Within local HEIs, variations in organizational capability, academic leadership practices, and e-leadership competencies continue to shape faculty perceptions. While prior investigations have explored these variables independently, few have examined their combined, integrated contribution to faculty job satisfaction within a single explanatory framework. Furthermore, empirical evidence remains limited regarding how institutional capability interacts with academic leadership and e-leadership in local HEIs undergoing digital transformation. This gap highlights the need for a comprehensive investigation that integrates these organizational dimensions. Accordingly, the present study seeks to determine the capability, academic leadership, and e-leadership skills of a local higher education institution and examine their relationship with faculty job satisfaction. The findings are expected to provide evidence that can guide institutional policy formulation, leadership development initiatives, faculty support programs, and strategic planning, while contributing to the growing body of knowledge on organizational leadership and faculty job satisfaction in Philippine higher education.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among capability, academic leadership, e-leadership, and faculty job satisfaction in a local higher education institution. The respondents of the study comprised all officially employed full-time permanent and full-time contractual faculty members of a local higher education institution within the Negros Island Region during the academic year 2026–2027, with a total population of 114.

Data were collected using a standardized four-part survey questionnaire measured through a five-point Likert scale. Institutional capability was assessed using a standardized 12-item instrument adapted from Vannasuk (2024), e-leadership skills were determined through a standardized 12-item instrument adapted from Sunaengsih et al. (2024), and faculty job satisfaction was evaluated using a standardized 12-item questionnaire adapted from Franco (2023).

Prior to data collection, formal institutional authorization was secured. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose and assured of voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the protection of their identities. Informed consent was obtained before questionnaire administration, and no personally identifiable information was recorded. Retrieved questionnaires were checked for completeness, coded, organized, and tabulated prior to statistical analysis.

Descriptive statistics, particularly the mean and standard deviation, were used to determine the levels of the study variables, while the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was employed to determine the direction, strength, and significance of the relationships between institutional capability, academic leadership, e-leadership, and faculty job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Institutional Capability of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 1. Level of Institutional Capability of Local Higher Education Institution as a whole and in terms of Academic Administration Capability, Budget and Financial Management Capability, and Personnel Administration Capability.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Academic Administration Capability	4.40	0.61	Very High
1. The college efficiently manages curriculum revisions to align with national standards.	4.51	0.63	Very High
2. The academic council promptly resolves matters concerning student retention and scholastic status.	4.39	0.65	Very High
3. The institution organizes systematic cross-departmental reviews of teaching plans.	4.35	0.80	Very High

4. The office of academic affairs provides structured support for publishing research papers.	4.37	0.74	Very High
Budget and Financial Management Capability	4.02	0.75	High
5. The college allocates its fiscal resources transparently across all operating units.	4.02	0.79	High
6. Financial disbursements for classroom technologies and laboratory upgrades are processed efficiently.	3.79	0.93	High
7. The finance office complies strictly with auditing standards for public or local college funds.	4.20	0.85	High
8. The institution successfully secures external funding, linkages, or grants to support programs.	4.07	0.84	High
Personnel Administration Capability	4.22	0.70	Very High
9. The recruitment process for new faculty is based purely on objective merit and credentials.	4.25	0.74	Very High
10. The Human Resource office maintains precise, up-to-date professional profiles of all staff.	4.25	0.76	Very High
11. The management executes clear protocols for employee conflict resolution and discipline.	4.25	0.76	Very High
12. The HR division designs personalized wellness and wellness-retention programs for employees.	4.13	0.85	High
As a Whole	4.21	0.62	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21-5.00)-Very High; (3.41-4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40)-Moderate; (1.81-2.60)-Low; (1.00-1.80)-Very Low</i>			

Table 1 presents the level of institutional capability of the local higher education institution in terms of academic administration capability, budget and financial management capability, and personnel administration capability. Overall, the institution attained a very high level of institutional capability ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.62$), indicating that the institutional capability of the local higher education institution is consistently and extensively demonstrated across the indicators measured, with highly effective governance, competent personnel, sufficient financial and material resources, sound organizational systems, and efficient operational processes that collectively support the successful attainment of its educational mandate and strategic priorities. The findings further suggest a consistent assessment of the institution's capability across the indicators, reflecting a generally uniform perception of its strong institutional capacity and effectiveness.

