Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-2 | Issue-4 | June 2025
Original Researcher Article

Level Of Faculty Engagement In Research And Extension: Basis For Program Enhancement

Agripina F. Banayo[1], Maria Daisy F. Camilon[1], Arlene P. Madrio[2]
[1]Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Philippines
Email ID : agripina.banayo@lspu.edu.ph,
[2] Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Philippines

ABSTRACT
In order to achieve equitable social and economic growth, it is crucial to encourage and empower higher education institutions to serve as hubs for innovation, extension, and research and development. Thus, the study aimed to examine the level of faculty engagement in research and extension as a basis for program enhancement. A descriptive method in this study is used through a researcher-made survey questionnaire. A survey questionnaire is used as the main instrument in obtaining the quantitative data using Likert-scale surveys. The survey was conducted through Google Forms which were investigated using descriptive statistics particularly frequency count, percent, mean, and standard deviation. The findings proved that the faculty exhibited a positive perception towards the level of participation, performance, and motivation of faculty towards research and extension. Moreover, a significant relationship exists between the level of faculty engagement in terms of participation, performance, and motivation, and research and extension. The findings showed that with the use of strategic and developmental plans, LSPU-SPCC has developed its culture of research and extension. These plans have been enhanced by research and extension agendas, as well as manuals with implementing rules and regulations
Keywords: Faculty Engagement; Research and Extension; Program Enhancement

1. INTRODUCTION:

The role of faculty members and their engagement reflects their centrality in addressing the primary educational mission among colleges and universities. Some of the duties of faculty include effective classroom teaching, academic advising and counseling of students, participation in departmental committee work, continuous development of the curriculum through assessment, applied research or scholarly activity, and extension services. Under Republic Act 722, ”An Act Creating the Commission on Higher Education” states that the knowledge society characterizes the university not just as a generator of knowledge, an educator of young minds, and a transmitter of culture but also as a major agent of economic growth, a research and development laboratory and a mechanism through which the nations build its human capital to enable it actively participate in the global economy”.

It is therefore imperative to inspire and enable Higher Education institutions to become platforms for research and development, innovation, and extension in pursuit of inclusive social and economic development (CHED Memo No.52, series of 2016). Universities are expected to be a repository of the most specialized and skilled intellectuals. They serve as storehouses of knowledge for nurturing the manpower needs of the nation and, hence, for satisfying the aspirations of the people for a good and humane society. Universities across world portray a different picture of educational values, higher education system and faculty so employed. Universities are focusing majorly on research and development of their faculty as well as extension services.

Being a national mandate, it is obligatory to give the four functions equal attention. Hence, the Joint Circular No.1-A, s. 2016 amending the Joint Circular No.1-A, s. 2013 between the CHED, DBM and PASUC was issued to provide SUC levelling instrument and guidelines for implementation where the areas of instruction, research, extension, and management of resources will be evaluated in order to determine the University’s level of performance for budgetary support and incentives. Also, for SUCs to catch up with top universities and colleges in other ASEAN countries (Revised CES Manual 2014). LSPU-SPCC already has long established its research and extension culture via strategic and developmental plans. It has augmented those plans with research and extension agenda and manuals with implementing rules and regulations. It has research and extension organizational structures composed of vice president for research and extension, directors, college and program coordinators, faculty researchers and extensionists including students. Then, the research and extension councils which provides policy directions (Sedanza, 2023).

With regards to the workload for faculty with permanent and temporary status, official time specifies the time spent for instruction (30 hours) but research and extension may be carried out anytime provided one completes 180 hours of research and another 180 hours of extension for one year which should be properly documented. Faculty with designations should also document research and extension involvement equivalent to 360 hours. Time spent for research and extension activities is supported by certificate of involvement with attached evidences such as SO’s, certificate of attendance, certificate of service rendered, research papers, terminal reports, etc. A point system provides an objective way of crediting research

and extension involvement before a certificate is issued. The certificate of involvement is used as a basis for determining faculty performance in research and extension. Awards and incentives are provided to deserving faculty members as a form of intrinsic motivation in conducting research and extension (Research and Extension Manuals). In light of the above statement, this study aims to determine the level of faculty engagement in research and extension which will serve as a basis for program enhancement.

