

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## The Impact of Socio-Demographic Profile on Campus Head's Managerial Effectiveness in Academic Institutions

**DR. DAN DAVE A. ABATON**

*Bukidnon State University*

**Corresponding Author:** DR. DAN DAVE A. ABATON, **E-mail:** [dandaveabatn@buku.edu.ph](mailto:dandaveabatn@buku.edu.ph)

---

| ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of demographic profiles on managerial effectiveness among satellite campus heads in a state university in Bukidnon, Philippines. Utilizing a descriptive quantitative causal cross-sectional design, data were collected from 146 faculty and staff members through a structured questionnaire assessing various dimensions of managerial effectiveness. The analysis revealed significant differences in managerial effectiveness ratings based on age, employment status, and salary. Notably, younger respondents rated their campus heads more favorably than older respondents, while contractual employees perceived their leaders as more effective compared to regular employees. These findings highlight the importance of considering demographic factors in leadership evaluations and suggest that tailored leadership strategies are essential for fostering an inclusive and effective management environment. The study underscores the need for higher education institutions to adapt their leadership development initiatives to meet the diverse expectations of their staff, ultimately enhancing organizational success.

| KEYWORDS

Demographic Profile, Managerial Effectiveness, Higher Education

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 16 August 2025

**PUBLISHED:** 27 October 2025

**DOI:** 10.61424/rjbe.v3.i2.447

---

### 1. Introduction

In the realm of higher education, leadership is pivotal for fostering effective management and achieving institutional goals. The capacity of leaders to navigate complex environments and inspire their teams significantly influences organizational outcomes (Scott, 2022). Recent research has highlighted how demographic factors—such as age, sex, and employment status—play a crucial role in shaping perceptions of managerial effectiveness among faculty and staff (Jamali et al., 2022; Twenge et al., 2010).

Age, for instance, affects leadership expectations; younger employees often favor modern and flexible approaches compared to their older counterparts, who may prefer more traditional leadership styles (Twenge et al., 2012). Similarly, sex has been examined as a potential determinant of leadership effectiveness, although findings suggest that when leadership styles align with institutional culture, sex does not significantly impact evaluations (Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014).

Employment status further complicates these dynamics, with regular employees typically having a stronger connection to the institution than contractual employees. This can lead to differing perceptions of managerial effectiveness, as contractual workers may feel more reliant on their leaders for job security and advancement (Kezar

& Maxey, 2013). Understanding these relationships is essential for developing effective leadership strategies that resonate with a diverse workforce.

This study aims to explore the relationship between demographic profiles and managerial effectiveness in satellite campuses of a state university, providing insights into how these factors influence leadership evaluations and highlighting the implications for institutional success.

## **2. Literature Review**

Demographic variables have been extensively studied in organizational contexts, revealing their significant impact on leadership perceptions. Age, for instance, influences leadership expectations, with younger employees often favoring more modern, flexible approaches compared to their older counterparts (Twenge et al., 2010). Similarly, sex has been examined as a potential determinant of leadership effectiveness, although findings suggest that when leadership styles align with organizational culture, sex does not significantly impact evaluations (Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014).

Employment status also contributes to differing perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Regular employees, enjoying job security, may assess their leaders more critically than contractual employees, who often rely heavily on managerial support for career advancement (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). This discrepancy underscores the need to understand how socio-demographic factors influence leadership dynamics and effectiveness in academic settings.

## **3. Methodology**

This study adopted a descriptive quantitative causal cross-sectional design to investigate the relationship between demographic profiles and managerial effectiveness among satellite campus heads. The research focused on a sample of 146 full-time teaching and non-teaching personnel selected through random sampling from a total population of 233 at 12 satellite campuses of a state university in Bukidnon, Philippines.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire that assessed demographic profiles and various dimensions of managerial effectiveness, including people management, task management, conflict management, and strategic management. The instrument underwent expert validation to ensure reliability and validity.

Participants were informed about the study's objectives and their right to withdraw at any time, ensuring ethical compliance. The survey was distributed to faculty and staff across the campuses, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of how demographic factors influence perceptions of managerial effectiveness.

Statistical analysis was conducted using non-parametric tests due to the non-normal distribution of the data. The Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to examine differences in managerial effectiveness ratings across different demographic groups. Dunn's post-hoc test was applied to identify specific group differences.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

The demographic profile of the respondents revealed notable trends, as summarized in Table 1. This table provides a comprehensive breakdown of the baseline characteristics, including age, sex, employment status, and monthly salary. Understanding these characteristics is crucial for contextualizing perceptions of managerial effectiveness within academic institutions.

**Table 1**  
*Frequency Distribution of Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents*

Baseline characteristic	Frequency	Percent
	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Age Bracket</b>		
44-59	15	10.27
28-43	95	65.07
18-27	35	23.97
60 and above	1	00.69
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	85	58.22
Female	61	41.78
<b>Employment Status</b>		
Regular	79	54.11
Contractual	67	45.89
<b>Monthly Salary</b>		
24,164.00 - 48,327.00	88	60.27
12,082.00 - 24,163.00	49	33.57
12,081.00 and below	9	6.16

The majority of respondents were Millennials (65.07%), followed by Generation Z (23.97%). Generation X constituted 10.27%, and Baby Boomers accounted for only 0.69%. This generational focus highlights a preference for collaboration and innovation; however, the limited representation of older generations raises questions about the comprehensiveness of the findings regarding managerial effectiveness.