Among the three dimensions, academic administration capability obtained the highest rating ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.61$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that the institution demonstrates strong competence in curriculum management, academic governance, instructional planning, and research support. The highest-rated indicator was the efficient management of curriculum revisions aligned with national standards ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 0.63$), reflecting the institution's commitment to maintaining curricular relevance and regulatory compliance. These findings support the assertion of Salmi (2021) that effective academic governance enhances institutional quality through responsive curriculum development and evidence-based academic decision-making. Likewise, UNESCO (2021) emphasized that higher education institutions with robust academic leadership and quality assurance systems are better positioned to sustain educational excellence and institutional effectiveness. Similarly, Hazelkorn and Gibson (2022) noted that effective academic administration strengthens institutional performance by promoting continuous improvement in teaching, research, and curriculum innovation.

Personnel administration capability likewise registered a very high level ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.70$), indicating that the institution maintains sound human resource management practices, particularly in recruitment, personnel records management, and employee relations. Faculty members perceived that merit-based hiring, organized personnel management, and structured conflict resolution mechanisms are consistently practiced. However, the provision of employee wellness and retention programs received a comparatively lower yet still high rating ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.85$), suggesting opportunities for further enhancement in faculty well-being initiatives. This

finding is consistent with OECD (2023), which emphasized that effective human resource management, professional support, and employee well-being significantly contribute to institutional performance and

workforce sustainability. Likewise, Benevene et al. (2022) reported that supportive personnel management practices foster greater employee engagement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction in educational institutions. In addition, Kinman (2022) underscored that comprehensive wellness initiatives are essential for maintaining faculty productivity and long-term organizational effectiveness.

In contrast, budget and financial management capability obtained the lowest, although still high, mean score ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.75$). This suggests that while financial governance and fiscal accountability are generally practiced effectively, aspects related to resource allocation, infrastructure funding, and external resource generation may still require continuous enhancement. The lowest-rated indicator involved the efficient processing of financial disbursements for classroom technologies and laboratory upgrades ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.93$), indicating faculty perceptions that improvements in funding efficiency remain necessary. These findings align with World Bank (2022), which emphasized that efficient financial management and strategic resource allocation are fundamental to improving institutional quality and educational outcomes. Similarly, UNESCO (2022) highlighted that transparent financial governance and sustainable institutional financing enable higher education institutions to respond effectively to evolving educational demands. Moreover, OECD (2022) stressed that accountable financial management strengthens institutional resilience, operational efficiency, and stakeholder confidence.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the local higher education institution exhibits strong institutional capability across its core administrative functions. The consistently high evaluations indicate that effective academic governance, sound personnel administration, and responsible financial management collectively provide an enabling organizational environment that supports faculty performance and organizational effectiveness..

Level of Academic Leadership of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 2. Level of Academic Leadership of Local Higher Education Institution as a whole and in terms of Technical Skills, Human Skills, and Conceptual Skills.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Technical Skills	4.42	0.63	Very High
1. The college administrator demonstrates strong mastery of academic policies, guidelines, and national regulatory frameworks.	4.48	0.6	Very High
2. The college administrator effectively structures and updates institutional curricula to fit modern educational trends.	4.43	0.7	Very High
3. The college administrator efficiently manages standard institutional data systems and academic record archives.	4.36	0.69	Very High
4. The college administrator executes data-driven choices to resolve structural and program monitoring issues.	4.39	0.7	Very High
Human Skills	4.32	0.66	Very High
Continuation of Table 2.			
5. The college administrator establishes a high level of institutional trust among faculty members.	4.35	0.66	Very High
6. The college administrator proactively supports the psychological well-being and morale of the academic staff.	4.24	0.71	Very High
7. The college administrator manages interpersonal conflicts within academic departments objectively and diplomatically.	4.34	0.76	Very High
8. The college administrator promotes an open environment where diverse professional feedback is valued.	4.34	0.75	Very High
Conceptual Skills	4.32	0.6	Very High
9. The college administrator effectively visualizes the "big picture" for the long-term sustainability of the college.	4.36	0.68	Very High
10. The college administrator successfully translates complex national educational mandates into actionable local campus strategies.	4.26	0.69	Very High