1.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There is tremendous diversity across higher education today regarding the strategic importance of community engagement. Higher Education Institutions have made progress, and others have transformed themselves into highly engaged colleges and universities.

Community engagement practices through research and extension are proving to be an effective response to core challenges for change that are now occurring across higher education. These include an emphasis on the creation of an inclusive and equitable learning environment for all and a focused agenda of engagement that reflects an alignment between academic strengths and community interests and objectives. These imperatives show us the future context for higher education culture and performance. Success in adapting to these priorities and expectations will be accelerated at institutions that recognize the power of community engagement strategies (Raina, K., & Khatri, P. (2015).

Work Engagement Theory of Kahn Work engagement denotes the degree to which a person shows self-preference in job tasks to promote connections between self and job, which can increase role performance through cognitive, emotional, and physical self-investment (Kahn, 1990). Based on the WE theory, this study believes that the WE theory should be divided into cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, and physical engagement. For example, a person who invests cognitive resources in work (e.g., I ought to work hard) to increase role performance is not necessarily to put emotional resources into a job (e.g., I am enthusiastic about work) or physical resources into a job (e.g., I actually work hard) at the same time.

Job Demands-Resources Model Employee engagement is also affected by Job Demands-Resources Model (Salminen et al., 2014). Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) model believes that different organizations may be confronted with different working environments, but the characteristics of these environments can always be classified into two general categories—job demands and job resources—thus constituting an overarching model that may be applied to various occupational settings, irrespective of the demands and resources involved. Job demands refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Examples are high work pressure, role overload, poor environmental conditions and problems related to reorganization.

Social Exchange Theory (SET) A stronger theoretical rationale for explaining employee engagement can be found in social exchange theory (SET). Levinson (1965) stated that employment is a transaction between labor, loyalty and actual interest, and social rewards. To a certain extent, the relationship between employee and employer is suitable for reciprocity, in which a request for a return will lead to beneficial results for both parties, no matter who gains preferential treatment. Masterson et al. (2000) proposed that one party expects a return in the future after contributing or providing services to the other party. At the same time, the party that gets something of value will produce a sense of responsibility to return to the other party. For individuals who have helped them, employees will actively give a return to gain more benefits in the future. Many scholars analysed the relationship between organizations and members based on social exchange theory. Employees are loyal to the organization and work hard in exchange for economic benefits and social rewards, establishing the organization-employee relationship.

Faculty who are highly engaged are indeed an asset to any organization, whereas disengaged faculty might end up being a major liability. Faculty are the storehouses of knowledge for nurturing the manpower needs of the nation and, hence, for satisfying the aspirations of the people for a good and humane society. Thus, this study aimed to discuss faculty engagement in the Higher Education Institution setting. The study utilized empirical research through desk review to evaluate the different dimensions of faculty engagement. The findings show that universities across the world portray a different picture of educational values, higher education system and faculty so employed. Faculty who are highly engaged are indeed an asset to any organization, whereas disengaged faculty might end up being a major liability. Nearly all studies conducted on faculty members show a growing tendency for absenteeism, intention to leave the profession, and early retirement of teachers, all of which reflect their disengaged condition. Faculty engagement is a significant predictor of enhanced student learning, which is the goal of all educational reforms. Engaged faculty will be more enthusiastic about investing more time and energy in teaching students. Further studies can be conducted to enhance the understanding of the effects of selected psychographic variables on faculty's job engagement and organizational engagement in the Philippines' educational context (Artates, 2023).

College and university outreach and engagement may be expressed through faculty teaching, research, and service. Engaged scholarship, service-learning, and public service and outreach are interrelated but involve different aspects of the faculty role. Engaged scholarship encompasses the research domain whereby faculty members incorporate a community orientation in their research agenda. Service-learning focuses on the teaching domain and involves a commitment to working with a community in ways that benefit the community and the faculty member's teaching. Public service and outreach focus on the service domain where faculty, and institutions more generally, lend their expertise to address community-based issues. In this

paper, we link this three-pronged conceptualization of faculty work to the broader community-university engagement movement. (Holland, B. A. (2016).

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to assess and determine the level of faculty engagement in research and extension which will serve as a basis for program enhancement.

