PANTAO
(International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

Professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of physical education faculty: Basis for a faculty development framework

Amanda G. Llaban*
Filamer Christian University, Roxas City, Capiz, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study determined the levels of professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of Physical Education (PE) faculty in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province, and examined the significant differences and relationships among these variables as basis for a Faculty Development Framework. The participants were one hundred thirty (130) PE faculty members drawn from a population of one hundred ninety-four (194). The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamane formula with a 5% margin of error, and participants were selected through simple random sampling. The study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-method design. Data were collected using three instruments: the Professional Commitment Questionnaire adapted from Meyer et al. (1991) Three-Component Model, a researcher-developed Research Productivity Questionnaire, and a Teaching Competence Questionnaire anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). All instruments underwent expert validation and pilot testing. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to determine variable levels, while inferential statistics, including one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Pearson Product–Moment Correlation Coefficient, were used to test differences and relationships at a 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that PE faculty demonstrated very high levels of professional commitment and teaching competence, while research productivity was moderate. Significant differences in teaching competence were found when grouped according to levels of professional commitment and research productivity. Significant relationships existed between professional commitment and teaching competence, and between research productivity and teaching competence, while no significant relationship was found between professional commitment and research productivity.

Keywords: Physical education faculty, professional commitment, teaching competence.

Date Submitted: May 6, 2026
Date Accepted: May 13, 2026
Date Published: May 20, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: amanda.llaban@wvsu.edu.ph
DOI: http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021196

Recommended citation:
Llaban, A. G. (2026). Professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of physical education faculty: Basis for a faculty development framework. Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (2), 4999-5021. http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021196

INTRODUCTION

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are mandated to fulfill a tri-fold function of instruction, research, and extension, with faculty members serving as the primary agents in achieving these institutional goals. Globally, higher education systems emphasize faculty performance as a key determinant of institutional quality, where teaching effectiveness and research productivity are widely used indicators of academic excellence (Tight, 2020). However, international studies reveal persistent disparities in research engagement and instructional quality, particularly in developing countries where institutional support systems remain limited (Marginson, 2018). In the Philippine context, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) reinforces this mandate by promoting quality instruction and research productivity among faculty members across HEIs. Despite these expectations, studies indicate that Filipino faculty often encounter challenges such as heavy teaching loads, limited research funding, and insufficient institutional support, which hinder their ability to fully engage in both teaching and research functions (Pentang et al., 2024). These challenges are more pronounced among Physical Education (PE) faculty, whose responsibilities extend beyond classroom instruction to include the promotion of physical fitness, wellness, and holistic student development.

Professional commitment refers to the degree of dedication, loyalty, and psychological attachment that faculty members demonstrate toward their profession and institution. It encompasses three dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Meyer et al., 1991). Studies suggest that faculty members with higher levels of professional commitment demonstrate greater motivation, persistence, and engagement in their professional roles, which in turn enhances their instructional effectiveness (Low et al., 2022). While existing studies affirm that committed educators tend to perform better and demonstrate greater resilience, a notable gap remains in the literature, as professional commitment is often examined independently of other performance indicators. In actual educational settings, PE faculty frequently encounter challenges such as heavy teaching loads, administrative responsibilities, and limited recognition of their discipline, which may affect the consistency and sustainability of their professional commitment. These realities suggest that commitment alone may not fully explain variations in faculty performance, thereby necessitating further investigation into its interaction with other variables.

Research productivity, on the other hand, refers to the scholarly outputs of faculty, including completed studies, publications, presentations, and applied research that contribute to institutional development and evidence-based teaching (Amanonce et al., 2025). Despite its importance, literature indicates that research productivity among Filipino faculty remains relatively modest compared to international counterparts due to constraints such as limited research training, insufficient funding, lack of incentives, and time pressures (Pentang et al., 2024). In practice, these challenges are more evident among PE faculty, whose professional responsibilities are often heavily centered on instruction and physical activity supervision, leaving limited time for research engagement. Furthermore, existing studies reveal that research outputs are not always effectively integrated into teaching practices, highlighting a gap between knowledge production and its application in instruction. This gap underscores the need to explore how research productivity contributes to, or interacts with, teaching competence.

Teaching competence is widely recognized as a critical determinant of instructional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. It encompasses the integration of content knowledge, pedagogical strategies, classroom management, communication skills, and reflective practice (Hermoso et al., 2023). Although prior research generally reports high levels of teaching competence among faculty, gaps remain evident in both literature and practice.

Many studies assess competence using established standards such as the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), yet they often overlook the influence of research engagement and professional commitment on teaching effectiveness. In actual classroom settings, PE faculty face unique challenges, including large class sizes, limited facilities, diverse learner abilities, and the need to balance theoretical instruction with physical performance tasks. These conditions may affect the consistent application of effective teaching strategies and limit opportunities for innovation and reflective practice.

A significant gap in both literature and practice lies in the limited examination of the interplay among professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence. Existing studies tend to investigate these variables separately, without adequately explaining how they influence one another in a dynamic and reciprocal manner. In real-world settings, this fragmentation is reflected in faculty development initiatives that often focus on either teaching enhancement or research capacity-building, rather than integrating both within a unified framework. Moreover, research focusing specifically on PE faculty remains scarce, despite evidence suggesting that they experience lower research engagement and reduced institutional recognition compared to faculty in other academic disciplines (Martinez et al., 2025). These gaps highlight the need for a more comprehensive investigation that considers the interrelationships among these variables within the context of PE in higher education.

This study was anchored on three complementary theoretical perspectives that collectively explain the interaction of the variables under investigation. Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) provides a basis for understanding professional commitment, emphasizing that faculty members who perceive institutional support, recognition, and fair workload are more likely to demonstrate sustained commitment and engagement. Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964) explains research productivity as an outcome of investments in education, training, and professional development, suggesting that faculty productivity increases when adequate support and opportunities are provided. Meanwhile, Shulman's (1987) Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) framework explains teaching competence as the integration of content expertise and pedagogical skill, highlighting how faculty effectively translate knowledge into meaningful learning experiences. Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that professional commitment influences both research productivity and teaching competence, while research engagement enhances instructional effectiveness through the integration of evidence-based practices. In turn, effective teaching reinforces professional identity and strengthens commitment, creating a continuous cycle of faculty development.

The conceptual framework of the study illustrates the relationships among the variables in determining the teaching competence of PE faculty in selected HEIs in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province. Professional commitment and research productivity were treated as the independent variables, while teaching competence was considered the dependent variable. The interplay of these variables explains how professional commitment and research productivity contribute to the development of teaching competence, and the result of this relationship serves as the basis for the development of a Faculty Development Framework aimed at improving teaching effectiveness, strengthening research engagement, and sustaining professional growth among PE faculty. Guided by these theoretical assumptions and addressing the identified gaps in both literature and practice, this study aims to examine the interrelationships among professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of Physical Education faculty in selected Higher Education Institutions in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province, with its findings ultimately serving as the empirical basis for a Faculty Development Framework designed to enhance teaching quality, promote research engagement, and strengthen professional commitment among PE faculty in higher education institutions.