11. The college administrator aligns the institutional vision with the day-to-day work tasks of the faculty.	4.36	0.64	Very High
12. The college administrator mobilizes the academic community around shared strategic milestones.	4.32	0.68	Very High
As a Whole	4.35	0.59	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21-5.00)-Very High; (3.41-4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40)-Moderate; (1.81-2.60)-Low; (1.00-1.80)-Very Low</i>			

As a whole, Table 2 shows that academic leadership was assessed as very high ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.59$), indicating that the academic leadership of the local higher education institution is perceived to be exceptionally effective and consistently demonstrated across all measured indicators, exhibiting exemplary competence in providing strategic direction, promoting instructional excellence, fostering research and innovation, supporting faculty and student development, and ensuring continuous quality improvement. The findings further reflect a consistent perception of the institution's academic leadership across the indicators measured, suggesting that these leadership competencies are uniformly demonstrated in the institution's academic and administrative practices.

Among the three dimensions, technical skills obtained the highest mean score ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.63$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that administrators possess strong expertise in academic policies, curriculum management, institutional data systems, and evidence-based decision-making. The highest-rated indicator pertained to administrators' mastery of academic policies, guidelines, and national regulatory frameworks ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 0.60$), highlighting their competence in ensuring institutional compliance and quality assurance. This finding is consistent with Bush (2021), who emphasized that effective educational leaders require strong technical competence to implement policies, manage instructional programs, and sustain institutional quality. Likewise, UNESCO (2021) underscored that leadership effectiveness in higher education depends on administrators' capacity to integrate policy requirements with institutional practices. Similarly, OECD (2023) reported that technically competent educational leaders strengthen institutional performance through informed planning, monitoring, and continuous quality improvement.

Both human skills ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.66$) and conceptual skills ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.60$) likewise received very high ratings, indicating that administrators effectively cultivate positive interpersonal relationships while providing strategic direction for the institution. Under human skills, the highest-rated indicator was the establishment of institutional trust among faculty members ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.66$), whereas supporting the psychological well-being and morale of academic staff obtained the lowest, though still very high, rating ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.71$). These findings suggest that administrators maintain supportive leadership practices while recognizing the continuing need to strengthen faculty well-being initiatives. According to Benevene et al. (2022), leaders who foster trust, collaboration, and employee well-being contribute significantly to faculty engagement, commitment, and organizational effectiveness. Likewise, Kinman (2022) emphasized that supportive leadership and attention to employee well-being enhance motivation, resilience, and institutional performance. Furthermore, Northouse (2022) explained that leaders with strong interpersonal competencies create collaborative organizational climates that encourage communication, teamwork, and shared accountability.

With respect to conceptual skills, faculty members perceived administrators as highly capable of translating institutional vision into strategic action and aligning organizational goals with faculty responsibilities. The highest-rated indicators were administrators' ability to visualize the long-term sustainability of the college and align the institutional vision with faculty work ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.68$; $M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.64$, respectively). Meanwhile, translating complex national educational mandates into actionable campus strategies received the lowest rating, although it remained very high ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.69$). These findings indicate that administrators demonstrate strategic thinking and long-term planning while continuing to strengthen policy implementation at the institutional level. This observation supports Fullan (2023), who asserted that effective

educational leadership requires the ability to transform strategic visions into coherent institutional actions that improve organizational performance. Similarly, Bush (2021) emphasized that conceptual leadership enables academic institutions to navigate organizational change through strategic planning and shared vision. In addition, OECD (2023) highlighted that leaders with strong conceptual competencies are better equipped to guide institutional innovation and long-term sustainability.

Overall, the findings indicate that the local higher education institution demonstrates a very high level of academic leadership characterized by strong technical expertise, effective interpersonal leadership, and strategic vision. These competencies collectively create an enabling academic environment that supports faculty development, institutional effectiveness, and the achievement of organizational goals.