Research development and extension services align with its university mission, provides quality education through responsive instruction, distinctive research, sustainable extension, and production services for improved quality of life. The researcher as a faculty member of Laguna State Polytechnic University -San Pablo City Campus would like to assess and determine faculty engagement in research and extension. Similarly, it is essential to assess the support of the organization especially the faculty members to motivate them to actively engage in research and extension. Hence, this study explored the following research questions:

What is the level of engagement in research and extension among faculty members in higher education in terms of:

Level of Participation:

School;

Community; and

Organization?

Level of Performance;

1.2.1 Professional Knowledge;

1.2.2 Training and Workshops; and

1.2.3 Skills and Abilities?

Level of Motivation;

1.3.1 Intrinsic; and

1.3.2 Extrinsic?

Which level of engagement greatly affects the research and extension of the faculty?

Does the following level of faculty engagement significantly relate to their research and extension?

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This section explains the research design, context and participants, and the research instrument employed in the present research.

3.1. Research Design

A descriptive method in this study is used through a researcher-made survey questionnaire. In treating the collected data, the quantitative approach is significantly helpful in this study in which the researcher will design and control data collection and analysis. The correlational approach is employed to find out if any relationship exists between variables, that is how variables vary with one another.

3.2. Research Instrument

A survey questionnaire is used as the main instrument in obtaining the quantitative data using Likert-scale surveys. Data are gathered through frequency and percentage distribution. Descriptive analysis such as mean and standard deviation will also be utilized. Pearson r Product Moment Correlation coefficient will be used to determine the relationship of the variables.

To determine the level of engagement in research and extension among faculty in higher education, the researcher used the frequency and percentage distribution.

To determine the level of engagement that greatly affects the research and extension among faculty in higher education, the researcher used weighted mean and standard deviation.

To find out if this level of faculty engagement significantly relates to research and extension, the researcher used the Pearson r Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section constitutes tabular presentations of the gathered data that show its analysis with respective interpretations based on the statistical treatment used. Descriptive statistics for each indicator and scale are made, with remarks on these statistics. The data were examined and interpreted to generate conclusions and recommendations from the study. Statistical details for the indicators were presented individually and as a whole, asserting that the respondents have a favorable perception of their online environment and online learning experience.

4.1. Level of Participation

Table 1. The level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in school.

	Indicator: Participation of faculty in school	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	develops a plan for obtaining data and facts for research.	4.44	0.61	Agree
2	permits the right data to be evaluated for relevance and quality.	4.33	0.63	Agree
3	foster critical thinking in conducting research.	4.50	0.56	Strongly Agree
4	enable them to become research-oriented.	4.50	0.56	Strongly Agree
5	promote interest since it exposes us to a range of viewpoints and ideas.	4.44	0.56	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.44**	**0.58**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 1 represents the respondents' total weighted mean perception to the level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in school with an overall mean of 4.44. The highest mean of 4.50 shows that respondents strongly agree that fostering critical thinking in conducting research and the participation of faculty enable them to become research-oriented. The lowest mean with 4.33 states that respondents agree that participation of faculty towards research and extension in school permits the right data to be evaluated for relevance and quality.

Table 2. The level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in the community.

	Indicator: Participation of faculty in the community	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	strengthen informational resources that can help address the problem.	4.50	0.61	Strongly Agree
2	enable us to improve at identifying problems that may lead us to increase our performance.	4.42	0.50	Agree
3	cultivate strong communication abilities, which are essential for research.	4.50	0.56	Strongly Agree
4	help in tracing citations to unlock the scholarly conversation.	4.36	0.59	Agree
5	increase the likelihood of getting the exact information needed in research and extension.	4.56	0.50	Strongly Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.47**	**0.55**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 2 exhibits the level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in the community with an overall mean of 4.47. The highest mean of 4.50 shows that respondents strongly agree that the Participation of faculty in the community strengthens the informational resources that can help address the problem. Also, they strongly agree that it cultivate strong communication abilities, which are essential for research. The least mean of 3.36 shows that respondents agree that participation of faculty in the community helps in tracing citations to unlock the scholarly conversation.