Statament of the Problem

This study aimed to assess the professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of Physical Education (PE) faculty in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province. The findings served as the basis for designing a Faculty Development Framework that enhances instructional effectiveness, research engagement, and professional growth among PE educators.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of professional commitment of Physical Education (PE) faculty as a whole and in terms of affective, continuance, and normative commitment?
2. What is the level of research productivity of Physical Education (PE) faculty as a whole and in terms of completion, alignment, publication, and utilization?
3. What is the level of teaching competence of Physical Education (PE) faculty as a whole and in terms of communication skills, instructional delivery, classroom management, and reflective practice?
4. Is there a significant difference in teaching competence among the levels of professional commitment of PE faculty?
5. Is there a significant difference in teaching competence among the levels of research productivity of PE faculty?
6. Is there a significant relationship among teaching competence, professional commitment, and research productivity of PE faculty?
7. What Faculty Development Framework can be developed from the results of this study?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodological framework governing the collection, measurement, and analysis of data in this study. The purpose of this study was to examine the levels of professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of Physical Education (PE) faculty in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province, with the findings serving as the basis for the development of a Faculty Development Framework aimed at enhancing teaching effectiveness, research engagement, and professional growth among PE educators.

This study employed a mixed-method sequential explanatory research design, which involved the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by qualitative data to further explain and elaborate the initial results. According to John W. Creswell et al. (2011, as cited in Dawadi et al., 2021), the sequential explanatory design is characterized by two distinct phases, wherein quantitative data are collected and analyzed first, and qualitative data are subsequently gathered to provide deeper interpretation and clarification of the quantitative findings. In this study, the quantitative phase utilized a survey-correlational approach to determine the levels of professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence among PE faculty, as well as to examine the relationships among these variables. Following the quantitative phase, the qualitative phase was conducted through Focus Group Discussion (FGD) to further explain and enrich the statistical results, exploring the experiences, perceptions, and challenges of the participants related to professional commitment, research engagement, and teaching competence. In this design, teaching competence served as the dependent variable, while professional commitment and research productivity were treated as the independent variables. For data analysis, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were utilized to summarize the responses of the participants, while inferential statistics, including the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, were

applied to identify significant differences and relationships among variables, with the significance level set at 0.05.

The participants of this study were Physical Education (PE) faculty members currently teaching in selected public and private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province. The total population consisted of one hundred ninety-four (194) PE faculty members distributed across multiple institutions and campuses in the region. Using the Taro Yamane (1967) formula with a 5% margin of error, a sample size of one hundred thirty (130) participants was obtained. The study employed simple random sampling to ensure that each member of the population had an equal chance of being selected. Only faculty members currently teaching PE or related courses were included, while those on leave, assigned to non-PE courses, or holding purely administrative roles were excluded. To supplement the quantitative data, six (6) faculty members were selected through purposive sampling for participation in a Focus Group Discussion (FGD), ensuring representation across institutions, academic ranks, and years of service.

The distribution of participants across HEIs reflects the diversity and representativeness of the sample. West Visayas State University (WVSU) contributed a total of 44 faculty members drawn from six campuses, namely WVSU La Paz with 20, WVSU Pototan with 5, WVSU Lambunao with 7, WVSU Janiuay with 6, WVSU Calinog with 4, and WVSU CAF with 2. Northern Iloilo State University (NISU) accounted for 27 faculty members distributed across seven campuses: NISU Estancia with 12, NISU Barotac Viejo with 2, NISU Lemery with 2, NISU Ajuy with 2, NISU Sara with 3, NISU Concepcion with 4, and NISU Batad with 2. Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology (ISUFST) contributed 10 faculty members from five campuses, specifically ISUFST Main Poblacion with 2, ISUFST Main Tiwi with 5, ISUFST Dumangas with 1, ISUFST San Enrique with 1, and ISUFST Dingle with 1. Iloilo Science and Technology University (ISAT U) provided 26 faculty members from five campuses: ISAT U La Paz with 12, ISAT U Miag-ao with 6, ISAT U Barotac Nuevo with 3, ISAT U Dumangas with 2, and ISAT U Leon with 3. Among private institutions, Central Philippine University (CPU) contributed 16 faculty members, the University of San Agustin (USA) contributed 14, and PHINMA University of Iloilo contributed 22. UP Visayas contributed a combined total of 11 faculty members, with 3 from the Iloilo campus and 8 from the Miag-ao campus. The remaining institutions included St. Paul's University with 3, Iloilo Doctor's College with 6, and St. Therese-MTC Colleges with 15, bringing the total population to 194. This distribution indicates that state universities, particularly WVSU, NISU, and ISAT U, comprise the largest share of the population, while private institutions such as PHINMA University of Iloilo, CPU, and USA also contributed substantially. The inclusion of multiple campuses within each university system ensures that the study captures variations in institutional size, location, and academic structure, thereby strengthening the generalizability of the findings within the specified geographic scope.

The researcher used three primary instruments to gather data on the study variables. The first instrument was the Professional Commitment Questionnaire, a 29-item questionnaire adopted from Meyer et al.'s (1991) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment. The instrument measures three dimensions of professional commitment: affective commitment, which refers to the emotional attachment and identification of faculty with their profession; continuance commitment, which pertains to the perceived cost associated with leaving the profession; and normative commitment, which reflects a sense of moral obligation to remain in the profession. Each item was answered using a five-point Likert scale, with a score of 5 corresponding to Strongly Agree, 4 to Agree, 3 to Neutral, 2 to Disagree, and 1 to Strongly Disagree. The scale interpretation applied to descriptive scaling ranged from 4.21 to

5.00 described as Very High, 3.41 to 4.20 as High, 2.61 to 3.40 as Moderate, 1.81 to 2.60 as Low, and 1.00 to 1.80 as Very Low. Prior to actual data collection, the instrument underwent expert validation by a panel of experts in Physical Education, research methodology, and educational measurement, who evaluated its content relevance, clarity, and alignment with the objectives of the study. Their feedback and recommendations were incorporated to improve the overall quality of the instrument, consistent with the principle that content validation ensures the instrument adequately represents the construct being measured (Polit et al., 2006). A pilot test was subsequently conducted among PE faculty members not included in the actual study, and the collected data were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to determine internal consistency reliability. According to Cronbach (1951), an alpha value of 0.70 or higher is considered acceptable for research use (Nunnally et al., 1994). The pilot test results indicated that the professional commitment instrument demonstrated very high reliability ($\alpha = .942$), providing strong evidence of internal consistency. Factor analysis was additionally employed to determine whether the items appropriately measured their intended constructs, with items having factor loadings below .50 discarded and those with factor loadings of .50 and above retained. The retained items loaded significantly on their respective factors, confirming acceptable internal consistency and reliability.

The second instrument was the Research Productivity Questionnaire, an 8-item researcher-developed instrument designed to assess the scholarly engagement of PE faculty based on their outputs within the past five years. It encompasses four key indicators: research completion, which refers to the number of finished and unfinished research projects; alignment with specialization, which pertains to whether research outputs are aligned with the faculty's field of expertise; publication status, which includes unpublished and published research outputs; and utilization of research, which reflects the extent to which research findings are applied in instruction, extension, or institutional practices. Using a structured scoring system, each indicator was assigned corresponding values based on the presence of research outputs, with a score of 1 for completed research, 2 for aligned research, 3 for published research, and 4 for utilized or applied research. The total scores were computed and interpreted using a scale wherein 8.01 to 10.00 was described as Very High, 6.01 to 8.00 as High, 4.01 to 6.00 as Moderate, 2.01 to 4.00 as Low, and 0.00 to 2.00 as Very Low. The instrument underwent the same expert validation and pilot testing procedures as the professional commitment questionnaire. The pilot test results showed that the research productivity instrument demonstrated moderate reliability ($\alpha = .70$), which suggests an acceptable level of internal consistency for exploratory research. Factor analysis was similarly applied, retaining items with factor loadings of .50 and above, which loaded significantly on their respective factors, confirming the instrument's acceptable internal consistency and reliability.