Level of E-Leadership of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 3. Level of E-Leadership of Local Higher Education Institution as a Whole and in Terms of Administrative Digitalization, Technological Infrastructure Management, and Digital Communication and Adaptability.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Administrative Digitalization	4.25	0.77	Very High
1. The institution utilizes secure cloud-based spaces for student grading systems and record tracking.	4.25	0.85	Very High
2. The management ensures that online administrative approvals are fast, efficient, and well-regulated.	4.28	0.8	Very High
3. The institutional administrative workflows are transparently tracked via online platforms.	4.2	0.88	High
4. The management sets clear digital guidelines for standard submission deadlines and tracking reports.	4.25	0.82	Very High
Technological Infrastructure Management	4.04	0.79	High
5. The college optimizes the deployment and daily utilization of Learning Management Systems (LMS).	4.18	0.8	High
6. The management ensures reliable internet access and campus IT support for active instruction.	3.95	0.88	High
7. The institution updates academic software and digital lab resources to meet current technological trends.	3.99	0.93	High
8. The leadership provides secure digital workspaces and communication devices for faculty administrative work.	4.03	0.8	High
Digital Communication and Adaptability	4.24	0.69	Very High
9. The school leaders communicate institutional updates clearly via electronic channels.	4.16	0.74	High
10. The academic heads demonstrate agility when adapting to sudden shifts in educational technology.	4.28	0.73	Very High
11. The management encourages creative problem-solving using collaborative digital platforms.	4.26	0.76	Very High
12. The leaders maintain a healthy boundary between digital work hours and off-duty faculty personal time.	4.27	0.73	Very High
As a Whole	4.18	0.71	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21-5.00)-Very High; (3.41-4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40)-Moderate; (1.81-2.60)-Low; (1.00-1.80)-Very Low</i>			

Table 3 presents the level of e-leadership of the local higher education institution in terms of administrative digitalization, technological infrastructure management, and digital communication and adaptability. Overall, e-leadership was evaluated as very high ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.71$), indicating that the e-leadership of the local higher education institution is generally evident and demonstrated to a considerable extent, reflecting well-established

digital leadership practices that effectively support academic and administrative functions, facilitate efficient communication and organizational processes, and promote the institution's responsiveness to technological demands. The findings further suggest a generally consistent perception of e-leadership across the indicators measured, demonstrating that digital leadership practices are regularly evident throughout the institution's academic and administrative operations.

Among the three dimensions, administrative digitalization obtained the highest mean score ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.77$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that digital systems are widely utilized to enhance administrative efficiency, transparency, and accountability. The highest-rated indicator was the efficient regulation of online administrative approvals ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.80$), while transparent tracking of administrative workflows through online platforms received the lowest, though still high, rating ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.88$). These findings imply that digital administrative processes are well established, although opportunities remain to further strengthen transparency across institutional platforms. This result supports Bond et al. (2021), who emphasized that digital transformation in higher education improves organizational efficiency, administrative effectiveness, and institutional responsiveness. Likewise, UNESCO (2023) highlighted that digitally enabled governance enhances accountability, institutional coordination, and service delivery in higher education. Similarly, OECD (2023) reported that digital administrative systems enable institutions to improve decision-making, operational efficiency, and stakeholder engagement.

Digital communication and adaptability likewise attained a very high rating ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.69$), indicating that institutional leaders effectively utilize digital communication tools while demonstrating flexibility in responding to technological changes. The highest-rated indicator referred to administrators' agility in adapting to emerging educational technologies ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.73$), whereas communicating institutional updates through electronic channels obtained the lowest, though still high, mean score ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.74$). These findings suggest that administrators successfully embrace digital innovation while maintaining effective communication practices. According to Crawford et al. (2021), educational leaders who demonstrate adaptability and digital competence are better equipped to sustain institutional continuity and organizational resilience. Likewise, Bozkurt et al. (2021) emphasized that adaptive digital leadership strengthens collaboration, innovation, and responsiveness within higher education institutions. Furthermore, UNESCO (2023) noted that effective digital communication fosters institutional transparency, stakeholder participation, and organizational agility.

In contrast, technological infrastructure management received the lowest overall rating, although it remained high ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.79$). This indicates that the institution generally provides adequate technological resources and information technology support but may further enhance its digital infrastructure to meet evolving educational demands. The highest-rated indicator involved the effective utilization of Learning Management Systems ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.80$), whereas ensuring reliable internet connectivity and campus IT support recorded the lowest mean score ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.88$). These results imply that while digital learning platforms are effectively implemented, continuous investment in technological infrastructure remains essential. This finding is consistent with OECD (2023), which emphasized that reliable digital infrastructure is fundamental to sustaining quality teaching, learning, and institutional operations. Similarly, World Bank (2022) reported that strategic investments in educational technology and digital connectivity enhance institutional efficiency and learning outcomes. In addition, Bond et al. (2021) concluded that robust technological infrastructure serves as a critical foundation for successful digital transformation in higher education.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the local higher education institution exhibits a very high level of e-leadership characterized by effective administrative digitalization, adaptive digital communication, and generally strong technological management. These capabilities indicate that institutional leaders have successfully incorporated digital practices that support efficient administration, organizational adaptability, and the continuous improvement of higher education services.