The overall mean of 4.52 was shown in table 3 stating the level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in organization. With the highest mean of 4.61, respondents strongly agree that participation of faculty in the organization aims to increase the achievement rate through quality research. On the contrary, respondents agree that participation of faculty in the organization enhances the responsibilities to promote an advanced method of conducting research with a mean of 4.47.

Table 3. The level of participation of faculty towards research and extension in organization.

	Indicator: Participation of faculty in the organization	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	aim to increase the achievement rate through quality research.	4.61	0.49	Strongly Agree
2	enhance the responsibilities to promote an advanced method of conducting research.	4.47	0.56	Agree
3	stimulate the research work in the form of publications or presentations.	4.53	0.65	Strongly Agree
4	motivate academics to improve university research performance.	4.47	0.61	Agree
5	promote research output that leads to high-quality research.	4.50	0.51	Strongly Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.52**	**0.56**	**Strongly Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

4.2. Level of Performance

Table 4. By means of professional knowledge, the faculty members' level of performance in research and extension.

	Indicator: Level of performance in research and extension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	acknowledges advancements in research and extension activities.	4.47	0.61	Agree
2	provide an access to the most recent research findings.	4.33	0.63	Agree
3	enable them to become research-oriented and speaker in the extension.	4.39	0.65	Agree
4	encourages faculty members to participate in yearly research presentation activities to showcase their completed research outputs.	4.39	0.65	Agree

5	make them proficient in carrying out research and extension services.	4.33	0.68	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.38**	**0.64**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 4 shows the level of performance in research and extension with an overall mean of 4.38. The highest mean of 4.47 states that respondents agree by means of professional knowledge, the faculty members' level of performance in research and extension, it acknowledges advancement in research and activities. The least mean of 4.33 shows that respondents agree that it provides as access to the most recent research findings and make them proficient in carrying out research and extension services.

Table 5 represents the faculty members' level of performance in research and extension y means of training and workshops with an overall mean of 4.48. The highest mean of 4.56 states that the respondents strongly agree that training and workshops improve their professional growth.

Table 5. By means of training and workshops, the faculty member's level of performance in research and extension

	Indicator: Training and Workshops	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	amplifies productivity and effectiveness at work.	4.44	0.66	Agree
2	motivates faculty members to attend various training and seminars pertaining to their area.	4.50	0.66	Strongly Agree
3	improve their professional growth.	4.56	0.61	Strongly Agree
4	explore their experiences in conducting various researches.	4.44	0.70	Agree
5	enhance their information in creating innovative researches and extension services.	4.44	0.61	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.48**	**0.64**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

The least mean of 4.44 shows that respondents agree that training and workshops amplifies productivity and effectiveness at work, explore their experiences in conducting various research, and enhance their information in creating innovative research and extension services.

Table 6. Level of Performance of Faculty in Training and Workshop

	Indicator: By means of skills and abilities, the faculty members' level of performance in research and extension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	develop their skills and abilities in terms of major field of specialization.	4.50	0.51	Strongly Agree
2	enable us to improve at identifying problems that may lead us to increase our performance.	4.47	0.61	Agree
3	develop excellent communication skills, which are vital in research.	4.36	0.64	Agree
4	help in tracing citations to unlock the scholarly conversation.	4.31	0.75	Agree
5	increase the likelihood of getting the exact information needed in research.	4.42	0.55	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.41**	**0.61**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 6 shows the faculty members' level of performance in research and extension in terms of skills and abilities with an overall mean of 4.41. The highest mean of 4.50 states that the respondents strongly agree that skills and abilities develop their skills and abilities in terms of major field of specialization. The least mean of 4.31 implies that respondents agree that training and workshops develop excellent communication skills, which are vital in research help in tracing.

4.3. Level of Motivation

Table 7. Level of Intrinsic Motivation

	Indicator: The level of faculty intrinsic faculty motivation for research and extension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	strive to raise the success rate by doing high-caliber research and extension services.	4.39	0.65	Agree
2	increase the obligations to support innovative researches.	4.47	0.61	Agree

3	encourage the scientific effort through research presentation or publications.	4.25	0.63	Agree
4	inspire faculty to raise their performance in university research and providing more services.	4.39	0.60	Agree
5	motivate research output that results in research of greater quality.	4.33	0.63	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.35**	**0.64**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 7 implies that the faculty members' level of intrinsic motivation in research and extension with an overall mean of 4.35. The highest mean of 4.47 states that the respondents agree that the least mean of 4.25 infers that respondents agree that the level of intrinsic motivation encourage the scientific effort through research presentation or publications.