The third instrument was the Teaching Competence Questionnaire, a 39-item researcher-developed questionnaire anchored in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and contextualized for higher education PE instruction. The instrument measures teaching effectiveness across four key domains: communication skills, which refer to the ability to clearly and effectively convey information and facilitate interaction; instructional delivery, which pertains to the organization and implementation of teaching strategies to achieve learning objectives; classroom management, which involves maintaining a safe, organized, and conducive learning environment; and reflective practice, which reflects the ability of faculty to evaluate and improve their teaching practices. Each item was answered using a five-point Likert scale with the same response categories and scale interpretation as the professional commitment questionnaire, ranging from Very High at 4.21 to 5.00 down to Very Low at 1.00 to 1.80. The instrument underwent expert validation by a panel of specialists in Physical Education, pedagogy, and educational measurement, and a pilot test was subsequently conducted among PE faculty not included in the actual study. The pilot test results indicated

that the teaching competence instrument had strong reliability (α = .942), providing substantial evidence of internal consistency. Factor analysis confirmed that the retained items, those with factor loadings of .50 and above, loaded significantly on their respective factors, indicating acceptable internal consistency and reliability of the instrument.

To initiate the conduct of the study, the researcher formally sought permission from the presidents and administrators of selected HEIs in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province through an official communication letter, accompanied by a copy of the approved research proposal and an Ethics Review Certificate to ensure compliance with institutional and ethical research standards. Upon approval, coordination was undertaken with the deans, department heads, and PE program chairs to identify and inform qualified faculty participants. The data collection process was carried out in two phases, quantitative and qualitative, to obtain both measurable and experiential data relevant to the study variables.

The quantitative phase involved the administration of the three validated instruments, distributed either in printed format or through secure online survey platforms, depending on the accessibility and preference of the participating institutions. Prior to administration, the researcher conducted an orientation session to explain the purpose of the study, the nature of participation, and the proper way of answering the instruments. Each participant was provided with an Informed Consent Form clearly stating the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the ethical safeguards implemented. Participants were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary, that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, that all responses would be treated with strict confidentiality, and that results would be reported in aggregate form to protect their identity. In compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173), no personally identifiable information was disclosed, and all data collected were used solely for academic and research purposes. For printed questionnaires, the researcher personally distributed the instruments and arranged a schedule for retrieval to ensure a high response rate. For online surveys, secure links were sent to participants through official communication channels, and follow-up reminders were provided to ensure completion. Completed questionnaires were retrieved within the agreed timeframe and carefully checked for completeness and accuracy prior to data processing. All quantitative data were encoded in Microsoft Excel and subsequently processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) with the assistance of a licensed statistician.

The qualitative phase involved the conduct of a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) to provide deeper insights into the findings of the quantitative phase. The six (6) PE faculty participants were selected from different public and private HEIs in Iloilo City and Iloilo Province to ensure representation in terms of educational attainment, length of service, and institutional type. The FGD was conducted on March 23, 2026, from 7:00 PM to 8:30 PM via Google Meet, based on the availability and accessibility of the participants. A semi-structured interview guide was used to facilitate the discussion, focusing on the experiences, perceptions, and challenges of the participants related to professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence. Prior to the discussion, participants were informed of the purpose of the FGD and were asked for their consent to participate and to have the session recorded. The discussion was audio-recorded with permission and subsequently transcribed verbatim for analysis. All data collected, including survey responses, FGD transcripts, and field notes, were handled with strict confidentiality. Hard copies of the questionnaires were stored in sealed and labelled folders, while digital files were secured through password-protected storage systems. Access to all research data was restricted solely to the researcher and the supporting statistician, and in compliance with institutional and ethical standards, all data were preserved for a

designated duration and subsequently disposed of appropriately to ensure data privacy and protection.

The data obtained from the questionnaires were systematically organized, processed, and analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS, guided by the research questions and hypotheses of the study, with the level of significance set at 0.05 alpha level to determine the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses. The mean was used to determine the overall levels of professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence among PE faculty, while the standard deviation was computed to measure the variability or consistency of the responses of the participants. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine whether there were significant differences in professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence across groupings. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to examine the strength and direction of the relationships among the three main variables of professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the study examining the professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of Physical Education (PE) faculty. The discussion is organized into three parts: descriptive data analysis, inferential data analysis, and the research output in the form of a proposed faculty development framework. A total of 130 PE faculty served as participants in the study. Data were gathered using validated survey instruments measuring professional commitment across its affective, continuance, and normative dimensions, research productivity across indicators of completion, alignment to specialization, publication status, and utilization and application, and teaching competence across the domains of communication skills, instructional delivery, classroom management, and reflective practice. Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations were computed, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test differences in teaching competence across levels of professional commitment and research productivity, and Pearson r was used to examine relationships among the three major variables, all at the 0.05 level of significance. Qualitative data gathered through focus group discussions (FGD) were integrated to deepen the interpretation of the quantitative findings. All results are interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study.

Level of professional commitment of Physical Education faculty

The overall professional commitment of the PE faculty participants obtained a mean of 4.55 (SD = 0.42), interpreted as "very high" on the adopted scale ranging from 1.00 to 5.00. Across all three dimensions, affective commitment registered the highest mean of 4.77 (SD = 0.35), followed by normative commitment with a mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.52), and continuance commitment with a mean of 4.43 (SD = 0.55), all of which were likewise interpreted as "very high." These results indicate that PE faculty demonstrate a consistently strong and multidimensional level of commitment across all aspects of their professional engagement. The very high overall level suggests that faculty members are not only dedicated to their teaching responsibilities but are also deeply engaged in their professional duties, driven by a combination of emotional investment, a sense of duty, and awareness of the value of remaining in the profession. Such commitment may be attributed to their passion for teaching, strong sense of responsibility, and genuine concern for student learning despite the existing demands of their workload. PE faculty often participate actively in both academic and co-curricular activities, including sports, coaching, and student engagement programs, and these

responsibilities further strengthen their sense of purpose and professional identity, allowing their commitment to remain high even in the presence of challenges such as heavy workload and limited resources. This finding is supported by Low et al. (2022), who emphasized that professional commitment plays a crucial role in enhancing the motivation and engagement of teachers in their work, noting that committed educators are more likely to invest time and effort in their professional responsibilities, resulting in improved instructional practices and overall teaching effectiveness. Similarly, Skaalvik et al. (2017) underscored that teachers with high levels of professional commitment demonstrate greater work engagement and instructional quality, and that committed teachers tend to exhibit stronger dedication to student learning, which positively influences their teaching performance. Participants in the focus group discussion affirmed these findings. One discussant, who serves as a department head, described professional commitment as encompassing dedication to the profession, connection with students, maintenance of professional standards, and the balancing of responsibilities to provide quality instruction, noting that teaching is not merely a duty but a core aspect of professional identity. Another discussant expressed that despite multiple responsibilities, they continue to give their best because they genuinely value their role as a mentor and teacher, and that PE teachers are naturally passionate and dedicated to their work.

The very high affective commitment mean of 4.77 (SD = 0.35) suggests that PE faculty genuinely enjoy their profession and are emotionally invested in their roles. This finding is consistent with Meyer et al. (1991), who explained in their Three-Component Model of Commitment that affective commitment is characterized by emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization, and that employees who exhibit high affective commitment remain in their profession because they genuinely want to, driven by a sense of belonging and personal fulfilment. Liu et al. (2021) similarly highlighted that affective commitment plays a significant role in enhancing employee engagement and work involvement, with individuals who have a strong emotional attachment to their organization tending to invest more effort in their tasks, leading to improved performance and active participation in professional responsibilities. These theoretical perspectives support the present finding, suggesting that when faculty members feel emotionally connected to their profession, they are more motivated to engage meaningfully in their teaching and academic functions. Focus group participants reinforced this interpretation. One discussant stated that their commitment comes from carrying out duties responsibly and from genuinely enjoying the teaching of Physical Education, particularly dance, as sharing that passion with students is what sustains motivation. Another discussant echoed this sentiment by noting that commitment comes from passion and that the sight of students truly understanding a lesson serves as a powerful motivating force.