Level of Faculty Job Satisfaction in Local Higher Education Institution

Table 4. Level of Faculty Job Satisfaction in Local Higher Education Institution as a whole and in terms of Work Environment and Support, Compensation and Recognition, and Professional Growth Opportunities.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work Environment and Support	4.02	0.78	High
1. The local college environment provides adequate physical facilities conducive to teaching.	3.91	0.91	High
2. I feel physically and emotionally safe while performing my academic duties on campus.	4.16	0.74	High
3. The academic workload distribution is reasonable and fair across department members.	4.19	0.74	High
4. The administration provides sufficient classroom materials and teaching aids.	3.82	1.04	High
Compensation and Recognition	4.04	0.79	High
5. The local college offers fair compensation that aligns with my educational attainment and academic rank.	3.99	0.83	High
6. My contributions to the college's academic and community goals are regularly recognized.	4.1	0.84	High
7. The institutional benefits package provides meaningful security for myself and my family.	4.04	0.86	High
8. Outstanding performance in research or teaching is rewarded with appropriate honors or incentives.	4.03	0.9	High
Professional Growth Opportunities	4.09	0.87	High
9. The college actively sponsors faculty attendance at national or international research conferences.	4.11	0.93	High
10. There is a transparent and accessible roadmap for promotion and career advancement.	4.15	0.87	High
11. The institution provides funding or study leave for continuing advanced graduate studies.	3.9	1.03	High
12. Regular in-service training programs enrich my instructional and administrative capabilities.	4.18	0.87	High
As a Whole	4.05	0.77	High
<i>Legend: (4.21-5.00)-Very High; (3.41-4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40)-Moderate; (1.81-2.60)-Low; (1.00-1.80)-Very Low</i>			

Table 4 presents the level of faculty job satisfaction in the local higher education institution in terms of work environment and support, compensation and recognition, and professional growth opportunities. Overall, faculty job satisfaction was rated high ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.77$), indicating that the faculty members demonstrate a high level of job satisfaction, reflecting generally favorable perceptions of their work responsibilities, institutional support, and workplace environment. The findings further suggest a generally consistent perception of job satisfaction across the indicators measured, reflecting similar assessments of their work responsibilities, institutional support, and workplace environment.

Among the three dimensions, professional growth opportunities obtained the highest mean score ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.87$), interpreted as high. This indicates that faculty members perceive the institution as supportive of their career development through training, promotion opportunities, and participation in scholarly activities. The highest-rated indicator was the provision of regular in-service training programs that enhance instructional and administrative competencies ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.87$), while funding or study leave for advanced graduate studies received the lowest rating within the dimension ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.03$). These findings imply that although professional development initiatives are widely available, greater institutional support for advanced academic studies may further strengthen faculty satisfaction. This finding is consistent with OECD (2023), which emphasized that continuous professional development enhances teacher motivation, instructional effectiveness, and organizational commitment. Likewise, UNESCO (2022) highlighted that sustained investments in faculty

learning and career advancement contribute to higher institutional quality and employee satisfaction. Similarly, Toropova et al. (2021) found that opportunities for professional growth significantly influence teachers' job satisfaction and long-term retention.

Compensation and recognition ranked second with a high level ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.79$). Faculty members generally perceived that their compensation, benefits, and recognition practices are appropriate and contribute positively to their work experience. The highest-rated indicator was the regular recognition of contributions to the institution's academic and community goals ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.84$), whereas the perceived fairness of compensation relative to educational attainment and academic rank obtained the lowest mean score ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.83$). These results indicate that recognition mechanisms are positively perceived, although compensation practices may still be strengthened to further improve faculty satisfaction. This observation supports Herzberg et al.'s motivation-hygiene theory, which identifies compensation as a foundational factor influencing employee satisfaction. Consistent with this perspective, Benevene et al. (2022) reported that recognition and organizational appreciation enhance employee engagement, commitment, and job satisfaction in educational settings. Likewise, OECD (2023) emphasized that fair compensation and meaningful recognition contribute to teacher retention and improved organizational performance.