In terms of sex, 58.22% of respondents were female, while 41.78% were male. This gender disparity suggests that the views of female respondents may significantly influence assessments of leadership, as women often favor collaborative styles. The underrepresentation of males could skew perceptions of leadership effectiveness, indicating a need for managers to be aware of these dynamics.

Regarding employment status, 54.11% were regular employees, and 45.89% were contractual. Regular employees may feel more committed to the institution, positively affecting their views on managerial effectiveness, while contractual employees may adopt a more critical stance due to their temporary status.

In terms of income, 60.27% of respondents fell into the lower middle-income class (₱24,164 to ₱48,327), while 33.57% were in the low-income class (₱12,082 to ₱24,163). The small percentage (6.16%) from the lowest income bracket limits insights into their experiences. Employees from more stable financial backgrounds generally expect fairness and growth opportunities, while those in lower-income categories often prioritize job security.

These findings underscore the need to consider socio-demographic factors in evaluations of managerial effectiveness. The predominance of younger generations and the gender imbalance suggest that leadership styles should adapt to diverse expectations. Addressing the varying needs of employees based on employment status and income levels is essential for fostering effective management practices. Future research should aim for a more inclusive representation to capture a broader range of perspectives on leadership dynamics.

The assessment of managerial effectiveness among campus heads is summarized in Table 2. This table presents the mean scores and standard deviations for four key dimensions of managerial effectiveness: People Management, Task Management, Conflict Management, and Strategic Management.

**Table 2**

*Summary of Respondents' Assessment of the Managerial Effectiveness of their Campus Head*

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Interpretation
People Management	4.29	0.82	Always	Highly Effective
Task Management	4.23	0.82	Always	Highly Effective
Conflict Management	4.27	0.81	Always	Highly Effective
Strategic Management	4.43	0.72	Always	Highly Effective
<b>Over-All</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>Always</b>	<b>Highly Effective</b>

*Note:* 1.00 – 1.80 (Very Poorly Effective); 1.81 – 2.60 (Poorly Effective); 2.61 – 3.40 (Moderately Effective); 3.41 – 4.20 (Satisfactorily Effective); 4.21 – 5.00 (Highly Effective)

The overall mean score for managerial effectiveness was 4.31 (SD = 0.79), reflecting a strong consensus among respondents regarding the high effectiveness of campus heads. Strategic Management received the highest mean score of 4.43 (SD = 0.72), illustrating campus heads' proficiency in long-term planning and goal setting. This finding aligns with Dyer and Dyer (2017), who emphasize the importance of strategic leadership for institutional sustainability. People Management scored 4.29 (SD = 0.82), indicating effective personnel management and a supportive work environment. Bush and Middlewood (2013) highlight the significance of fostering a positive organizational culture, which correlates with increased morale and job satisfaction.

Task Management, with a mean score of 4.23 (SD = 0.82), reflects the capacity of campus heads to effectively organize tasks to meet institutional goals. Daly et al. (2020) underline the importance of task optimization for organizational success, a view supported by the high rating in this dimension. Conflict Management scored 4.27 (SD = 0.81), demonstrating the effectiveness of campus heads in resolving conflicts and maintaining harmony. Effective conflict resolution is crucial for institutional performance, as noted by Erzen and Armağan (2015).

Overall, these findings suggest that campus heads exhibit a balanced approach to managerial effectiveness, excelling in both operational tasks and strategic planning. The high ratings across all dimensions highlight the importance of strong managerial competencies in educational leadership, reinforcing the need for leaders to effectively manage people, tasks, and conflicts to ensure institutional success.

This study examines how respondents' assessments of their campus heads' managerial effectiveness vary based on socio-demographic factors, as summarized in Table 3. Significant differences were found in relation to age, employment status, and monthly salary, while sex did not show a significant impact.

**Table 3**

*Summary of Statistical Tests on Respondents' Assessments of Campus Heads' Managerial Effectiveness by Socio-Demographic Profile*

Socio-Demographic Profile	Test Used	Statistics (df)	p-value	Decision on Ho
Age Bracket	Kruskal-Wallis	$\chi^2(2) = 10.767$	0.005	rejected
Sex	Mann-Whitney U	U = 2203.500	0.164	Failed to reject
Employment Status	Mann-Whitney U	U = 1437.500	< 0.001	rejected
Monthly Salary	Kruskal-Wallis	$\chi^2(2) = 17.382$	< 0.001	rejected

*Note.* A p-value of less than 0.05 indicates a statistically significant difference.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that older respondents (ages 44-59) rated their campus heads' effectiveness lower than younger respondents (ages 18-27 and 28-43), suggesting generational differences in leadership expectations ( $\chi^2(2) = 10.767$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ). Younger employees may favor modern, flexible leadership styles, whereas older employees might prefer traditional approaches (Twenge et al., 2012).