The very high continuance commitment mean of 4.43 (SD = 0.55) indicates that PE faculty demonstrate a strong tendency to remain in the profession due to considerations related to job stability, professional investment, and accumulated experience. This result aligns with the explanation of Meyer et al. (1991) that continuance commitment is influenced by an individual's awareness of the costs associated with leaving an organization, and that employees remain not only because of emotional attachment but also due to the economic, professional, and personal investments they would forfeit if they leave, explaining why faculty with longer tenure and greater accumulated benefits tend to exhibit higher continuance commitment. Erdogan et al. (2019) similarly emphasized that continuance commitment is closely associated with professional experience, finding that employees who have spent more years in their profession develop stronger continuance commitment as they become more aware of the risks and potential losses related to career changes. FGD responses provided further support, with

one discussant explaining that they continue to fulfill their duties responsibly and remain in the teaching profession despite the demands of their role, while another stated that they highly value their position and remain committed to staying in teaching despite their many responsibilities.

The very high normative commitment mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.52) indicates that PE faculty possess a strong sense of obligation and responsibility toward their profession and their students, suggesting that commitment is driven not only by personal interest or practical considerations but also by a deep sense of duty to fulfill their roles as educators. This finding is consistent with Meyer et al. (1991), who explained that normative commitment is grounded in an individual's sense of obligation to remain in their organization, with employees demonstrating high normative commitment staying because they feel it is the right thing to do, reflecting a strong sense of duty and moral responsibility. Eirín-Nemiña et al. (2020) similarly found that educators who possess a strong sense of duty are more likely to remain dedicated to their roles and uphold professional standards, supporting the present result that a teacher's sense of obligation contributes to sustained commitment and responsible practice. During the focus group discussion, one participant stated that they always ensure students achieve the lesson objectives by coming prepared every time and adjusting strategies based on student needs, with this sense of responsibility serving as the motivating force for giving their best. Another participant described their commitment as rooted in accountability for fulfilling what is expected of them as a teacher. Collectively, these responses affirm that normative commitment is driven by a strong sense of professional responsibility, accountability, and moral obligation to ensure that students achieve meaningful learning.

Level of research productivity of Physical Education faculty

The overall research productivity of PE faculty obtained a mean of 4.72 (SD = 3.34), interpreted as "moderate" on the adopted scale. However, a notable discrepancy was observed between this overall rating and the performance across individual indicators. Research completion obtained a mean of 0.78 (SD = 0.41), alignment to specialization had a mean of 1.71 (SD = 0.71), publication status had a mean of 1.25 (SD = 1.48), and utilization and application had a mean of 0.98 (SD = 1.73), all of which were interpreted as "very low." This discrepancy suggests that while faculty may have initial involvement or exposure to research, they face substantial challenges in completing, publishing, and utilizing their work. The finding implies that PE faculty are constrained by factors such as heavy teaching loads, administrative responsibilities, lack of funding, and limited institutional support for research activities. This is consistent with Pentang et al. (2024), who identified workload and time constraints as major barriers to research productivity, and with Amanonce et al. (2025), who reported that Filipino faculty often demonstrate modest research output due to institutional limitations. Focus group discussants affirmed this interpretation: one explained that while they have been actively involved in research, consistency is difficult to maintain due to administrative duties, and that the biggest challenge remains time, while another noted that as a PE teacher, the primary focus is not on writing, and that multiple roles as coaches and coordinators, combined with insufficient financial support, significantly limit research output.

The very low research completion mean of 0.78 (SD = 0.41) indicates that many PE faculty encounter significant challenges in finishing research projects. Although faculty members may initiate research activities, sustaining momentum throughout the research process proves difficult as demands from other professional responsibilities increase. This finding is consistent with Hemmings et al. (2016), who found that heavy teaching loads limit faculty members' ability to complete research, and with Pentang et al. (2024), who emphasized that time constraints are among the most significant barriers to research productivity in higher

education, particularly in contexts where faculty are assigned multiple responsibilities beyond teaching. A focus group participant explained that while it is possible to begin with two or three research titles, sustaining the process becomes very challenging because of limited time and competing tasks, including teaching loads, coaching, student club advising, and other institutional designations. Another participant similarly stated that research is a genuine challenge for PE teachers because of packed class schedules and the many obligations they manage daily.

The very low alignment to specialization mean of 1.71 (SD = 0.71) suggests that many PE faculty either do not conduct research related to their field of expertise or are unable to prioritize discipline-specific research due to competing responsibilities. This implies a mismatch between faculty specialization and the research topics they pursue, or a lack of opportunity to engage in research aligned with their area of expertise. The finding supports Launio et al. (2024), who emphasized that institutional priorities influence research engagement, and Alcazaren (2021), who noted that a weak research culture within institutions can negatively affect research productivity and alignment, particularly when research is not embedded as a core academic responsibility. FGD responses reinforced this interpretation, with one discussant explaining that research productivity depends on institutional priority areas and that if the institution does not offer a major in Physical Education, research in the field is often not considered a priority, while another noted that research is not always a priority because the focus is more on teaching and coaching.

The very low publication status mean of 1.25 (SD = 1.48) indicates that only a limited number of research outputs produced by PE faculty are successfully published, suggesting that while some faculty engage in research activities, these efforts do not consistently lead to publication in academic journals or recognized outlets. The low publication rate may be attributed to insufficient training in research writing, limited access to funding, and a lack of institutional mechanisms that support the publication process. These findings align with Aguinis et al. (2020), who highlighted that organizational support, including funding, mentoring, and structured research systems, plays a critical role in increasing faculty publication productivity, and with Ocampo et al. (2022), who identified funding availability and mentorship as key determinants of successful research dissemination. Focus group participants strongly affirmed this finding: one stated that stronger institutional support is genuinely needed to assist in processing papers and publishing research so that productivity can be sustained despite workload demands, while another noted that because of multiple responsibilities, there have been requests for research personnel who can assist in processing papers, and that funding concerns arise when expenses reach 200,000 pesos or more, making it very difficult to continue and publish studies.

The very low utilization and application mean of 0.98 (SD = 1.73) indicates that although PE faculty may engage in research-related activities, these outputs are not effectively translated into teaching practice or professional application. This finding is consistent with Chou (2024), who highlighted that research enhances instructional practices when it is properly integrated into classroom teaching, suggesting that the mere conduct of research is insufficient without its utilization, and with Tight (2016), who explained that the relationship between research and teaching is not automatic but depends largely on how research is applied in practice. Focus group discussants supported this interpretation, with one explaining that although research helps improve teaching, the workload makes it difficult to apply findings in class, while another noted that even when teachers understand the importance of research, they still need support, proper guidance, resources, and encouragement to put it into practice.