Finally, work environment and support recorded a high level ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.78$). This finding indicates that faculty members generally perceive their workplace as safe, supportive, and conducive to teaching. The highest-rated indicator was the perception of physical and emotional safety while performing academic duties ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.74$), whereas the provision of sufficient classroom materials and teaching aids obtained the lowest mean score ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.04$). This suggests that although the institutional environment is viewed positively, additional investments in instructional resources could further improve faculty satisfaction. These findings align with Kinman (2022), who emphasized that supportive working conditions and adequate institutional resources positively influence employee well-being and job satisfaction. Similarly, UNESCO (2022) highlighted that safe, resource-rich, and supportive educational environments enhance faculty productivity and organizational effectiveness. Moreover, Toropova et al. (2021) concluded that favorable working conditions are among the strongest predictors of teacher job satisfaction.

Overall, the findings indicate that faculty members exhibit a high level of job satisfaction, reflecting favorable perceptions of their professional development opportunities, compensation and recognition systems, and work environment. The consistently high ratings suggest that the institution has established supportive organizational practices that contribute to faculty motivation and commitment while identifying areas for continuous improvement in instructional resources and career development support.

Relationship Between Institutional Capability and Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 5. Relationship between the Level of Institutional Capability and Level of Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Institutional Capability vs. Faculty Job Satisfaction	0.754**	<0.001	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 5 presents the relationship between the level of institutional capability and the level of faculty job satisfaction in the local higher education institution using Spearman's rank-order correlation. The analysis revealed a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($r_s = .754$, $p < .001$). Since the obtained p -value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The result indicates that higher levels of institutional capability are associated with higher levels of faculty job satisfaction. This implies that as the institution strengthens its academic administration, budget and financial management, and personnel administration capabilities, faculty members tend to experience greater satisfaction with their work environment, compensation and recognition, and opportunities for professional growth. The

strength of the correlation further suggests that institutional capability is a substantial organizational factor influencing faculty job satisfaction.

This finding is consistent with Toropova et al. (2021), who reported that institutional conditions, including effective organizational management, administrative support, and resource availability, are significant predictors of teachers' job satisfaction. Similarly, Benevene et al. (2022) found that supportive organizational practices and effective institutional management foster higher employee well-being, engagement, and job satisfaction within educational institutions. Likewise, OECD (2023) emphasized that institutions characterized by sound governance, efficient resource management, and responsive administrative systems are more likely to maintain a satisfied, committed, and productive academic workforce.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that institutional capability plays a significant role in promoting faculty job satisfaction. Strengthening organizational systems and administrative capacities is therefore essential in cultivating a supportive academic environment that enhances faculty motivation, commitment, and overall organizational effectiveness.

Relationship Between Academic Leadership and Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 6. Relationship between the Level of Academic Leadership and Level of Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Academic Leadership vs. Faculty Job Satisfaction	0.706**	<0.001	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 6 presents the relationship between the level of academic leadership and the level of faculty job satisfaction in the local higher education institution using Spearman's rank-order correlation. The analysis revealed a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between academic leadership and faculty job satisfaction ($r_s = .706$, $p < .001$). Since the obtained p -value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The findings indicate that improvements in academic leadership are associated with higher levels of faculty job satisfaction. Specifically, administrators who demonstrate strong technical, human, and conceptual leadership skills contribute to a more satisfying work environment for faculty members. The strength of the correlation suggests that effective academic leadership substantially influences faculty perceptions of their work environment, professional development, compensation, recognition, and overall organizational experience.

This finding corroborates the study of Nguyen et al. (2023), who reported that effective academic leadership significantly enhances faculty job satisfaction by promoting supportive supervision, collaborative decision-making, and professional empowerment. Likewise, Benevene et al. (2022) found that leadership characterized by trust, communication, and employee support positively influences faculty engagement, well-being, and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. Similarly, OECD (2023) emphasized that educational leaders who demonstrate strong instructional, interpersonal, and strategic leadership competencies create positive organizational climates that strengthen employee commitment, motivation, and satisfaction.