Table 8. Level of Extrinsic Motivation

	Indicator: The level of faculty extrinsic faculty motivation for research and extension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	lead faculty to become globally competitive.	4.36	0.76	Agree
2	explore their experiences in conducting more researches.	4.31	0.75	Agree
3	encourage faculty to develop their creativity and resourcefulness.	4.31	0.78	Agree
4	upgraded with technological competencies.	4.36	0.72	Agree
5	extend their linkages to community and other institutions.	4.40	0.76	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.34**	**0.76**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 8 display the faculty members' level of extrinsic motivation in research and extension in with an overall mean of 4.34. The highest mean of 4. 39 states that the respondents agree that the faculty's level of extrinsic motivation extend their linkages to community and other institutions. The least mean of 4.31 implies that the respondents both agreed that the level of faculty's extrinsic motivation encourage faculty to develop their creativity and resourcefulness and explore their experience in conducting more research.

4.4. Research and Extension

Table 9. Program and Activities

	Indicator: The program and activities influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	widen their capacity in making various research and extension.	4.44	0.61	Agree
2	create innovative extension and research needed in the community.	4.42	0.55	Agree
3	learn effective way to produce various research.	4.36	0.59	Agree
4	provide activities in order to produce more extension to the community.	4.44	0.56	Agree
5	gainfully develop their ability in conducting advanced researches.	4.36	0.59	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.41**	**0.58**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Based on Table 9, all statements relating to the program and activities influence the extensionist have the same "agreed" verbal interpretation with mean scores ranging from Mean 4.36 to 4.44 and SD .593 to .607. Respondents both agreed that program and activities influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to widen their capacity in making research and extension. It also provides activities in order to produce more extension to the community. It also creates innovative extension and research needed in the community and gainfully develops their ability to conduct advanced research.

Table 10. Community Coordination

	Indicator: The coordination to the community influences the extensionist and faculty researcher to	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**

1	enables the educational programs to reach and "touch the lives "of communities and the environment through services	4.39	0.65	Agree
2	transfer knowledge and technologies to create impact on holistic and sustainable development programs and people empowerment.	4.44	0.65	Agree
3	unlock the potential of agricultural innovation and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.	4.28	0.74	Agree
4	develop entrepreneurial ability among the beneficiaries	4.39	0.65	Agree
5	uplift the standard of living of the people in the community.	4.47	0.56	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.39**	**0.65**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

Table 10 implies that the coordination influences the extensionist and faculty researcher with an overall mean of 4.39. The highest mean of 4.47 states that the respondents agree that the coordination of the community influences the extensionist and faculty researcher to transfer knowledge and technologies to create impact on holistic and sustainable development programs and people empowerment. The least mean of 4. 28 infers that coordination to the community influences the extensionist and faculty researcher to unlock the potential of agricultural innovation and achieve the sustainable development goals.

Table 12 suggests that the research and extension output influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to supports research and extension to the extent that it leads to new and creative outcomes with an overall mean of 4.36.

Table 11. Budget Allocation

	Indicator: The budget allocation influences the extensionist and faculty researcher to	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	assists the academic researcher carry out their research and extension services.	4.25	0.81	Agree
2	generates research facilities for the research and development center and provide more extension activities.	4.22	0.72	Agree
3	provides financial support and assistance for faculty to present their findings at local, national, or international conferences.	4.12	0.81	Agree
4	encourages research among faculty members through training programs and seminars.	4.39	0.69	Agree
5	supports with in-house proposals, en banc and international publication and provide various extension services to the locals.	4.33	0.68	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.27**	**0.74**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

The highest mean of 4.44 states that research and extension output influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to train community members in research methods and analysis, which can be beneficial in a number of ways.