Level of teaching competence of Physical Education faculty

The overall teaching competence of PE faculty obtained a mean of 4.63 (SD = 0.38), interpreted as "very high." All four domains were similarly rated as very high: communication skills (M = 4.67, SD = 0.35), classroom management (M = 4.67, SD = 0.37), instructional delivery (M = 4.59, SD = 0.43), and reflective practice (M = 4.56, SD = 0.49). These results indicate that PE faculty possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and professional experience to effectively facilitate learning, which may be attributed to their strong academic preparation, years of teaching experience, and adherence to established instructional standards such as the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The finding is supported by Hermoso et al. (2023), who highlighted that teaching competence encompasses effective instructional delivery, classroom management, and the ability to engage learners meaningfully, and by Shulman (1987), who emphasized the importance of pedagogical content knowledge as the integration of subject matter expertise with effective teaching strategies, noting that competent teachers are those who can transform content knowledge into forms that are understandable and meaningful to learners. Focus group responses affirmed the quantitative finding: one discussant noted that the demands of the field, including managing large numbers of students with a limited faculty complement, require a high level of competence, and that while faculty are already experienced and aligned with PPST standards, continuous improvement remains important since the field is continuously evolving. Another expressed confidence in handling students and delivering lessons, describing this as grounded in actual classroom experience.

The very high communication skills mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.35) indicates that PE faculty are highly effective in conveying instructions, explaining concepts, and engaging students in learning activities. In the context of PE, where both theoretical understanding and practical demonstration are required, effective communication plays a crucial role in ensuring that students not only follow instructions but also achieve meaningful learning outcomes. This finding is supported by Nikola (2021), who identified effective communication as a fundamental component of teaching, enabling teachers to clearly convey ideas, facilitate understanding, and promote active student engagement. Shulman (1987) further emphasized through the concept of pedagogical content knowledge that effective teaching is not only about what teachers know but also how well they communicate that knowledge to students. FGD participants affirmed this finding: one stated that they always ensure students truly understand the lesson by coming prepared and adjusting strategies based on student ability levels, while another described confidence in delivering lessons and engaging students, noting that teaching in PE requires connecting with students and helping them learn rather than simply demonstrating skills.

The very high instructional delivery mean of 4.59 (SD = 0.43) reflects the ability of PE faculty to organize lessons, apply appropriate teaching strategies, and adapt instruction based on student needs. This finding supports Hermoso et al. (2023), who emphasized that effective instructional strategies are central to teaching competence, and Shulman (1987), who highlighted the importance of integrating pedagogy and content knowledge to present subject matter in ways that are meaningful to learners. Focus group participants confirmed this result: one stated that they come prepared every time and adjust teaching strategies depending on the level of students, while another explained that they integrate cultural activities such as dance into their teaching to make classes more engaging and to ensure that students not only follow activities but also enjoy them.

The very high classroom management mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.37) indicates that PE faculty are highly capable of maintaining order, managing large classes, and creating a conducive learning environment. This aligns with Nikola (2021), who identified classroom management as a fundamental component of teaching competence, and with Hermoso et al.

(2023), who emphasized that well-managed classrooms contribute to improved teaching performance and better learning outcomes. FGD responses provided further support: one discussant noted that commitment affects how teachers manage their classes, explaining that when a teacher is committed, they make an effort to manage their class well even when class sizes are large, and that commitment pushes more effective use of knowledge and experience. Another acknowledged that while they are able to manage their class effectively, there remain areas for improvement, particularly as teaching experience continues to develop.

The very high reflective practice mean of 4.56 (SD = 0.49) suggests that PE faculty consistently evaluate and improve their teaching strategies to enhance student learning outcomes. This finding is supported by Guerriero (2017), who emphasized that reflective practice is essential in improving teaching competence and is aligned with PPST Domain 7, which promotes continuous professional growth through reflection. Hermoso et al. (2023) similarly identified reflective practice as a key domain of teaching competence, finding that teachers who reflect regularly are more effective in addressing classroom challenges and improving instruction. Focus group participants confirmed this disposition: one stated that they balance theory and practice and reflect on their teaching to continue improving, while another noted that while faculty are experienced and aligned with PPST standards, continuous learning and development remain important to sustain teaching competence since the field continues to evolve.

Differences in teaching competence among the levels of professional commitment and research productivity of PE faculty

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) examining the difference in teaching competence among the levels of professional commitment yielded a computed F-value of 10.086 with a corresponding p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance, with a sum of squares between groups of 2.537 (df = 2, MS = 1.268) and within groups of 15.971 (df = 127, MS = 0.126), with a total sum of squares of 18.508 (df = 129). This result indicates that there is a significant difference in teaching competence among the levels of professional commitment, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The significant result implies that teaching competence varies depending on the level of professional commitment, and that faculty members with higher levels of commitment tend to demonstrate higher teaching competence compared to those with lower levels. This suggests that professional commitment plays a crucial role in enhancing teaching competence, as faculty who are more committed are more likely to invest time, effort, and energy in preparing lessons, engaging students, and improving instructional strategies. In the context of PE faculty, commitment may influence how teachers manage classes, deliver instruction, and ensure student learning, especially given the physical and interactive nature of the subject. These findings are consistent with Ulaş et al. (2020), who found that higher levels of teacher commitment enhance instructional delivery and classroom engagement, with Skaalvik et al. (2017), who reported that committed teachers demonstrate stronger motivation and improved classroom effectiveness, and with Collie et al. (2018), who emphasized that teacher commitment positively contributes to both instructional quality and classroom functioning. Focus group participants corroborated this finding: one stated that teachers who are more committed naturally exert greater effort in their teaching by preparing better and engaging more actively to ensure students learn effectively; another shared that committed teachers tend to go beyond what is required by giving more time, energy, and attention to their classes; a third explained that commitment is closely connected to passion and that teachers who love what they do continuously strive to improve their teaching; and a fourth

noted that teaching is not only about skills but also about attitude, with committed teachers being more patient, prepared, and focused on student learning.

The ANOVA examining the difference in teaching competence among the levels of research productivity yielded a computed F-value of 5.315 with a corresponding p-value of 0.001, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance, with a sum of squares between groups of 2.69 (df = 4, MS = 0.673) and within groups of 15.817 (df = 125, MS = 0.127), with a total sum of squares of 18.508 (df = 129). This result indicates that there is a significant difference in teaching competence among the levels of research productivity, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The significant result implies that teaching competence varies depending on the level of research productivity, with faculty members who demonstrate higher levels of research engagement tending to exhibit higher teaching competence. This suggests that research productivity contributes to enhancing teaching competence, as faculty who engage in research are more likely to integrate evidence-based practices, updated knowledge, and innovative strategies into their teaching. Considering that overall research productivity was found to be moderate while its individual indicators were all very low, this result also reflects that even limited research engagement can still influence teaching effectiveness, particularly when applied in instructional practice. This finding is consistent with Chou (2024), who found that faculty actively involved in research tend to incorporate innovative and empirically grounded methodologies into their instruction, with Tight (2016), who noted that the relationship between research and teaching becomes meaningful when scholarly outputs are directly applied to instructional practice, and with Aguinis et al. (2020), who emphasized that faculty research involvement contributes to overall academic performance, particularly when supported by institutional resources and aligned with teaching responsibilities. Focus group participants confirmed these interpretations: one stated that research helps improve teaching by allowing the use of evidence-based approaches and by identifying what needs improvement so that appropriate strategies can be applied in the field; another explained that teachers who conduct research are more innovative, bring new ideas into the classroom, and can see what strategies are effective and what areas need adjustment to continuously enhance their teaching practices for the benefit of students.