Overall, the results demonstrate that academic leadership is a significant determinant of faculty job satisfaction. Strengthening administrators' leadership competencies in managing academic programs, fostering positive interpersonal relationships, and providing strategic direction can therefore enhance faculty satisfaction and contribute to the continuous improvement of institutional performance.

Relationship Between E-Leadership and Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution

Table 7. Relationship between the Level of E-Leadership and Level of Faculty Job Satisfaction of Local Higher Education Institution.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
E-Leadership vs. Faculty Job Satisfaction	0.784**	<0.001	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 7 presents the relationship between the level of e-leadership and the level of faculty job satisfaction in the local higher education institution using Spearman's rank-order correlation. The analysis revealed a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between e-leadership and faculty job satisfaction ($r_s = .784$, $p < .001$). Since the obtained p -value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The findings indicate that higher levels of e-leadership are associated with higher levels of faculty job satisfaction. This suggests that administrators who effectively implement digital technologies, manage technological infrastructure, and promote adaptive digital communication contribute to a more satisfying work environment for faculty members. The strong magnitude of the correlation further implies that e-leadership is a major organizational factor influencing faculty satisfaction, particularly in contemporary higher education settings where digital transformation has become integral to institutional operations.

This finding is supported by Bond et al. (2021), who asserted that effective digital leadership enhances organizational efficiency, collaboration, and faculty engagement by integrating technology into institutional governance and academic processes. Likewise, UNESCO (2023) emphasized that digitally competent educational leaders foster responsive, innovative, and inclusive institutional environments that strengthen employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Similarly, OECD (2023) reported that higher education institutions with effective digital leadership and robust digital governance are better positioned to support employee productivity, adaptability, and overall job satisfaction.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that e-leadership is a significant determinant of faculty job satisfaction. Strengthening administrators' digital leadership competencies, technological management, and digital communication practices can therefore enhance faculty satisfaction while supporting institutional innovation and sustainable organizational development.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the observed findings determined in this study, the conclusions drawn are as follows:

The local higher education institution possesses a very high level of institutional capability, demonstrating consistently and extensively effective governance, competent personnel, sufficient financial and material resources, sound organizational systems, and efficient operational processes that collectively support the successful attainment of its educational mandate and strategic priorities.

The institution demonstrates a high level of e-leadership, indicating that digital leadership practices are generally evident and demonstrated to a considerable extent through administrative digitalization, technological infrastructure management, and digital communication and adaptability, supporting academic and administrative functions and the institution's responsiveness to technological demands.

Faculty members experience a high level of job satisfaction, reflecting generally favorable perceptions of their work responsibilities, institutional support, and workplace environment, particularly in terms of work environment and support, compensation and recognition, and professional growth opportunities.

Institutional capability significantly contributes to faculty job satisfaction, indicating that effective organizational systems and administrative practices are essential in fostering a supportive and satisfying academic work environment.

Academic leadership significantly influences faculty job satisfaction, highlighting the importance of competent and supportive academic administrators in promoting faculty engagement, motivation, and organizational effectiveness.

E-leadership significantly contributes to faculty job satisfaction, emphasizing the role of digital leadership competencies in creating an adaptive, innovative, and supportive institutional environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher humbly offers his deepest gratitude and highest praise to the Almighty God, whose infinite wisdom, unfailing grace, and abundant blessings made the completion of this scholarly endeavor possible. Through every challenge, uncertainty, and demanding phase of this academic journey, His divine guidance, strength, and providence continually inspired the researcher to persevere and accomplish this significant milestone. The researcher extends his profound appreciation to his esteemed adviser, statistician, and language critic, for their exceptional mentorship, scholarly competence, unwavering encouragement, and invaluable guidance throughout every stage of this dissertation. The researcher also conveys his heartfelt appreciation to the Chairman and distinguished members of the panel for their scholarly evaluation, insightful observations, constructive criticisms, and valuable recommendations. Their expertise and thoughtful suggestions greatly contributed to refining the methodological soundness, academic integrity, and overall quality of this dissertation.