Regarding Employment Status, contractual employees rated their campus heads more favorably than regular employees (U = 1437.500,  $p < 0.001$ ). This may be due to job security concerns among contractual workers, who often rely on positive relationships with their managers for stability (Bakker et al., 2020). In contrast, regular employees, feeling more secure, may express more critical views based on their long-term engagement with the organization (Barden, 2018).

For Monthly Salary, lower-income respondents rated their campus heads more positively than higher-income respondents ( $\chi^2(2) = 17.382$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This difference may arise from varying expectations, with lower-income employees valuing supportive leadership more than their higher-income counterparts, who might have performance-oriented expectations (Kara et al., 2018; Sherman, 2018).

In contrast, no significant differences were observed based on sex (U = 2203.500,  $p = 0.164$ ). This aligns with findings that suggest evaluations of leadership effectiveness are consistent across genders when leadership behaviors meet organizational standards (Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Cundiff, 2022).

Overall, the results indicate that assessments of campus heads' managerial effectiveness significantly differ based on age, employment status, and monthly salary, while sex does not play a significant role. These findings suggest that leadership strategies should be tailored to meet the diverse needs of staff, promoting adaptive or transformational leadership styles to enhance managerial effectiveness and satisfaction across demographic groups. Consequently, the null hypothesis stating no significant differences in assessments based on socio-demographic profiles was partially rejected for age, employment status, and salary, but accepted for sex.

## 5. Conclusion

This study highlights the significant influence of demographic factors on perceptions of managerial effectiveness among faculty and staff at satellite campuses of a state university. The findings indicate that age, employment status, and monthly salary play critical roles in shaping how employees assess their campus heads, while sex appears to have no significant impact.

Younger employees, particularly those aged 18-27 and 28-43, tend to favor modern and flexible leadership styles, contrasting with older employees who prefer more traditional approaches. This generational divide emphasizes the

need for leaders to adapt their styles to meet the expectations of a diverse workforce. Furthermore, the study reveals that contractual employees rate their campus heads more favorably than regular employees, possibly due to the latter's greater job security and critical engagement with the institution. Additionally, lower-income respondents expressed more positive assessments of managerial effectiveness compared to their higher-income counterparts, suggesting that leadership perceptions are influenced by varying expectations related to job security and support. These findings underscore the importance of developing adaptive leadership strategies that consider the diverse needs and preferences of employees. By recognizing and addressing these demographic differences, institutional leaders can enhance managerial effectiveness and promote a more inclusive and supportive organizational culture.

Overall, the study contributes valuable insights into the dynamics of leadership evaluation in academic settings and highlights the necessity for ongoing research to explore these relationships further, ensuring that leadership practices resonate with all demographic groups. Future studies should aim for a more comprehensive representation to capture a broader range of perspectives on leadership effectiveness, ultimately fostering better management practices and institutional success.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**ORCID iD (if any):** <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7068-9069>

## References

- [1] Barden, C. L. (2018). The correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the Social Security Administration.
- [2] Bush, T., & Middlewood, D. (2013). *Leading and Managing People in Education*. London: SAGE.
- [3] Cundiff, N. L. (2022). Gender and organizational culture: Perceptions of leadership style and effectiveness. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, 41(1), 50-63.
- [4] Daly, E., Mohammed, D., Boglarsky, C., Blessinger, P., & Zeine, R.
- [5] (2020). Interaction facilitation and task facilitation need optimization in higher education institutions. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(3), 403-412. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2018-0062>
- [6] Dyer, G., & Dyer, M. (2017). Strategic leadership for sustainability by higher education: The American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140, 111-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.077>
- [7] Erzen, E., & Armağan, Y. (2015). The effect of leadership on conflict management. *Leadership and Organizational Outcomes: Meta-analysis of Empirical Studies*, 225-237.
- [8] Jamali, A., Bhutto, A., Khaskhely, M., & Sethar, W. (2022). Impact of leadership styles on faculty performance: Moderating role of organizational culture in higher education. *Management Science Letters*, 12(1), 1-20.
- [9] Kara, D., Kim, H., Lee, G., & Uysal, M. (2018). The moderating effects of gender and income between leadership and quality of work life (QWL). *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 1419-1435.
- [10] Kezar, Adrianna, and Daniel Maxey. "The Changing Academic Workforce." *Trusteeship* 21.3 (2013): 15-21.
- [11] Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., Walker, L. S., & Woehr, D. J. (2014). Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1129-1145.
- [12] Scott, G. (2022). Leadership versus management in higher education. In A. Blair, D. Evans, C. Hughes, & M. Tight (Eds.), *International Perspectives on Leadership in Higher Education* (Vol. 15, pp. 97-113). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-362820220000015006>
- [13] Sherman, A. J. (2018). *Effects of Income Level on the Relationship Between Leadership and Employee Behavior*. Walden University.
- [14] Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966-2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5), 1045-1062. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027408>