Relationship among professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of PE faculty

Pearson r analysis revealed that the relationship between professional commitment and research productivity yielded a correlation coefficient of r = 0.033 with a p-value of 0.711, which exceeds the 0.05 level of significance. This result is not statistically significant, and therefore the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is no significant relationship between professional commitment and research productivity among PE faculty. This finding indicates that even when faculty demonstrate a very high level of dedication and commitment to their profession, this does not necessarily translate into increased research output. The result suggests that research productivity is influenced more by external and contextual factors rather than by professional commitment alone, including heavy teaching loads, limited time, lack of funding, and insufficient institutional support, which may hinder faculty from engaging in research activities regardless of their level of commitment. This is consistent with Pentang et al. (2024), who found that even motivated and committed teachers may struggle to engage in research due to competing professional demands, and with Alcazaren (2021), who highlighted those institutional challenges, including limited resources and lack of support systems, significantly restrict research engagement among faculty. FGD participants affirmed this interpretation: one stated that even if a teacher is committed, research becomes impossible because of time constraints; another explained that it is not always easy to conduct research

due to workload and multiple responsibilities, making it challenging to maintain balance, such that commitment does not always translate into active research engagement.

The Pearson r analysis of the relationship between professional commitment and teaching competence yielded a correlation coefficient of r = 0.579 with a p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. This result is statistically significant, and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that there is a significant moderate positive relationship between professional commitment and teaching competence among PE faculty. The finding implies that faculty who are more committed to their profession tend to demonstrate better teaching performance, as committed teachers are more likely to invest time, effort, and energy in lesson preparation, student engagement, and continuous instructional improvement, with this level of dedication contributing to more effective teaching practices and enhanced student learning outcomes. Professional commitment may also serve as a motivating factor that drives teachers to refine their pedagogical approaches and maintain high standards in their instructional delivery. These findings are supported by Ulaş et al. (2020), who reported that professional commitment significantly enhances instructional effectiveness, and by Skaalvik et al. (2017), who found that teachers with higher levels of commitment exhibit greater motivation that positively influences their teaching performance and classroom practices. Focus group participants reinforced this finding: one stated that commitment directly affects how lessons are prepared and how much effort is given to ensure students truly learn, naturally improving teaching competence; another explained that committed teachers do not simply settle for teaching but continuously strive to improve their strategies and become better at managing their classes.

The Pearson r analysis of the relationship between research productivity and teaching competence yielded a correlation coefficient of r = 0.228 with a p-value of 0.009, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. This result is statistically significant, and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that there is a significant low positive relationship between research productivity and teaching competence among PE faculty. Although the relationship is relatively low, it still highlights the important role of research in enriching teaching competence and enhancing the overall quality of instruction, as research involvement exposes teachers to updated knowledge, innovative strategies, and evidence-based approaches that can be integrated into instructional delivery. This finding is supported by Chou (2024), who found that research productivity enhances teaching effectiveness when research is properly integrated into instructional practices, and by Aguinis et al. (2020), who emphasized that research engagement contributes to overall faculty performance, including teaching effectiveness, by promoting continuous learning and innovation. Focus group participants confirmed this relationship: one stated that teaching truly improves when engaged in research because reading studies and conducting one's own increases awareness of new strategies and helps adjust teaching so students can understand; another explained that conducting research allows teachers to gain new strategies that can be applied in teaching and provides ideas on how to improve lessons and make them more effective.

Research output: Faculty development framework

The findings of the study served as the empirical basis for the development of the CRT Faculty Development Framework, a Commitment-Research-Teaching Framework designed to address the identified needs and strengths of PE faculty. The framework is structured according to the Input-Process-Output-Outcome model. As inputs, the framework draws from the three key study variables: professional commitment, which was identified as a strength to sustain

given its very high level (M = 4.55, SD = 0.42); research productivity, which was identified as a primary area for improvement given its moderate overall level (M = 4.72, SD = 3.34) and very low individual indicators across research completion (M = 0.78, SD = 0.41), alignment to specialization (M = 1.71, SD = 0.71), publication status (M = 1.25, SD = 1.48), and utilization and application (M = 0.98, SD = 1.73); and teaching competence, which was identified as a strength to enhance given its very high level (M = 4.63, SD = 0.38). The process component of the framework consists of five targeted intervention programs. The Research Capability Enhancement Program addresses research completion and publication through research writing workshops, mentoring and coaching systems, statistical and methodological training, and research proposal development sessions. The Institutional Support Strengthening program addresses the time, funding, and support constraints identified through both quantitative data and FGD responses, through mechanisms such as reduced teaching loads for research-active faculty, provision of research funding and incentives, establishment of research assistance units, and clear research policies and guidelines. The Teaching Enhancement Program sustains and enhances very high teaching competence through PPST-aligned training workshops, innovative evidence-based teaching strategies, integration of research into teaching, and peer observation and feedback. The Professional Commitment Enrichment Program sustains the already high level of commitment and aims to prevent burnout through recognition and reward systems, career development opportunities, leadership and engagement programs, and wellness and motivation initiatives. The Research-Teaching Integration Initiative strengthens the link between research and teaching by encouraging action research in PE, using research outputs in lesson planning, and promoting evidence-based teaching strategies. The expected outputs of the framework include enhanced teaching competence, improved research productivity, and sustained professional commitment, while the ultimate outcome is a proposed faculty development framework that supports balanced faculty roles integrating teaching and research, and promotes evidence-based instructional practices among PE faculty.

Taken together, the findings of this study address all the research objectives and provide a coherent and evidence-based understanding of the professional landscape of PE faculty. The very high levels of professional commitment and teaching competence confirm existing theoretical claims that dedication to the profession is a significant driver of instructional quality, as supported by the statistically significant ANOVA result (F = 10.086, p = 0.000) and the moderate positive Pearson correlation (r = 0.579, p = 0.000) between these two variables. The moderate overall research productivity and the consistently very low performance across all four research indicators reveal a critical gap that requires systematic and targeted institutional intervention. Despite this gap, the statistically significant ANOVA result (F = 5.315, p = 0.001) and the low but positive Pearson correlation (r = 0.228, p = 0.009) between research productivity and teaching competence confirm that even modest research engagement meaningfully contributes to teaching effectiveness. The absence of a significant relationship between professional commitment and research productivity (r = 0.033, p = 0.711) further underscores that motivation alone is insufficient to produce research outcomes, and that structural and institutional factors must be purposefully addressed. The proposed CRT Faculty Development Framework synthesizes these findings into a practical and theoretically grounded intervention model that is directly responsive to the identified strengths and needs of PE faculty. The subsequent chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations derived from these results, along with practical implications for policy, institutional practice, and future research directions.

PANTAO
(International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

CONCLUSION

This study examined the professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence of 130 Physical Education faculty members using validated survey instruments, Analysis of Variance, Pearson r correlation, and qualitative data gathered through focus group discussions. The findings across all three major variables provide a comprehensive and evidence-based portrait of the professional landscape of PE faculty, revealing both significant strengths and critical areas requiring systematic institutional attention.

The professional commitment of PE faculty was found to be very high, with an overall mean of 4.55 (SD = 0.42). Across its three dimensions, affective commitment registered the highest mean of 4.77 (SD = 0.35), followed by normative commitment at 4.45 (SD = 0.52) and continuance commitment at 4.43 (SD = 0.55), all interpreted as very high. These results indicate that PE faculty demonstrate a consistently strong and multidimensional level of commitment driven by emotional investment, a sense of duty, and an awareness of the professional value of remaining in the field. The very high affective commitment suggests that faculty genuinely enjoy their roles and are emotionally invested in their profession, as described by Meyer et al. (1991), whose Three-Component Model of Commitment explains that individuals with high affective commitment remain in their profession because they genuinely want to, driven by a sense of belonging and personal fulfillment. The very high continuance commitment reflects a strong tendency to remain in the profession due to considerations related to job stability, professional investment, and accumulated experience, consistent with findings by Erdogan et al. (2019) that faculty who have invested more years in their profession develop stronger continuance commitment as awareness of the costs associated with leaving deepens over time. The very high normative commitment similarly points to a deep sense of duty and obligation toward students and the profession, supported by Eirín-Nemiña et al. (2020), who found that educators with a strong sense of duty are more likely to remain dedicated and uphold professional standards. Focus group discussion participants reinforced these findings, describing their commitment as rooted in passion, accountability, and a genuine sense of responsibility to ensure that students achieve meaningful learning outcomes.