Sincere appreciation is likewise extended to the officials and administrators of a local higher education institution in the Negros Island Region, particularly the institutional head, deans, and other academic administrators, for granting permission and extending their full cooperation during the conduct of this study. The researcher is likewise grateful to the full-time permanent and full-time contractual faculty members who generously served as respondents. Their willingness to participate, thoughtful responses, and meaningful contributions provided the empirical foundation necessary for examining institutional capability, academic leadership, e-leadership, and faculty job satisfaction in local higher education institutions. Finally, the researcher expresses his deepest gratitude to his beloved family for their unconditional love, immeasurable sacrifices, constant prayers, unwavering encouragement, and steadfast confidence in his abilities. Their enduring support and understanding served as a continuous source of inspiration and strength throughout this demanding academic pursuit. This dissertation stands as a testament not only to the researcher's perseverance but also to the collective support, generosity, and guidance of all those who became part of this remarkable academic journey.

REFERENCES

1. Apdian, V., & Prado, N. (2024). Transformational leadership, cultural intelligence, self-efficacy, and productivity among higher education faculty: A structural model. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 55(1), 203–233.
2. Benevene, P., De Stasio, S., Fiorilli, C., Buonomo, I., Ragni, B., Briegas, J. J. M., & Barni, D. (2022). Effect of teachers' happiness on teachers' health. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 849335. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.849335>
3. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2021). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00282-x>
4. Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirsch, V., Schuwer, R., Egorov, G., Lambert, S. R., Al-Freih, M., Pete, J., Olcott, D., Jr., Rodes, V., Aranciaga, I., Bali, M., Alvarez, A. V., Roberts, J., Pazurek, A., Raffaghelli, J. E., Panagiotou, N., de Coëtlogon, P., ... Paskevicius, M. (2021). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1–126.
5. Bush, T. (2021). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage.
6. Commission on Higher Education. (2023). *Higher education statistical bulletin*. <https://ched.gov.ph>
7. Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P., & Lam, S. (2021). COVID-19: Twenty countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 3(1), 1–20.

8. Franco, J. (2023). The relationship between servant leadership and employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Basis for a proposed model for higher educational institutions. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 12(3), 45–58.
9. Fullan, M. (2023). *The new meaning of educational change* (6th ed.). Teachers College Press.
10. Hazelkorn, E., & Gibson, A. (2022). *Research handbook on quality, performance and accountability in higher education*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
11. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
12. Kasalak, G., Güneri, B., Ehtiyar, V. R., Apaydin, Ç., & Türker, G. Ö. (2022). The relation between leadership styles in higher education institutions and academic staff's job satisfaction: A meta-analysis study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1038824. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1038824>
13. Kinman, G. (2022). Supporting the well-being of higher education employees: A review of the evidence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11598. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811598>
14. Lucero, H. R., Victoriano, J. M., Carpio, J. T., & Fernando, P. G., Jr. (2022). *Assessment of e-learning readiness of faculty members and students in the government and private higher education institutions in the Philippines*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.06069>
15. Maheshwari, G., Clarke, S., Nguyen, Q.-A. N., McClelland, R., & Kunte, M. (2024). Effect of e-leadership on employees' outcomes in the higher education sector during COVID-19 and beyond: A case study from Vietnam. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231222715>
16. Nguyen, T. D., Pham, H. H., & Tran, T. (2023). Academic leadership and faculty job satisfaction in higher education: The mediating role of organizational support. *Education Sciences*, 13(9), 901. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090901>
17. Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
18. OECD. (2022). *Education at a glance 2022: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
19. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b14bef59-en>
20. Privitera, G. J., & Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. (2022). *Research methods for education* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
21. Salmi, J. (2021). *Tertiary education and the sustainable development goals*. World Bank.
22. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research methods for business students* (9th ed.). Pearson.
23. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction, stress, and professional engagement: A review of recent research. *Educational Research Review*, 33, 100389.
24. Smith, A., & Egitim, S. (2024). Governance of higher education institutions through faculty perspectives. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 5(2), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0473>
25. Sunaengsih, C., Maulana, M., Djuanda, D., Rosalin, E., Thahir, M., & Nurafifah, T. S. (2024). E-leadership in effective higher education management. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 11(4), 807–827. <https://doi.org/10.53400/mimbar-sd.v11i4.79400>
26. Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>
27. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
28. UNESCO. (2022). *Transforming higher education for the future*. UNESCO Publishing.
29. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO.
30. Vannasuk, N. (2024). *Needs assessment of participatory school management for educational quality development of small primary schools under the Office of Basic Education Commission* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED648489).
31. World Bank. (2022). *Achieving quality education through efficient public spending*. World Bank.