Table 12. Research and Extension Output

	Indicator: The research and extension output influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1	provide opportunities for integrating development theories and practice.	4.25	0.60	Agree
2	offer services to the needs of individuals and groups at the grassroots level.	4.33	0.68	Agree
3	train community members in research methods and analysis, which can be beneficial in a number of ways.	4.44	0.70	Agree
4	plays a competitiveness in the university, which ultimately enables the interest of the faculty to do their part in research as well as extension.	4.36	0.64	Agree

5	supports research and extension to the extent that it leads to new and creative outcomes.	4.42	0.73	Agree
	Over-all mean	**4.36**	**0.67**	**Agree**

Legend: 1.00-1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50-2.49=Disagree; 2.50-3.49=Uncertain; 3.50-4.49=Agree; 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree

The respondents agree that the least mean of 4.25 infers that respondents agree that the research and extension output influence the extensionist and faculty researcher to provide opportunities for integrating development theories and practice.

Table 13. Correlation between the Level of Faculty Engagement in terms of Participation and Research Extension

Level of Participation	**Program and Activities r-value**	**Community Coordination r-value**	**Budget Allocation r-value**	**Research and Extension Output r-value**
School	.734**	.462**	.671**	.585**
Community	.855**	.684**	.805**	.686**
Organization	.793**	.641**	.789**	.732**

Legend: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It can be depicted from Table 13 that it shows a highly positive significant correlation exist between the Level of Faculty Engagement in terms of Participation and Research and Extension. It can be inferred from the table that it contradicts some Universities Faculty in which they encountered difficulty in participating in program activities, community coordination, budget allocation, and research and extension output. In some universities, faculty encountered difficulties on their official time instruction that shows inefficiency in terms of their level of participation in research and extension. However, on the obtained result from this study, it contradicts the table since the LSPU-SPCC has already been long established in terms of their commitment to research and extension agenda. As mandated by the revised CES Manual (2014), SUCs should be on the pedestal in research and extension in to be more globally competitive as other ASEAN countries.

Moreover, the result shows that as the level of participation in terms of school, community, and organization increases, it implies that the result of the research extension will also increase. Research over the past decades also revealed that SBM has contributed to significant improvements in student achievements (Gamage, 2006). One of the initiatives of SBM is to engage faculty members in levelling their commitment in terms of instruction, research, extension, and school management. This shows that when there is a strong school-based management, the institution and faculty member's level of engagement in terms of research and extension will also increase. Concurringly, Dempster (2000) agreed that SBM or School-Based Management has an impact in the improvement of student outcomes. It depicts that the SBM's initiatives are important in improving the school's climate most especially in increasing the student outcomes.

Moreover, the result of this study was supported by the findings of Blank (2004) that School-Based Management can promote improvements building relationships between schools and diverse community entities. It further asserted that building partnerships that link school, family, and community is intimately connected to student achievements because linking schools and community resources leads to providing services and support that address various needs of the students. This implies that the SBM do not just build communal relationship with other stakeholders, but it significantly improves the faculty members in terms of providing services and addressing the needs of students. Parallel to this, this idea was supported by Sheldon & Voorhis (2004) when he affirms that community and parental attachment in support to school-based management program can improve schools and the quality of education that the children achieved as well as the academic achievements off students which can explain the relationship established in this study.

It can be gleaned from table 14 that all variables in terms of level of performance has a positively significant relationship to all variables namely: Programs and Activities, Community Coordination, Budget Allocation, Research and Extension Output. It can be inferred from the table that professional development of faculty such as professional knowledge, training and workshops, and skills and abilities are very important in terms of increasing their performance in different programs and activities, community and coordination, wise budget allocation, and research and extension output.

Table 14. Correlation between the Level of Faculty Engagement in terms of Performance and Research Extension

Level of Performance	**Program and**	**Community**	**Budget Allocation**	**Research and**

	Activities r-value	**Coordination r-value**	**r-value**	**Extension Output r-value**
Professional Knowledge	.860**	.609**	.698**	.610**
Training and Workshops	.820**	.620**	.709**	.636**
Skills and Abilities	.837**	.573**	.729**	.620**

Legend: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Concurringly, according to Etienne Wegner, the cognitive anthropologist who coined the Community of Practice which is defined as the group of people who has common level of concern or passion on the endeavour they are into. This shows that in a professional development with a group that teaches the same content, it elicits rich conversations and varying perspectives that optimally develop their level of professional knowledge, training and workshops, and skills and abilities which in turn increases their level of performance in research and extension. This supports the idea that training and workshops lead to innovative ideas and solutions to issues we face, in this research training and workshops contributed much to performance of teachers in research and extension.