In contrast to the strong findings on professional commitment and teaching competence, the research productivity of PE faculty presented a markedly different picture. The overall research productivity obtained a mean of 4.72 (SD = 3.34), interpreted as moderate, yet a notable discrepancy was observed between this overall rating and performance across individual indicators. Research completion obtained a mean of 0.78 (SD = 0.41), alignment to specialization had a mean of 1.71 (SD = 0.71), publication status had a mean of 1.25 (SD = 1.48), and utilization and application had a mean of 0.98 (SD = 1.73), all of which were interpreted as very low. The very low research completion mean indicates that although faculty may initiate research activities, sustaining momentum throughout the research process proves difficult as competing professional responsibilities intensify, consistent with Hemmings et al. (2016) and Pentang et al. (2024), who identified heavy teaching loads and time constraints as among the most significant barriers to research productivity in higher education. The very low alignment to specialization mean suggests a mismatch between faculty expertise and the research topics they pursue, reflecting the influence of institutional priority areas over disciplinary focus, as noted by Launio et al. (2024) and Alcazaren (2021). The very low publication status mean indicates that few research outputs are successfully disseminated, attributable to insufficient training in research writing, limited access to funding, and the absence of structured institutional mechanisms that support the publication process, as underscored by Aguinis et al. (2020) and Ocampo et al. (2022). The very low utilization and

application mean further indicates that even when research is conducted, its findings are not effectively integrated into teaching practice, consistent with Chou (2024) and Tight (2016), who emphasized that the relationship between research and teaching is not automatic but depends on how scholarly outputs are deliberately applied in the classroom. Focus group participants consistently identified time constraints, administrative overload, coaching and coordination responsibilities, and insufficient financial support as the primary barriers to research engagement, affirming that the low research productivity indicators are structural rather than motivational in origin.

Teaching competence was found to be very high overall, with a mean of 4.63 (SD = 0.38). Across all four domains, communication skills obtained a mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.35), classroom management obtained a mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.37), instructional delivery obtained a mean of 4.59 (SD = 0.43), and reflective practice obtained a mean of 4.56 (SD = 0.49), all interpreted as very high. These results indicate that PE faculty possess the knowledge, skills, and professional experience necessary to effectively facilitate learning, attributable to strong academic preparation, years of teaching experience, and adherence to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. The very high communication skills mean reflects the capacity of faculty to clearly convey instructions and engage students in both theoretical and practical learning contexts, supported by Nikola (2021) and Shulman's (1987) concept of pedagogical content knowledge, which emphasizes that effective teaching depends not only on what teachers know but also on how well they communicate that knowledge. The very high instructional delivery mean reflects the ability to organize lessons, apply appropriate strategies, and adapt instruction to student needs, consistent with Hermoso et al. (2023) and Shulman (1987). The very high classroom management mean indicates that faculty are highly capable of maintaining order and creating conducive learning environments, supported by Nikola (2021) and Hermoso et al. (2023), who found that well-managed classrooms contribute to improved teaching performance and student learning outcomes. The very high reflective practice mean suggests that faculty consistently evaluate and improve their instructional strategies, aligned with Guerriero (2017) and PPST Domain 7, which promotes continuous professional growth through sustained reflection. Focus group participants affirmed these findings, describing high levels of preparedness, confidence in lesson delivery, and a commitment to ongoing improvement despite the evolving demands of the field.

The inferential analyses revealed significant and theoretically meaningful patterns among the three major variables. The ANOVA examining differences in teaching competence across levels of professional commitment yielded a computed F-value of 10.086 ($p = 0.000$), indicating a statistically significant difference and leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This result implies that teaching competence varies according to the level of professional commitment, with more committed faculty tending to demonstrate stronger instructional performance, a finding consistent with Ulaş et al. (2020), Skaalvik et al. (2017), and Collie et al. (2018), who collectively established that professional commitment enhances instructional delivery, classroom engagement, and overall teaching effectiveness. Similarly, the ANOVA examining differences in teaching competence across levels of research productivity yielded a computed F-value of 5.315 ($p = 0.001$), which was likewise statistically significant, supporting the conclusion that research engagement contributes to teaching competence even when overall productivity remains modest, consistent with Chou (2024), Tight (2016), and Aguinis et al. (2020). With respect to the correlational analyses, the Pearson r coefficient between professional commitment and research productivity was $r = 0.033$ ($p = 0.711$), which was not statistically significant, thereby accepting the null hypothesis and indicating that a very high level of dedication to the profession does not necessarily translate into increased research output. This finding confirms that research productivity is governed more by structural and institutional conditions than by motivational factors alone, consistent with Pentang et al. (2024)

and Alcazaren (2021). The Pearson r coefficient between professional commitment and teaching competence was r = 0.579 (p = 0.000), a statistically significant moderate positive relationship indicating that more committed faculty tend to demonstrate better teaching performance, supported by Ulaş et al. (2020) and Skaalvik et al. (2017). The Pearson r coefficient between research productivity and teaching competence was r = 0.228 (p = 0.009), a statistically significant low positive relationship indicating that even modest research engagement meaningfully enriches instructional practice, consistent with Chou (2024) and Aguinis et al. (2020). Focus group participants throughout the discussions affirmed all three relational findings, describing the direct influence of commitment on teaching preparation and effort, the role of research in generating new strategies applied in the classroom, and the structural barriers that prevent professional commitment from producing research outputs.

The empirical findings of the study served as the basis for the development of the CRT Faculty Development Framework, a Commitment-Research-Teaching Framework structured according to the Input-Process-Output-Outcome model. The framework draws from the three key study variables as its primary inputs, identifying professional commitment and teaching competence as strengths to sustain given their very high levels, and research productivity as the critical area requiring targeted improvement given its moderate overall level and very low individual indicators. The process component of the framework consists of five targeted intervention programs. The Research Capability Enhancement Program addresses the barriers to research completion and publication through workshops, mentoring and coaching systems, statistical training, and research proposal development. The Institutional Support Strengthening Program responds to the time, funding, and structural constraints identified through both quantitative data and focus group responses, through mechanisms such as reduced teaching loads for research-active faculty, research funding and incentives, research assistance units, and clear institutional policies. The Teaching Enhancement Program sustains and strengthens very high teaching competence through PPST-aligned training, innovative evidence-based strategies, peer observation, and the integration of research into instruction. The Professional Commitment Enrichment Program aims to sustain high commitment levels and prevent burnout through recognition systems, career development opportunities, leadership engagement, and wellness initiatives. The Research-Teaching Integration Initiative strengthens the link between research and teaching by promoting action research in PE, encouraging the use of research outputs in lesson planning, and fostering evidence-based instructional practices. The expected outputs of the framework include enhanced teaching competence, improved research productivity, and sustained professional commitment, with the ultimate outcome being a practical and theoretically grounded faculty development model that supports balanced faculty roles integrating teaching and research in the Physical Education field.