Table 15. Correlation between the Level of Faculty Engagement in terms of Performance and Research Extension

Level of Performance	**Program and Activities r-value**	**Community Coordination r-value**	**Budget Allocation r-value**	**Research and Extension Output r-value**
Intrinsic	.758**	.775**	.767**	.738**
Extrinsic	.548**	.732**	.564**	.582**

Legend: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 15 shows that a highly significant relationship exist between the level of faculty engagement in terms of motivation and research extension. It can be depicted from the table that if the level of motivation of faculty in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic is high, it also implies that their level of engagement in research and extension is also high. This supported by Sedanza (2018) which shows that research and extension has an imperative role in Higher Education Institutions in which there is a need among the faculty members to show active participation in research and extension so that their level of performance would increase. Thus, it is essential to conduct various building program through provision of regular training since faculty with high level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation drive continuous engagement in research activities.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study on the level of faculty engagement in research and extension: basis for program enhancement yielded the following conclusions:

Based on the result of the study there is a strong level of faculty engagement in conducting research and extension among regular faculty members of LSPU-SPCC in level of their participation, performance and motivation.

There is high level of engagement among LSPU-SPCC faculty members that greatly affects their research and extension.

The level of faculty engagement is significantly related in the conduct of their research and extension.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the conclusion of this study, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. The research and extension chairperson and their respective heads may encourage all faculty members, regardless of profile, to perform studies that may be advantageous to both the researchers and extensionist and the entire institution.

2. Updated learning resources may be made available, and administrative assistance may be enhanced by establishing rules for rewards, incentives, and recognition in their research and extension.

3. Motivation and encouragement from the administration, notably the deans of the various departments, may increase the faculty engagement in research and extension.

4. Other studies concerning the level of faculty engagement in research and extension using other basis or input may be investigated by future researchers to improve research and extension in universities..

REFERENCES

1. Artates, Jennelyn R. (2023) "Faculty Engagement: A Study on the Higher Education Institutions' Setting". Journal of Business and Management Studies 5(3):137-142 DOI: 10.32996/jbms.2023.5.3.14

2. Barman, A. and Ray, S. (2016), "Faculty engagement in higher educational institution: a proposed model", Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education, Vol. 3 No. 6, pp. 7-17.

3. Dempster, N. 2021. Guilty or Not: The Impact and Effects of Site-Based Management on Schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 38(1),47-62.

4. Grauwe, A. 2019. School Based Management (SBM): Does it Improve Quality. Data accessed and retrieved on August 13, 2013, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/.

5. Hogan, B.E. (2013), "Faculty engagement at British Columbia institute of technology: a case study in institutional decision making", Unpublished PhD thesis, Simon Fraser University, Canada, available at: www.summit.sfu.ca/system/fifiles/iritems1/9987/etd5895bhogan.pdf (accessed 12 November 2014).

6. Holland, B. A. (2016). Factors Influencing Faculty Engagement--Then, Now, and Future. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 20(1), 73-81.

7. Kyaligonza, R. (2015). An investigative study of research productivity of the academic staff in public universities in Uganda. Research Journal of Social Science and Educational Studies (DRJSSES), 2(4), 60- 68.

8. M. B. Omary, J. Eswaraka, S. D. Kimball, P. V. Moghe, R. A. Panettieri et al., (2020) "The COVID-19 pandemic and research shutdown: Staying safe and productive," The Journal of Clinical Investigation, vol. 130, no. 6, pp. 2745–2748, 2020.

9. Raina, K., & Khatri, P. (2015). Faculty Engagement in Higher education: Prospects and Areas of Research. On the Horizon, 23(4), 285-308.

10. Ramkumar S., et. al. (2017). Faculty-Student Collaboration in Enhancing Research Productivity: A Study. International Journal of Health Sciences and Research www.ijhsr.org ISSN: 2249-9571

11. Sedanza, N. (2018). Research and Extension Participation, Performance And Motivation Of The Leyte Normal University Faculty. ResearchGate; Granthaalayah Publications and Printers.

12. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344147232_