Taken together, the findings of this study present a coherent and evidence-based understanding of the professional strengths and development needs of PE faculty. The very high levels of professional commitment and teaching competence confirm that dedication to the profession is a significant driver of instructional quality, as supported by both the statistically significant ANOVA results and the moderate positive correlation between these two variables. The consistently very low performance across all four research productivity indicators reveals a critical structural gap that requires systematic institutional intervention, as motivational factors alone, however strong, are insufficient to overcome the barriers of heavy workloads, limited funding, and the absence of adequate support systems. The proposed CRT Faculty Development Framework synthesizes these findings into a responsive and actionable model designed to address the identified needs of PE faculty while preserving and enhancing their established professional strengths. Future research may expand the scope of this inquiry

by examining additional variables such as institutional culture, administrative support, and faculty demographics, or by employing experimental or longitudinal designs to measure the actual impact of faculty development interventions on professional commitment, research productivity, and teaching competence over time.

REFERENCES

Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2017). The role of collaboration in research productivity: A study of Italian academics. Scientometrics, 110(3), 1637–1654. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2175-1

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., & Alabduljader, N. (2020). Best-practice recommendations for producers and consumers of research on academic productivity. Organizational Research Methods, 23(4), 671–702. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428119896745

Alcazaren, H. K. G. (2021). Research productivity as capital in Philippine higher education: A systematic review. Journal of Philippine Education Studies, 35(2), 45–61.

Al-Momani, M. O., & Jawarneh, R. S. (2022). Professional teaching competencies of physical education teachers in Jordan and their relationship to selected variables. Journal of Education and Learning, 11(4), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v11n4p101

Amanonce, J. T., Temporal, C. M., Vecaldo, R. T., Calubaquib, J. B., Tamayao, A. I., Malana, M. F., Tamayo, R. A., & Calanoga, M. C. M. (2025). Research productivity of teacher educators in a Philippine state university: Implications for faculty development. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 13(1), 55–68.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2016). Professional identity in teacher education: A review of the literature and implications for teacher learning. Educational Research, 48(3), 175–189.

Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.

Blanco, J. A., et al. (2022). Teacher empowerment and organizational commitment: Implications for teaching performance. International Journal of Educational Management, 36(5), 789–803.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. Wiley.

Chong, K. M., Ating, R., Separa, L. A. C., Widyatama, A., Palmares-Cruz, M. R. M. J., & Buluran, M. J. C. (2022). Digital competencies and challenges of higher education lecturers in the digital era. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 17(2), 65–80.

Chou, P. (2024). Research productivity and teaching effectiveness of engineering faculty: An educational data mining approach. Journal of Higher Education Research, 45(1), 76–92.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2018). School climate and social–emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. Journal of Educational Psychology, 110(8), 1181–1198.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Department of Education. (2017). Philippine professional standards for teachers (PPST). https://www.deped.gov.ph

Eirín-Nemiña, R., Sanmiguel-Rodríguez, A., & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, J. (2020). Teacher satisfaction, autonomy, and self-determination: A study in Spain. Teaching and Teacher Education, 96, 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103118

Erdogan, T., & Cavli, E. (2019). Demographic predictors of teachers' organizational commitment in Turkey. International Journal of Instruction, 12(2), 557–574.

Guerriero, S. (Ed.). (2017). Pedagogical knowledge and the changing nature of the teaching profession. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264270695-en

Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2016). Research self-efficacy, publication output, and early career development. Higher Education Research & Development, 35(6), 1194–1208.

Hermoso, J. R., & Brobo, M. A. (2023). Teaching competence and teacher performance in diocesan schools. Philippine Journal of Education and Development, 4(2), 145–163.

Jorilla, C. D., & Bual, J. M. (2021). Teaching competence of Catholic school teachers relative to PPST standards. Philippine Social Science Journal, 4(3), 32–45.

Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2018). Measuring teacher engagement: Development of the Engaged Teachers Scale (ETS). Frontline Learning Research, 6(2), 33–52.

König, J., Jäger-Biela, D. J., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19: Teacher competence and challenges. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 608–622.

Kraft, M. A., Papay, J. P., & Johnson, S. M. (2018). The effect of teacher working conditions on teacher retention. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 40(2), 204–225.

Launio, C. C., Samuel, F. K. D., Banez, A., Talastas, M. C., Sito, L., & Cruz, K. B. D. (2024). Research performance and motivations of faculty in a Philippine state university. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 12(2), 101–115.

Liu, S., & Chang, Y. (2021). Teachers' sense of calling and professional commitment: A mediated model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 103, 103369.

Liu, Y., & Chang, C. (2025). Teacher calling and organizational commitment in Taiwan: A vocational perspective. International Journal of Educational Development, 63, 45–55.

Low, E. L., Goh, S., & Tan, J. S. Y. (2022). Sustaining career-long professional commitment of teachers: Insights from Singapore. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42(3), 481–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1999552

Manigbas, J. I., Ollet, A. L., Noble, M. P. L., Angeles, J. R., Cayetano, N. M., & Fucio, M. P. (2024). Competency of teachers in content knowledge and pedagogy in Camarines Sur. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 8(1), 201–219.

Marginson, S. (2018). High participation systems of higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 89(6), 843–873. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2018.1442638

Martinez, J., & Huang, L. (2025). Professional commitment of PE teachers: Factors influencing retention. Journal of Physical Education and Sport, 25(2), 301–315.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

M, N. A. F., & Majdob, A. (2017). Teacher educators' research productivity: Background, attitudes, and obstacles. Teaching and Teacher Education, 63, 1–12.

Nikola, S. (2021). Teachers' self-assessment of competencies for innovating the teaching process. International Journal of Instruction, 14(1), 115–134.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Ocampo, L., Alinsunod, K., Casul, R. A., & Enquig, G. (2022). Determinants of research productivity among faculty members in higher education institutions: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 3, 100177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100177

Penney, D. (2018). Physical education as a curriculum subject: Status, challenges and development. Sport, Education and Society, 23(2), 1–15.

Pentang, J. T., & Domingo, J. G. (2024). Research self-efficacy and productivity of faculty members: Challenges in research writing and publication. Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement, 6(2), 55–70.

Pinuela, F. S. (2023). Faculty professional identity, commitment, and teaching performance in a Philippine university. International Journal of Education, 15(1), 101–119.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? Research in Nursing & Health, 29(5), 489–497.

Roman, A. G. (2021). Research competencies and performance of higher education institution faculty. International Journal of Research Publications, 78(1).

Salazar-Clemeña, R. M., & Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2017). Developing research culture among faculty: The Philippine experience. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 37(3), 349–363.

Sheikh, A. Z., & Aghaz, A. (2019). Faculty brand, professional commitment, and organizational outcomes in higher education. International Journal of Educational Management, 33(6), 1115–1131.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Sims, S., & Jerrim, J. (2020). TALIS 2018: Teacher working conditions and job satisfaction. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 225.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivation and burnout in teachers: The role of school context. Teaching and Teacher Education, 67, 152–160.

Song, Y., Liu, X., & Wei, K. (2024). Factors influencing research productivity of library and information science faculty in North America. Journal of Information Science Research, 46(2), 155–172.

Tight, M. (2016). Examining the research–teaching nexus. Higher Education, 71(3), 293–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9886-1

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions. Educational Review, 73(1), 71–97.

Türk, N., & Korkmaz, Ö. (2022). Professional commitment, dedication, and teaching attitudes of Turkish teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology Research, 14(2), 201–214.

Ulas, M., & Senel, E. (2018). Institutional effectiveness and research productivity: A sequential mixed methods study. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 40(5), 452–468.

Ulas, M., & Senel, E. (2020). Teacher efficacy and professional commitment of PE teachers in Turkey. International Journal of Kinesiology and Education, 12(3), 211–224.

V, D., V. Jr., & Corpuz, L. N. (2022). Research productivity of a state university in Central Luzon: Basis for policy formulation. Philippine Journal of Education, 39(4), 77–96.

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes and student outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 981–1015.